

Peer Evaluation - MJF¹

Instructor: Jenni fer Thomas
 Course CRN & Title: 18037 - MJFC 313-01
 Number of Students Enrolled: 14

Observer: J. M. Latta
 Location/Time/Date: Tues. 10:10
 Number of Students In Attendance: 12

SCALE: 1 = Inadequate 2 = Poor 3 = Average 4 = Good 5 = Excellent NA = Not Applicable

	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
PART 1: Content and Organization (30%)							
Class started & ended on time						✓	
Presented overview of class content/objectives						✓	
Presented Context to syllabus				✓			
Presented & defined key concepts; emphasized major ideas				✓			
Covered material presented in a thorough, organized fashion – well prepared					✓		
Material level appropriate to the course					✓		
Demonstrated command of the subject matter					✓		
Made efficient use of class time / Paced presentation effectively					✓		
Covered class content/objectives					✓		
Distinguished between major and minor issues				✓			
Recapitulated key points for the class					✓		
Related new ideas to already familiar ones					✓		

¹ This form seeks to be as qualitative in nature as possible – please utilize the opportunity to add comments whenever applicable.

PART 5: Teaching Methods (10%)

NA / 2 3 4 5

Used student engagement techniques (e.g. discussion, small group work, active learning strategies, etc.) effectively.					✓	Used a variety of techniques effectively. Online PQA
Incorporated technology (e.g. PowerPoint slides, course website, YouTube logs, videos, blackboard etc.) effectively, to enhance student learning.					✓	
Used visuals materials effectively					✓	
Fostered students' ability to workshop / research independently.					✓	Encouraged student's motivation
Handouts given are clear and relevant						

PART 6: Syllabus (15%)

Discuss effectiveness of design & evaluation method

Instructor's availability specified.					✓	
Descriptive information provided.					✓	
Course Description and Objectives clearly stated.					✓	
Required Text and resources listed.					✓	
Course Requirements clarified.					✓	
Course Grading method stipulated.					✓	
Attendance & Tardiness policies stated.					✓	
HU Academic Integrity & Disability policies cited.					✓	
Clear Topical / Course Outline specified.					✓	
Other Issues					✓	

Strengths Observed:

The class was absolutely fascinating. Thomas used a series of practical interactive activities and exercises to engage student answers their questions and push them to understand complex concepts. Her experience as a journalist was an invaluable tool.

Suggestions for Improvements:

None

Summary - comment on the quality of instruction and concern for student learning provided by the individual under review:

High quality instruction drawn from real life - a first hand experience of the professional world.

Comments of instructor - to be given only on the FINAL PEER EVALUATION COMMITTEE SUMMARY REVIEW.

CULCULATIONS FOR COMMITTEE:

This REVISED version includes what was discussed in our last meeting, as per notes taken by Prof. Missouri & emailed by Prof. Ahmed.

I have taken the liberty to assign the percentage I think makes sense for each section in more rounded numbers, as per importance.

The following, however, is the mathematical representation of the calculation based on the number of questions remaining – totaling in 220 points:

PART	POINTS	ACTUAL %	ROUNDED %
1	60	27.3	27
2	60	27.3	27
3	15	6.8	7
4	15	6.8	7
5	25	11.4	12
6	45 (L-AST question is optional, therefore not calculated)	20.4	20
Total	220 points	100%	100%