

## Peer Evaluation - MJF<sup>1</sup>

**Instructor:** Jennifer Thomas  
**Course CRN & Title:** Multimedia Storytelling  
**Number of Students Enrolled:** 2

**Observer:** Mark Beckford  
**Location/Time/Date:** CB Powell Building 213/ 10:10-11:30/4/26/18  
**Number of Students in Attendance:** 2

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

	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
<b>PART 1: Content and Organization (30%)</b>							
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						✓	

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

<b>PART 2: Communication and Delivery Style (25%)</b>						
Spoke audibly and clearly						✓
Demonstrated ability to simplify complex subject matters & speak at students' level.						✓
Held students' interest						✓
Demonstrated enthusiasm						✓
Encouraged students' questions						✓
Answered questions appropriately						✓
Recognized and responded to instances when students weren't responsive / didn't understand						✓
Clarified points students found challenging						✓
Responded to students' unanticipated solutions / to students view point that differs from own						✓
Gave constructive feedback to student presentation						✓
Ensured an environment conducive to discussion and learning						✓
Made direct eye contact						✓
<b>PART 3: Critical Thinking Skills (10%)</b>						
Asked probing questions						✓
Used problem solving examples					✓	
Guided students towards application of material to the larger picture – in terms of syllabus / real life.						✓
<b>PART 4: Rapport with Students (10%)</b>						
Responded appropriately to a range of student class behaviors						✓
Ensured that students interacted civilly/respectfully with each other						✓
Listened carefully and respectfully to students' questions						✓

<b>PART 5: Teaching Methods (10%)</b>							
Used student engagement techniques (e.g. discussion, small group work, active learning strategies, etc.) effectively.						✓	
Incorporated technology (e.g. PowerPoint slides, course website, YouTube, blogs, videos, blackboard etc.) effectively, to enhance student learning.						✓	
Used visuals materials effectively						✓	
Fostered students' ability to workshop / research independently.						✓	
Handouts given are clear and relevant							
<b>PART 6: Syllabus (15%)</b>							<b>Discuss effectiveness of design &amp; evaluation method</b>
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:

Students expressed how their work and professionalism grew in the Professor's class. Professor Thomas' instructions allowed students to use multimedia modes of journalism to tell stories, which is necessary in today's media landscape.

Suggestions for Improvements:

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

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 (LAST question is optional, therefore not calculated)	20.4	20
Total	220 points 219	100% 99.5	100%