

Peer Observation Form

1. Does the faculty member use a variety of teaching and learning strategies to effectively engage diverse learners?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence of variety in teaching and learning strategies. -Instruction appears to rely primarily or exclusively on a single approach (e.g., lecture), with minimal evidence of adaptation for learners who differ in preparation, experience, or learning needs.	-There is evidence that the faculty member uses more than one teaching and learning strategy (e.g., case studies, small group work, simulation, individual work). -Evidence suggests that the variety may be limited, inconsistent, or concentrated in isolated portions of the course. -Strategies appear to be used but are not clearly selected in response to the range of learners in the course.	-Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member consistently uses a variety of teaching and learning strategies across the course (e.g., case analysis, simulation, small group problem-solving, visual and multimedia materials, hands-on skill application). -The strategies are purposefully selected and clearly connected to the learning outcomes. -There is evidence that the variety of approaches is responsive to differences among learners in preparation, experience, and learning needs.
Evidence (<i>e.g., syllabus, in-class observation, lesson plans, sample of student work</i>):		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

2. Are students engaged in higher order thinking that is appropriate to the course level and content?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-The available evidence suggests that the course is characterized primarily by passive knowledge acquisition and recall-based assessment. -There is minimal evidence that students are required to analyze, apply, or synthesize course content. -Where higher-order tasks are present, the level of cognitive demand may not appear appropriate to the level of the course.	-There is evidence that some assignments and activities require students to engage in higher-order thinking (e.g., analyzing a case, developing a plan of care, evaluating a source, writing, presenting). -Opportunities appear somewhat limited and not central to the design of the course. -Evidence suggests that the level of cognitive demand may not be consistently appropriate to the course level and content, and that recall-based instruction and assessment remain a regular feature of the course.	-Evidence demonstrates that the course is designed around activities and assessments that consistently require higher-order thinking at a level appropriate to the course and its content (e.g., analyzing complex scenarios, prioritizing and justifying interventions, appraising evidence, synthesizing content across courses). -The cognitive demand is well matched to students' place in the program of study and builds toward critical reasoning and critical judgment. -Higher-order thinking is a central feature of the course.
Evidence reviewed:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

3. Does the faculty member create a respectful learning environment for all students?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence that the faculty member establishes a respectful learning environment for all students. -Expectations for respectful interaction appear absent, and there is limited to no evidence of intentional efforts to ensure that all students are able to participate. -There may be evidence of interactions, language, or course practices that could be experienced as dismissive or exclusionary.	-There is evidence that the faculty member takes some steps to create a respectful learning environment (e.g., a syllabus statement, stated expectations for discussion). -Evidence suggests that these efforts may be limited to formal statements rather than consistently reinforced in practice. -Evidence of attention to whether all students are able to participate appears uneven across the course.	-Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member consistently creates and maintains a respectful learning environment for all students. -Expectations for respectful interaction appear in course materials and are reinforced in practice (e.g., ground rules for discussion of sensitive topics, inclusive language, addressing disrespectful behavior when it arises). -Evidence suggests that all students have opportunity to participate and that the environment reflects the standards of professional civility expected in this field.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

4. Does the faculty member promote student engagement?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence that the faculty member takes intentional steps to promote student engagement. -Class sessions and course activities appear to position students primarily as recipients of content. -Low or uneven participation, where observed, does not appear to be addressed.	-There is evidence that the faculty member uses some strategies to promote student engagement (e.g., posing questions, brief discussion, small group activity). -Evidence suggests that these efforts may be occasional, concentrated in lower-stakes activities, or not sustained across the course. -Some students appear engaged, but engagement does not appear to be broadly cultivated.	-Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member consistently promotes student engagement throughout the course (e.g., questioning that requires students to reason aloud, discussion of scenarios, group problem-solving, application of content to practice). -There is evidence that the faculty member reviews levels of participation and adjusts to draw in students who are less engaged. -Student engagement is a central feature of the design of the course.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

5. Does the faculty member actively seek student questions/concerns about the course?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
There is little to no evidence that the faculty member actively seeks student questions or concerns about the course. -Opportunities to raise questions appear absent or appear to depend entirely on students initiating contact on their own.	-There is evidence that the faculty member provides some opportunities for students to raise questions or concerns (e.g., inviting questions at the close of class, a question forum in D2L). -Evidence suggests that these efforts may be occasional, informal, or not sustained across the term. -There may be limited evidence that questions raised were followed up on.	-Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member actively and regularly seeks student questions and concerns about the course (e.g., recurring check-ins, course announcements, office hours, mid-course feedback survey, dedicated question forums, prompts before and after major assignments). -Multiple avenues are available and are described to students. -There is evidence that students use these opportunities and that the faculty member acknowledges and follows up on what is raised.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

6. Does the faculty member respond to students in a professional manner?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence that the faculty member responds to student questions or concerns in a professional manner. -Responses, where present, may appear dismissive, unclear, or inconsistent with the standards of professional communication expected in this field.	-There is evidence that the faculty member responds to student questions and concerns in a professional manner in some instances. -Evidence suggests that tone, thoroughness, or responsiveness may be inconsistent across students or across the term. -There may be evidence of an instance in which a response did not adequately address the student's question or concern in a timely manner	-Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member consistently responds to student questions and concerns in a professional manner. -Responses are respectful, clear, and substantive, and model the norms of professional communication expected in the MSU code of teaching responsibility. -There is evidence that concerns are addressed directly and, where appropriate, followed up to resolution in a timely manner.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

7. Does the faculty member use technologies effectively to support student learning?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence that technologies are used to support student learning. -Where technologies are used, evidence suggests they may be poorly integrated, unreliable, or used in ways that create barriers rather than support learning.	-There is evidence that the faculty member uses some technologies in ways that support student learning (e.g., D2L, recorded content, audience response tools, simulation). -Evidence suggests that use may be inconsistent, limited primarily to content delivery or administrative functions, or not clearly connected to the learning outcomes. -There may be evidence of technical difficulties that were not fully resolved.	-Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member consistently and effectively uses technologies to support student learning. -The technologies are purposefully selected and clearly connected to the learning outcomes (e.g., virtual simulation, D2L tools for formative assessment and feedback, accessible multimedia). -There is evidence that the faculty member is proficient with the technologies used, provides students with guidance in using them, and uses them to extend rather than substitute for effective instruction.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

8. Is the course organized in D2L?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence that the course is organized within D2L. -Materials may appear absent, incomplete, or posted without a discernible structure. -Evidence suggests potential difficulty in locating the materials, assignments, or information.	-There is evidence that the course is organized in the D2L. -Evidence suggests that the organization may be inconsistent across modules or units, only partially developed, or not clearly labeled, such that some materials are difficult to locate. -Navigation appears functional but may not be intuitive throughout the course.	-Evidence demonstrates that the course is consistently and coherently organized in D2L using CON D2L shells/best practice to standardize across courses and programs. Materials, assignments, and assessments are logically sequenced, clearly labeled, and current (e.g., a consistent module structure, readings and activities placed with the corresponding unit, an up-to-date calendar of due dates). -Evidence suggests that the organization supports locating what is needed to progress toward the outcomes for the course.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

9. Are learning outcomes for assignments/assessments aligned with learning outcomes for the course?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence of a clear connection between the learning outcomes for assignments/assessments and the learning outcomes for the course. -Assignment/assessment outcomes, where present, may appear unrelated to or misaligned with the stated course outcomes. -Alignment does not appear to be articulated.	-There is evidence that outcomes for some assignments/assessments are aligned with the learning outcomes for the course. -Evidence suggests that the connection may be inconsistent, incomplete, or only partially articulated. -There is evidence of alignment for some assignments/assessments or some course outcomes, but not across the course as a whole.	-Evidence demonstrates that the learning outcomes for assignments are consistently and coherently aligned with the learning outcomes for the course. -The connections are clearly articulated (e.g., assignment descriptions identify the course outcomes each assignment addresses). -Evidence suggests that, taken together, the assignments support students' progress toward achieving the outcomes for the course.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

10. Are learning outcomes clearly articulated for students for all major assignments/assessments?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence of outcomes articulated for each major assignment/assessment.	-Outcomes are articulated for some major assignments/assessments. -Some outcome statements may be vague or incomplete.	-Learning outcomes are clearly articulated for every major assignment/assessment. -There is evidence that outcome statements are adequately specific and complete.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

11. Are instructions for all assignments usable by students (i.e., clear, comprehensive)?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence that instructions are usable by students. -Instructions may be missing, minimal, or ambiguous with respect to the task, requirements, or expectations for submission.	-There is evidence that instructions for some assignments are usable by students. -Evidence suggests that clarity or completeness may be inconsistent across assignments, with some instructions omitting key information (e.g., criteria for evaluation, formatting expectations, submission process, due dates).	-Evidence demonstrates that instructions for all assignments are clear and comprehensive. -Instructions specify the task, the requirements, and the criteria by which work will be evaluated. -Evidence suggests that students can interpret what is expected without ambiguity.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		

Peer Observation Form

12. Is an objective rubric used for all major assignments/assessments?		
None-Limited (1-2)	Moderate (3)	Substantial-Extensive (4-5)
-There is little to no evidence that rubrics are used for major assignments/assessments. -Where evaluation criteria are present, they appear vague or subjective. -Evidence suggests that grading may not be based on consistently applied criteria.	-There is evidence that rubrics are used for some major assignments/assessments. -Evidence suggests that use may be inconsistent across assignments, or that criteria and performance levels are only partially specified. -Some rubrics may include criteria that leave substantial room for subjective interpretation.	-Evidence demonstrates that a rubric is used for every major assignment/assessment. -Rubrics specify observable criteria and clearly differentiated performance levels that are connected to the learning outcomes for the assignment and are provided to students in advance. -Evidence suggests that rubrics support consistent and equitable evaluation of student work.
Evidence:		
Thoughtful questions and suggestions from Peer Observer		