

Peer Review of Teaching - Economics

Name of Professor: _____

Date: _____

Topic/Class: _____

Reviewer: _____

1. CLASS CONTENT: The content of the course was appropriate to the audience, and highly relevant to this course.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	The information presented was not appropriate to this class.
2. PRESENTATION: Information was presented logically, clearly, in an organized and understandable manner. The teacher's delivery style was effective. Good opener and closure with topic.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	The teacher's delivery style was confusing. Lacked good opening or closure with topic.
3. SUPPLEMENTS: Textbook and other materials are appropriate. Syllabus includes required information	5 4 3 2 1 NA	Reading materials not relevant to course. Syllabus missing required information.
3. HANDOUTS/VISUALS: Handouts or visuals are professional appearing, accurate, clear, adequate size, helpful to students. Not too wordy. Appropriate use of the whiteboard.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	Handouts or visuals are sloppy, inaccurate, unclear, of inadequate size to see, or too wordy and not helpful. Poor use of the whiteboard.
4. CONFIDENCE: evidence of knowing subject very well and displayed confidence in thorough command of the material and topic.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	Lacked confidence and did not display "owning" or command of the material and topic.
5. LANGUAGE: uses language the audience understood and connected to. Uses real-life examples to illustrate abstract ideas. Gives clear instructions needed to complete required tasks.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	Language inappropriate to the audience. "Talked up or down to the group". No real-life examples. No instructions given for completion of tasks.
6. ENERGY for presentation. Demonstrated an excitement/passion about the subject. Engaged group in the purpose of the presentation. Motivated the audience to learn.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	Lack of energy, zest, or enthusiasm for this presentation. Did not engage with audience or motivate audience to learn.
7. RAPPORT with students is clearly evident. Listens carefully to students' questions and comments; encourages students to ask questions, express opinions, give feedback that promotes thinking. Effective eye contact used.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	No connection noted with students. Does not promote interaction, encourage questions/comments. Did not provide an opportunity for feedback/questions with the audience. Ineffective or no eye contact with students.
8. ACTION: Started and ended class on time. Pace lively but not too fast; uses time efficiently	5 4 3 2 1 NA	Did not start or end class on time. Pace sluggish or frenzied; time is wasted on things that do not support the course or overall objectives
9. OVERALL EVALUATION is superior.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	Overall poor evaluation. Much improvement needed for professional teaching delivery.

Peer Review of Teaching

Three Overall Strengths Observed during this Class:

Three Constructive Feedback Recommendations:

Other Insights:

Distribution:
Professor Evaluated (Copy)
Office of the Dean, College of Business and Economics (Original)