1-1-1995

A multidimensional model for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness

B Kumaravadivelu

San Jose State University, b.kumar@sjsu.edu

Recommended Citation

A Multidimensional Model for
Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

B. Kumaravadivelu
San José State University

*The current practice of peer evaluation of teaching effective-
ness, which emphasizes observer perception of observable
teacher behavior, provides only a limited and limiting under-
standing of classroom processes. This article proposes a broader
concept of peer evaluation, in which the perspectives of the
teacher, the learners, and the observer are taken into consider-
ation. It is also argued that three basic principles—intention/
interpretation, advisement/appraisement, and acceptability/
accessibility—must necessarily and minimally guide peer eval-
uation. In accordance with these concepts, the article presents
a four-part, multidimensional model that can be adopted and
adapted by various academic units to meet their specific needs,
wants, and situations.*

Introduction

Not long ago, the President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Ad-
vancement of Teaching made a clarion call "to move beyond the tired
old 'teaching versus research' debate and give the familiar and honor-
able term 'scholarship' a broader, more capacious meaning, one that
brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work" (Boyer, 1990, p.
16). Following his lead, a consensus definition of scholarship has been
forged and encompasses four interrelated areas: advancement of knowl-
edge through original research, integration of knowledge through
meaningful synthesis, application of knowledge through professional
practice, and transfer of knowledge through pedagogic exercise (Rice,
1991). Since then, within a surprisingly short period of time, a welcome

surge has occurred in the emphasis placed on, and the importance given to, the scholarship of teaching, so much so that Seldin (1993) declared: "Countless institutions are reexamining their commitment to teaching and exploring ways to improve and reward it. As for faculty, they are being held accountable, as never before, to provide solid evidence of the quality of their classroom instruction" (p. 1). It is clear that both faculty and administrators are becoming increasingly involved in the complexity of pedagogic processes, thereby contributing to a growing awareness and acceptance that teaching effectiveness should form an integral part of the faculty reward system (Cox & Richlin, 1993; Diamond & Adam, 1993).

Teaching effectiveness, however, is an elusive concept. To define it in operational terms is challenging; to assess it in objective ways is even more daunting. It is no wonder, therefore, that the laudable awareness about teaching effectiveness inevitably brings with it legitimate concerns about the availability as well as the reliability of appropriate assessment methods. Consequently, several methods, some still unfolding, have been introduced and implemented, the most important being the use of teaching portfolios (Anderson, 1993; Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991; Seldin, 1993). Closely linked to the concept of teaching portfolios, and indeed to other assessment methods as well, is peer review of teaching effectiveness.

It has been widely conceded, at least in theory, that for teaching performance to be recognized and rewarded as a scholarly activity, it should be subject to the same rigorous peer review process a research paper is subject to before being published in a refereed journal. Yet, sustained and systematic scrutiny of teaching effectiveness has long been neglected. This neglect stems partly from the fact that peer review, as Hutchings (1993) rightly pointed out, "prompts considerable squirming and discomfort by faculty, many of whom envision drop-in classroom visits by an (inevitably antagonistic) colleague" (p. 4). More often than not, it is the random review, not any informed inquiry, that causes understandable apprehension in the minds of faculty. Such concerns can hardly be ignored in any serious and sincere effort to maximize the teaching effectiveness of faculty. Therefore, what is badly needed

> . . . is a broader, more useful conception of peer review—not as perfunctory classroom visits but as a matter of professional accountability among faculty, and as a range of activities through which faculty themselves assume responsibility for monitoring and improving the quality of teaching. (Hutchings, 1993, p. 4)

This article presents one such "broader, more useful conception of peer review." Building on the work already done (see, for instance, Braskamp & Ory, 1994, and Centra, 1993), first a set of governing principles to guide peer review is proposed, followed by a multidimensional model for peer evaluation, designed in accordance with those principles, that can be applied by various academic units to meet their specific needs, wants, and situations.

Governing Principles

The proposed multidimensional model is based on the premise that any framework for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness must be founded on at least three basic principles. First and foremost, any potential mismatch between intention and interpretation of classroom processes should be minimized. Second, there should be sensitivity to the twin functions of advisement (mentoring) and appraisement (evaluation). Finally, any peer evaluation model should be acceptable and accessible to faculty in different disciplines with varying demands. These principles are by no means exhaustive. As exploration of classroom learning and teaching continues and additional insights are gained, the list of governing principles may grow. The three principles are described below.

Intention and Interpretation

The intention/interpretation principle constitutes the cornerstone of the proposed multidimensional model and therefore will be examined in considerable detail. This principle deals with potential sources of mismatch between teacher intention and observer interpretation, and between teacher intention and learner interpretation. Minimizing mismatches between intention and interpretation is a challenging aspect of peer observation that is seldom seriously addressed by existing models of peer evaluation of classroom instruction. With some commendable exceptions (e.g., Braskamp & Ory, 1994), traditional models have been unidirectional; that is, the information flow is generally from the observer to the teacher. Traditional models have also been unidimensional in that the evaluation is based largely on only one perspective, that of the observer. The reason is that traditional models reflect the belief that peer observation should be confined only to *observable* teacher behavior, a belief reiterated, for instance, in the categorical statement made by Bronowski, Toms-Bronowski, and Bearden (1993): "Teacher observation forms should focus on observable teacher preparation/behaviors and observable teaching technique factors appropriate to a particular lesson" (p. 31).

The current practice of classroom observation that emphasizes observer perception of observable teacher behavior is necessary but not sufficient for a thorough understanding of classroom events. Because of the narrow emphasis in vogue at present, the teaching act receives great attention, whereas teacher perception does not. Also neglected is the equally important task of observing the learning act and understanding learner perception of classroom events. Perhaps what is needed is a broader definition of the acts of teaching, learning, and observing.

The teaching act can be defined as an interactive activity through which learning opportunities are created by the teacher, the learner, or both. By logical extension, the learning act can be defined as a cognitive activity through which learning opportunities are utilized by the learner. Peer observation, then, becomes an activity of observing, analyzing, and understanding the successful, partially successful, or unsuccessful creation and utilization of learning opportunities. In such a teaching and learning paradigm, a productive peer evaluation must encompass systematic observation of the teaching and learning acts and also an awareness of the teacher and learner perceptions of what did or did not happen in class. Only such a multifaceted, stereoscopic picture will provide a well-rounded perspective of the intended and unintended outcomes of classroom events.

To obtain an accurate evaluation of teaching performance, teachers, learners, and observers must function as partners who are striving to understand and assess the discourse of a particular lesson. These partners, by virtue of their prior experience and exposure, bring to the classroom their own perceptions and prescriptions as to what constitutes effective teaching and learning and acceptable learning outcomes. Therefore, as research has clearly revealed, the same classroom event can be, and often is, interpreted differently by various participants in that event (Kumaravadivelu, 1991). A balanced understanding of different—even contradictory—teacher, learner, and observer perceptions of classroom events is not only possible but desirable.

The emphasis on the teacher perspective ensures self-monitoring and self-evaluation on the part of the teacher. A meaningful dialogue with an observing and observant colleague gives teachers an opportunity to examine their own philosophical orientation, to analyze their own classroom discourse, and to theorize from their own practice. This continual reflection heightens awareness of one's own teaching behavior, and any changes in behavior that result from such reflection are bound to be meaningful and long-lasting. Besides, from a purely practical point of view, "faculty themselves are the most important assessment source because only they can provide descriptions of their work, the thinking be-

hind it, and their own personal reporting, appraisals, interpretations, and goals" (Braskamp & Ory, 1994, p. 102).

The emphasis on the learner perspective in peer evaluation of teaching is based on the learners' role as primary consumers of instruction, who are therefore uniquely qualified to judge the effectiveness of teaching. The learner perspective suggested here is different from that obtained on the evaluation forms students complete at the end of a semester. Whereas the latter is a macroanalysis of overall teaching effectiveness, the former is a microanalysis of the effectiveness of a particular lesson, the one being observed for peer evaluation. As interested and involved members of the classroom community, learners are best suited to explain and examine several aspects of classroom discourse, including the stated or unstated objective(s) of classroom activities, the articulated or unarticulated modes of ongoing self-evaluation they use to monitor and assess the complexity of the task at hand, the clarity of instructional guidance given by the teacher to help them achieve their goal(s), and their attitude toward the nature and scope of classroom activities in general.

The emphasis on the observer perspective envisions the kind of collaboration among colleagues characteristic of modern management methods such as Total Quality Management and Continuous Quality Improvement (for details, see Hubbard, 1993). That is, working together, colleagues can help each other improve both the classroom environment and their own teaching performance. This collegial, collaborative process can produce valuable and valued insights into pedagogic processes.

In the context of classroom teaching and learning, then, the three perspectives—teacher, learner, and observer (peer)—are easily identifiable and analyzable. Peer observation models that narrowly focus on one perspective, but neglect the other two, are bound to provide only a limited and limiting view of the classroom. An understanding of all three perspectives is essential for a meaningful assessment of teaching effectiveness, because, as in the case of the proverbial six blind men and the elephant, each of the participants touches upon only one aspect of the whole classroom experience. The primary goal of the proposed three-dimensional model, therefore, is to sensitize teachers and observers to alternative perspectives of classroom aims and events, and thus to make them aware of the complexity of learning and teaching.

Advisement and Appraisement

The second governing principle addresses the twin, supportive functions of peer review: advisement and appraisement. Advisement relates to the mentoring function of providing guidance to colleagues, and ap-

praisement relates to the evaluative function of aiding the retention-tenure-promotion process. In other words, advisement entails formative assessment, and appraisement entails summative assessment.

Advisement is meant to bring about positive attitudes in an informal atmosphere. If the desired goal of peer observation is improvement, not merely judgment, then it makes eminent sense to use peer review as a mentoring, not merely evaluative, process. Mentoring relationships, if carefully cultivated, can prove to be a valuable source of friendly feedback and alternative strategies for faculty (Walen & DeRose, 1993). The mentor and the advisee engage in expanding their knowledge and skills concerning pedagogic purposes and processes. They ask thoughtful questions, avoid value judgments, maintain a climate of collegiality, share their sufferings and successes, and learn from one another. The goal is performance improvement, not performance appraisal. The result is reflection, not evaluation.

Appraisement, on the other hand, is a summative assessment by the peer evaluator after carefully considering all aspects of instruction, including the three perspectives on classroom performance. The peer evaluator, as an experienced colleague, judges the teacher's demonstrated level of competence to transmit to students appropriate knowledge and skills in an effective manner. As Centra (1993) rightly pointed out, colleagues can provide evaluative information not available from any other source. Neither students, who lack the background, nor deans, who lack the time, can offer the kind of expert opinion that colleagues can.

Acceptability and Accessibility

The third principle that should guide the design of any peer evaluation model is acceptability and accessibility. Acceptability refers to the degree to which faculty who are likely to use the model perceive it as useful. A peer evaluation model is more than an observational tool. As an assessment instrument, it should incorporate "the institutional context, the role of colleagues in judging and helping others, and the need to observe the actual work of the faculty. It touches on self-reflection, dialogue, and discussion. It is learning, developing, and building" (Braskamp & Ory, 1994, p. 16). A workable model should elicit affirmative responses to the following questions: Is the model creative enough to achieve what it is supposed to achieve? Is the model comprehensive enough to take into consideration all aspects of instruction—course objectives, course content, instructional methods and materials, desired learning outcomes, classroom presentation—from the perspective of all the participants actively associated with the peer review? Is the model flexible

enough to be adapted to various disciplines with different needs, wants, and situations? Is the model robust enough to reveal the teacher's strengths and weaknesses, at least when its ratings are aggregated over a period of time?

Accessibility refers to the degree to which faculty who are likely to use the model perceive its feasibility. The following questions must be asked: Are the instruments that comprise the model user-friendly? Is the personal investment in time, energy, and commitment commensurate with the expected or desired outcome of the whole enterprise? Does the model provide an opportunity for quantitative as well as qualitative measurement?

A Multidimensional Model

The three basic principles outlined above—intention/interpretation, advisement/appraisement, and acceptability/accessibility—must necessarily and minimally guide the construction of any model for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The multidimensional model proposed in this article (see appendix) seeks to meet these criteria.

The model consists of the following four parts:

Part 1: Self Observation Report on Teaching (SORT Form A)
Part 2: Self Observation Report on Teaching (SORT Form B)
Part 3: Learner Observation Report on Teaching (LORT Form)
Part 4: Peer Observation Report on Teaching (PORT Form)

The first part of the observation instrument—Self Observation Report on Teaching (SORT Form A)—is actually a preobservation form, to be completed by the teacher well before the observation day. It is designed to give the teacher an opportunity to apprise the observer of the specific instructional objectives for that particular class, instructional strategies to be followed to achieve those objectives, and probable factors that might constrain successful teaching. In addition, the teacher indicates the general levels of student preparedness, motivation, and participation for that class.

The second part of the observation instrument—Self Observation Report on Teaching (SORT Form B)—is to be completed by the teacher after the observation is over. It is designed to give the teacher an opportunity to communicate his or her own perspective on the classroom event. The teacher focuses on crucial issues such as the extent to which the specific objectives identified earlier were or were not realized, changes made in the lesson plan and why, effectiveness of the teaching strategy followed, and so on. The teacher rates these and other items on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) and also provides brief narrative comments to explain the ratings.

The third part of the observation instrument—Learner Observation Report on Teaching (LORT Form)—is to be completed by the students after the observation is over. The LORT Form is to be administered by the observer at the end of the session observed or at another, mutually convenient time. The Form is designed to give students an opportunity to communicate their perspectives on the classroom activities. They rate the teacher's performance and their own response on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) and also provide, if they choose, brief narrative comments to explain the ratings. The students focus on several teaching and learning issues such as the difficulty level of the lesson, the teacher's communication skills, the effectiveness of the teaching method, and so on.

The fourth and final part of the observation instrument—Peer Observation Report on Teaching (PORT Form)—is to be completed by the observer. The SORT and LORT Forms are designed to help the observer arrive at an informed understanding of classroom events, particularly from the perspectives of the teacher and the learners. Based on this understanding and on his or her own observation and assessment, the observer can then complete the PORT Form, which covers wide-ranging issues related to course content, classroom presentation, student response, and teacher response. Although the completed PORT Form represents the observer's perspective on classroom events, it is predicated upon the observer's understanding of the multiple perspectives derived from meaningful interaction between the teacher, the learners, and the observer.

How (Not) to Use the Model

The objectives of peer evaluation are realized through a three-tier process: (a) preobservation, in which the observer consults with the teacher about what has been planned and, if necessary, with a select number of students to assess their expectations about the class to be observed; (b) observation itself, in which the observer takes careful notes; and (c) postobservation, in which the observer analyzes classroom discourse and discusses its implications with the teacher after getting feedback from the teacher and the students. Depending on time constraints and other exigencies, peer evaluation may be conducted twice a semester or year, with the first evaluation serving the purpose of advisement (formative assessment) and the second evaluation, appraisement (summative assessment). If time is limited, observations made during one session may be used for both advisement and appraisement.

Although the quantitative part of the multidimensional model measures most of the items on a five-point scale, it is obvious that the items do not have equal importance or relevance. Therefore, it is prudent to

resist the temptation to add the numbers and arrive at a total score to hold up against a "minimum" or "maximum" measurement that determines the effectiveness of classroom instruction. The emphasis should be on interaction among the participants in the classroom event and on their suggestions for improvement of instruction. It should be remembered that a checklist alone does not engage the teacher in the dynamic process of reflection, evaluation, and change.

The proposed model is not meant to be a university-wide classroom observation instrument for adoption by all schools and departments; rather, it is a generic model that provides general guidelines for individual schools and departments to adapt to their own discipline-specific needs, wants, and situations. It is neither feasible nor desirable to design a monolithic instrument suited to one and all, because a single model or process is simply not realistic given the differences among the disciplines. It is hoped that the basic principles and observation instruments presented in this article offer adequate guidelines for schools and departments to structure and restructure their classroom observation instruments to maximize the impact of the peer review process.

Conclusion

This article started with the premise that the current practice of peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness, which emphasizes observer perception of observable teacher behavior, provides only a limited and limiting understanding of classroom processes. There is a need to introduce a broader concept of peer evaluation, one in which the perspectives of the teacher, the learners, and the observer are taken into consideration. The article also argued that there are three basic principles—intention/interpretation, advisement/appraisement, and acceptability/accessibility—that must necessarily and minimally guide the construction of any model for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness. In accordance with these concepts, a multidimensional model for peer evaluation was presented. The model was based on a vision of peer evaluation as a process in which the observer not only evaluates but guides, the teacher not only teaches but learns, and the learners not only learn but evaluate. In practical terms, the multidimensional model has the potential to transform peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness into a meaningful and purposeful exercise. Clearly, the ultimate worth of such a model will be determined by how well it provides informed and informative feedback to teachers and how well it functions, so that faculty do not see it as yet another transgression of academic freedom and systemic flexibility.

References

Anderson, E. (Ed.). (1993). *Campus use of the teaching portfolio: Twenty-five profiles*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braskamp, L. A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bronowski, C., Toms-Bronowski, S., & Bearden, K. J. (1993). Teacher observation forms: A new look at an old technique. *NASSP Bulletin*, *77*, 30-38.

Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cox, M. D., & Richlin, L. (1993). Emerging trends in college teaching for the 21st century. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, *4*, 1-7.

Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (Eds.). (1993). *New directions for higher education: No. 81. Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship in teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Hubbard, D. L. (Ed.). (1993). *Continuous quality improvement: Making the transition to education*. Maryville, MO: Prescott Publishing.

Hutchings, P. (1993). Introduction. In E. Anderson (Ed.), *Campus use of the teaching portfolio: Twenty-five profiles* (pp. 1-6). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1991). Language learning tasks: Teacher intention and learner interpretation. *ELT Journal*, *45*, 98-107.

Rice, R. E. (1991). The new American scholar: Scholarship and the purposes of the university. *Metropolitan Universities Journal*, *1*, 7-18.

Seldin, P. (1993). *Successful use of the teaching portfolio*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Walen, E., & DeRose, M. (1993). The power of peer appraisals. *Educational Leadership*, *51*, 45-48.

Appendix

SELF-OBSERVATION REPORT on TEACHING (SORT Form A)
(To be completed by teacher *before* observation)

Teacher's name_____ Course _____ Date _____

1. Specific objectives: At the end of this class, I will have helped my students learn . . .

    a. to . . .

    b. to . . .

    c. to . . .

2. Briefly, I propose to achieve these specific objectives by using the following teaching procedures:

3. These specific objectives are related to what I taught in earlier sessions in this way:

4. These specific objectives are related to my next teaching item in this way:

5. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high), I would generally rate my students'

    a. preparedness   5   4   3   2   1

    b. motivation   5   4   3   2   1

    c. participation   5   4   3   2   1

6. Some of the factors that might constrain my successful teaching today are:

7. Two or three points I would like you to focus on during observation:

SELF-OBSERVATION REPORT on TEACHING (SORT Form B)
(To be completed by teacher *after* observation)

Teacher's name _____ Course _____ Date _____
_____

Circle one option for every item using the rating scale below. You
may rate to the nearest half (.5) where appropriate.

   5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = satisfactory; 2 = weak; 1 = poor;
   NA = not applicable

After each item is space for comments. Please use the space to give
reasons for your ratings.
_____

1. My clarification of specific objectives of the lesson

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

2. My use of media (chalkboard, AV aids, etc.)

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

3. The effectiveness of teaching method(s) I selected

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

4. My integration of theory and application

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

5. My promotion of critical thinking in class

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

6. My success in modifying the activity that wasn't working

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

7. My response to unanticipated problems

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

8. My ability to illustrate and explain new concepts

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

9. The pace of my presentation

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

10. The wait time I gave for students to respond

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

11. My ability to maintain student attention

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

12. My success in promoting student participation

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

13. My ability to let students express their opinions/ideas freely

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

14. My ability to handle questions from students

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

15. My acknowledgment and praise of student contributions

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

Any other comments:

LEARNER OBSERVATION REPORT on TEACHING (LORT)
(To be completed by learners)

Do not write your name on this form.

Course_____ Date_____

Circle one option for every item using the rating scale below. You may rate to the nearest half (.5) where appropriate.

   5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = satisfactory; 2 = weak; 1 = poor; NA = not applicable

After each item is space for comments. Please use the space to give reasons for your ratings.

1. Difficulty level of today's lesson
   5 4 3 2 1 NA
   Comments:

2. Organization of today's lesson
   5 4 3 2 1 NA
   Comments:

3. Teacher's knowledge of today's subject matter
   5 4 3 2 1 NA
   Comments:

4. Teacher's communication skills (fluency, voice, enthusiasm)
   5 4 3 2 1 NA
   Comments:

5. My understanding of the specific objectives of the lesson
   5 4 3 2 1 NA
   Comments:

6. My response to today's teaching methods

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

7. Teacher's effectiveness in promoting my critical thinking

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

8. Teacher's effectiveness in clarifying doubts

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

9. Teacher's pace of presentation

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

10. Time given by teacher for me to answer questions

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

11. Teacher's sense of humor

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

12. The level of my attentiveness

   5   4   3   2   1   NA
   Comments:

13. The level of my class participation

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

14. Freedom to express my opinions/ideas

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

15. Teacher's attitude toward me as a student

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

16. Teacher's sensitivity to diversity in class

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

17. Teacher's handling of questions from students

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

18. Teacher's praising of students when appropriate

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

19. My interest in the subject matter after today's lesson

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

20. My comprehension of today's lesson

    5   4   3   2   1   NA
    Comments:

PEER OBSERVATION REPORT on TEACHING (PORT)
(To be completed by observer)

The items on this PORT form are grouped into four main categories. Circle one option for every item using the rating scale below. You may rate to the nearest half (.5) where appropriate.

5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = satisfactory; 2 = weak;
1 = poor; NA = not applicable

At the end of each of the four main categories is space for comments. Please use the space to give reasons for your ratings. If your rating for any item falls at or below 3, please give specific suggestions for improvement.

1.0   COURSE CONTENT

1.1 Relevance of content	5 4 3 2 1 NA
1.2 Difficulty level of content	5 4 3 2 1 NA
1.3 Organization of content	5 4 3 2 1 NA
1.4 Authenticity of content	5 4 3 2 1 NA
1.5 Currency of content	5 4 3 2 1 NA
1.6 Mastery of content	5 4 3 2 1 NA
1.7 Other (specify)_____	5 4 3 2 1 NA
1.8 Comments:	

2.0   CLASSROOM PRESENTATION

2.1 Teacher's communication skills (fluency, voice, etc.)	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2.2 Teacher's recognition of learners' prior knowledge	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2.3 Teacher's effectiveness in holding learner interest	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2.4 Teacher's success in focusing learner attention	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2.5 Teacher's encouragement of two-way interaction	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2.6 Teacher's readiness to provide feedback	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2.7 Specific objectives of the lesson made clear to students	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2.8 Teacher's use of media (chalkboard, AV aids, etc.)	5 4 3 2 1 NA

2.9	Effectiveness of teaching methods (lecture, group work, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.10	Integration of theory and application	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.11	Teacher's efforts to promote critical thinking	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.12	Success in handling activity that isn't working	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.13	Attempt to respond to unanticipated challenges/problems	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.14	Clarity of ideas (examples provided, concepts explained)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.15	Pace of presentation	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.16	Wait time given for students to respond	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.17	Teacher's sense of humor	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.18	Teacher's rapport with students	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.19	Other (specify)_____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
2.20	Comments:						

3.0 STUDENT RESPONSE

3.1	Student attendance	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3.2	Student attentiveness	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3.3	Student participation	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3.4	Student demonstration of critical thinking	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3.5	Student readiness to express opinions/ideas freely	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3.6	Other (specify)_____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
3.7	Comments:						

4.0 TEACHER RESPONSE

4.1	Teacher's attitude toward students	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.2	Teacher's sensitivity to diversity in class	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.3	Teacher's readiness to encourage questions from students	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.4	Teacher's handling of questions from students	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.5	Teacher's readiness to praise students when appropriate	5	4	3	2	1	NA

4.6	Teacher's effort to design appropriate assignments	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.7	Teacher's feedback on assignments	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.8	Teacher's evaluation of student performance	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.9	Teacher's attempt to clarify grading policy to students	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.10	Other (specify)_____	5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.11	Comments:						

5.0   QUESTIONS FOR THE OBSERVER

5.1	Did you inform the teacher of the observation date in advance?	Yes	No
5.2	Did you get the completed SORT Form A from the teacher before the observation?	Yes	No
5.3	Did you have a preliminary conference with the teacher before the observation?	Yes	No
5.4	Did you administer LORT Forms to students at the end of the class?	Yes	No
5.5	Did you have a follow-up conference with the teacher to give him/her your suggestions for improvement?	Yes	No
5.6	Did you get the completed SORT Form B from the teacher?	Yes	No

B. Kumaravadivelu *is Professor of Linguistics and Language Development at San José State University, California. His research and teaching interests include second language education and classroom discourse analysis. In recognition of his excellence in teaching and teacher education, he was awarded a Lilly Teaching Fellowship for 1990-91. He was actively associated with the University Committee on Improvement of Instruction and chaired the Committee for two years (1992-94). He is also a member of the Board of Directors of the SJSU Institute for Teaching and Learning, and the Academic Senate.*