

## Classroom Observation Rubric

**Faculty Observed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Course:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Semester:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Observation Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Observer:** \_\_\_\_\_

*The goal of creating a standardized feedback rubric for peer classrooms evaluations is to allow consistent feedback to be given to faculty about their teaching. We recognize the importance of academic freedom in the context of professional responsibilities in our role as teachers. Teaching style can vary tremendously, and these are minimum expectations to meet professional standards for faculty in the Department of Psychology. Expectations are consistent with Senate Policy F12-6.*

**Please request access to the Canvas (or other) course website for evaluation using this rubric. This is especially important for evaluating a hybrid, flipped, or online course.**

**Please support your ratings with comments. Please specify when there are minor or more than minor problems in one of the areas of evaluation.**

### 1. Syllabus/Course/Website Structure

#### 1a. Structure of Course/Calendar

*As required S06-2: Instructor name, course title, number, semester/year, section, institution, contact info, class and office hours, prerequisites, GE categories, LMS if any, catalog copy, clearly defined Course, Program, & University learning outcomes, required text, course and grading requirements, university policies (integrity, ADA, add/drop). Course calendar is included and clearly indicates assignments and due dates. Clearly indicates course points can come from participation (if available) but not from class attendance (per University policy).*

More than minor deviations from requirements set by University policy. Missing or problematic calendar of assignments and due dates. States that course points may be given for attendance (this is not allowed per University policy).

Minor deviations from requirements set by University policy. Some lack of clarity with calendar assignments and due dates. Unclear statement about course points coming from participation but not attendance.

Syllabus is consistent with University Requirements. Calendar is clear with assignments and due dates. Clearly indicates that course points come from participation (if available) but not from class attendance.

COMMENTS:

#### 1b. Mapping Assignments onto Course Objectives (intentional learning)

*This mapping is required for GE courses, but is a recommended practice of the Department.*

Most assignments unrelated to course objectives, or no assignments

Assignments are implicitly related to course objectives

Assignments clearly and explicitly tied to course learning objectives

COMMENTS:

#### 1c. Clarity/Comprehension/Usability

Syllabus is unclear, not intelligible, or lacks direction to make it usable for the student

Syllabus has some problems with clarity or ease of use for the student (could include accessibility issues)

Syllabus is clearly laid out, assignments are clearly described; high usability

COMMENTS:

<b>1d. Appropriate Text Materials and ancillaries</b> <i>Focuses on level of presentation, organization, and how up-to-date materials are.</i>		
Text book and/or ancillaries are either at a level inappropriate for the course, are disorganized, or dated	Text book and/or ancillaries are generally at a level appropriate for the course, are organized, and are up-to-date	Text book and/or ancillaries clearly related to course objectives, are appropriate to the level of the course, are organized, and are up-to-date
COMMENTS:		
<b>1e. Course Website</b> <i>Focuses on organization, structure, ease of use, and inclusion of essential course materials (syllabus, assignment due dates, assignments, etc.). If the class does not have a Canvas site, please indicate this in the Comments section.</i>		
Course website offers no real organization, is difficult to navigate, includes multiple inactive or broken links, and/or does not include essential course materials (e.g., due dates, course syllabus). Was not given access to course website.	Some problems with course website with organization, links, or essential course materials. Please specify below.	Course website is organized, easy to navigate, links are active, and includes all essential course materials.
COMMENTS:		

## 2. Communication

<b>Clarity of Communication</b> <i>This section is based on the observed and inferred communications of the faculty member pertaining to the observed interaction.</i>		
<b>2a. Clarity of communication to students</b>		
The communications from the instructor were difficult to follow or comprehend on more than one occasion.	The communications from the instructor were typically clear and easy to follow	The communications from the instructor were always clear and easy to follow.
COMMENTS (required):		
<b>2b. Organization of presented materials</b>		
Structure of the lecture was unclear or not followed, wasn't sequenced well, or it didn't clearly map onto course objectives	Structure of the lecture, sequencing of content, and mapping onto course objectives was generally clear	Lecture was clearly structured, flowed from beginning to end, and mapped onto course objectives
COMMENTS (required):		

### 3. Relevance of Lecture to Course Description and Objectives

<b>Relevance of lecture given course description and CLOs</b> <i>The assignments and content discussed should be both educationally effective and lead to intentional learning (i.e., correspond to explicit outcomes identified as appropriate for the course)</i>		
<b>3a. Relevance</b>		
Lecture was not related to course description or CLOs, as defined in the syllabus, and/or deviated from the syllabus in presented content	Lecture was relevant to the stated CLOs, though connection was not explicit or there was a deviation from the syllabus in the presented content	Lecture was clearly and explicitly related to defined content from the syllabus, including one or more CLOs
COMMENTS (required):		

### 4. Knowledge of Subject Matter

<b>Knowledge of Subject Matter</b> <i>The content discussed/presented during the observation should clearly indicate knowledge or expertise in the area, and should introduce and use appropriate psychological terminology for the content.</i>		
<b>4a. Knowledge</b>		
Instructor's lecture was below expectations for course content or introduction/incorporation of key psychological terms	Instructor's lecture evidenced some difficulties with knowledge of content or did not consistently introduce/incorporate key psychological terms	Instructor's lecture clearly evidenced knowledge or expertise in the content area and introduced/incorporated key psychological terminology
COMMENTS (required):		

### 5. Interactions with Students

<b>5. Interactions with Students</b> <i>During the observed lecture, the instructor should evidence professionalism in their interactions with students, distinct efforts to engage students in the material and draw attention to interesting content, as well as ability to manage questions from students.</i>		
<b>5a. Classroom Environment</b>		
Instructor failed to recognize inappropriate or insensitive interaction, potentially discouraging an environment of mutual respect	Instructor was mostly appropriate and sensitive to student diversity, but could improve the classroom environment	Instructor was both appropriate and sensitive to student diversity, creating an atmosphere of mutual respect
COMMENTS (required):		

<b>5b. Student Engagement/Ability of Instructor to Stimulate Interest</b> (may include reference to frequency of student non-class technology use)		
Instructor did not appear to be engaged with students during lecture, or did not clearly state what might be important or interesting about material	Instructor intermittently engaged students directly, or stated why material may be interesting, though techniques used to stimulate interest were unsuccessful	Instructor clearly attempted to engage students during lecture, and was at least partly successful
COMMENTS (required):		
<b>5c. Handling of Questions/Statements</b>		
Instructor did not respond to classroom interactions or was defensive, dismissive, or disrespectful to students	Instructor handled classroom interactions well but not consistently	Instructor responded effectively to the statements or questions asked
COMMENTS (required):		

**6. Expectations for Demonstration of Higher Order Thinking**

<b>6. Expectations for Demonstration of Higher Order Thinking</b> <i>Critical thinking in courses involves integration of course content across lectures and potentially across courses. Instructors will be rated on observed ability to engage students in thinking about the larger concepts in the course and synthesis of the material.</i>		
<b>6a. Expectations for Demonstration of Higher Order Thinking</b>		
Instructor made no attempt to engage students in integration, synthesis, or critical thinking	Instructor made intermittent attempts to engage students in integration, synthesis, or critical thinking	Instructor clearly attempted to elicit critical thinking, synthesis of material, and integration across concepts to offer more depth or breadth to the course (this is an expectation of graduate and capstone courses)
COMMENTS (required):		

**Additional Comments**

Please make any additional recommendations, observations, or other comments that you feel are important and not clearly represented in the above rubric. Examples here include: Attributes related to the Peer Observation not easily captured elsewhere (e.g., lack of responsiveness to appropriate timing re: scheduling of the peer observation) or generalizations from themes identified earlier.

COMMENTS / FEEDBACK:
----------------------