SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
EDWARDSVILLE

Pedagogical Observation Form

(For Non-fully online courses)

Postdoc's Name: _____ Observer: _____ Date: _____

Course: _____ Number of students enrolled: _____ Room Number: _____

Class type: Select Class Type

List any aspects of the physical classroom environment that might affect the class (hot/cold, noise, time of day, length of class):

_____

Date of Preconference: _____ Date of Post-conference: _____

Pedagogical Observer

Pedagogical Observer is a tenured faculty member trained to observe, document, and support effective teaching practices that promote student learning. Postdocs will receive a pedagogical observation during their first and second year and potentially one additional time during their postdoctoral appointment.

Pre-Conference

1. The Observer meets with the Postdoc for a pre-conference and gathers information about the course including syllabus, objectives, etc. During this meeting, the observation process will be discussed, an observation date will be determined, and the Pedagogical Observation form will be shared. The Observer will review the process and talk about the developmental purpose of the pedagogical observation process. The Postdoc is informed that the observation will be sent to them, their department chair, and will become part of the annual review. The Observer and Postdoc will also discuss whether or not the Postdoc should let students know that the Pedagogical Observer will be present.
2. The Pedagogical Observer is encouraged to consider the following context markers: a) Is this a new course for this Postdoc?; b) Is this a pilot course? c) Are there specific things about this class that would be helpful to know? (Gatekeeper or General Education course, courses with high fail rates, courses with controversial topics, course materials prepared by others, etc.) d) Are there any other concerns or issues that the Postdoc would like to share to help contextualize the observation?

Observation

3. The Observer observes class for at least 50 minutes and takes detailed, objective notes about the Postdoc and student behavior throughout the session.
4. The Observer will complete the Pedagogical Observation form, based on observation notes.

Post-Conference

5. The Observer meets with the Postdoc within two weeks for a post-conference to discuss the practices observed, identify strengths of teaching, offer suggestions (if relevant). The Observer and Postdoc will engage in a supportive discussion about teaching practice
6. Optionally, the Postdoc may choose to write a reflection or clarification (within one week) which should be submitted to the Observer to attach to the Observation form.
7. A copy of the signed Pedagogical Observation Form will be provided to the Postdoc and a copy of the signed Pedagogical Observation Form will be confidentially sent to the Chair.

This form is adapted from the TEP Peer Teaching Observation Guide, University of Oregon Teaching Engagement Program.

Use the items below to comment on each area of the Postdoc's teaching. If an item is not applicable, or if there was no opportunity to observe a particular item, note "N/A or no opportunity to observe". Please note that a given observation is only a small snapshot of teaching practice so many N/A's is not necessarily a cause for concern.

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING	Observer's Notes	Ranking
1. Starts and ends class on time.		Select Ranking
2. Provides students with learning objectives/outline/overview for the class session. [3]		Select Ranking
3. Has organized the material into an obvious, explicit and logical framework using clear transitions between topics and parts of the class. [3]		Select Ranking
4. Employs audio and/or visual media (PowerPoint, writing on board/doc cam, handouts, videos) appropriately for learning (e.g., readable, not too much text, etc.). [3]		Select Ranking
5. Is approachable, in command of session, and willing to engage with students. [19]		Select Ranking
6. Is aware of and responsive to students' needs (e.g., raised hands, puzzled looks).		Select Ranking
7. Provides adequate time for completion of in-class activities.		Select Ranking

This form is adapted from the TEP Peer Teaching Observation Guide, University of Oregon Teaching Engagement Program.

INCLUSIVE TEACHING	Observer's Notes	Ranking
1. Makes an effort to use student names. [19]		Select Ranking
2. Demonstrates enthusiasm about working with students.		Select Ranking
3. Uses respectful and inclusive language, images, and examples to ensure an accessible and welcoming learning community. [7]		Select Ranking
4. Encourages and facilitates dialogue, discussion, and student-student interaction for all students (e.g., helps people find partners, structures activities to promote equal participation). [7] [17] [18]		Select Ranking
5. Has chosen content to reflect a diversity of voices, where appropriate. [14] [15]		Select Ranking
6. Draws upon student experience/real-world examples/other disciplines where appropriate. [5] [6]		Select Ranking

CLASSROOM COMMUNITY, THE STUDENTS...	Observer's Notes	Ranking
1. Seem engaged (answer questions, participate in activities, take notes) and are not distracted (having side conversations or surfing the web). [20][21]		Select Ranking
2. Listen to and build on each other's ideas.		Select Ranking
3. Appear to be comfortable in class (asking questions, approaching the Postdoc, etc.).		Select Ranking

This form is adapted from the TEP Peer Teaching Observation Guide, University of Oregon Teaching Engagement Program.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING PRACTICES	Observer's Notes	Ranking
1. Shows confidence with delivery of material.		Select Ranking
2. Class content appears relevant to overall course objectives. [1] [2]		Select Ranking
3. Incorporates small-group discussions or problem-solving sessions into the class. [8] [9] [10]		Select Ranking
4. Engages students with the subject matter (e.g., through storytelling [11]; compelling case studies [12]; commentary about the skills, values, or formation of the discipline). [3]		Select Ranking
5. Incorporates low-stakes assessment (such as poll-ing, one-minute papers, muddiest point, etc.) to help Postdoc and students gauge progress. [11] [12] [13]		Select Ranking
6. Asks a variety of types of questions (e.g., factual, application, critical) and responds to student answers/comments appropriately.		Select Ranking
7. Encourages students to reflect on their learning (e.g., by asking students to write an end-of-class summary, identify the day's muddiest point, or write about what they know now that they didn't several weeks ago). [13]		Select Ranking

Notes from Preconference:

This form is adapted from the TEP Peer Teaching Observation Guide, University of Oregon Teaching Engagement Program.

Notes from Observation:

Overall Impression and Feedback:

Observer Signature: _____ Date: _____

Postdoc Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature acknowledges that the information has been explained to the Postdoc.

This form is adapted from the TEP Peer Teaching Observation Guide, University of Oregon Teaching Engagement Program.

Works Cited

[1] J. B. Biggs and C. Tang, T*eaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does*, 4th ed., Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press, 2011.

[2] G. Wiggins and J. McTighe, *Understanding by Design,* 2nd ed., Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2005.

[3] S. A. Ambrose, M. W. Bridges, M. DiPietro, M. C. Lovett and M. K. Norman, "Chapter 2: How Does the Way Students Organize Knowledge Affect Their Learning?," in *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

[4] S. A. Ambrose, M. W. Bridges, M. DiPietro, M. C. Lovett and M. K. Norman, "Chapter 5: What Kinds of Practice and Feedback Enhance Learning?," in *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

[5] S. A. Ambrose, M. W. Bridges, M. DiPietro, M. C. Lovett and M. K. Norman, "Chapter 3: What Factors Motivate Students to Learn?," in *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

[6] S. A. Ambrose, M. W. Bridges, M. DiPietro, M. C. Lovett and M. K. Norman, "Chapter 1: How Does Students' Prior Knowledge Affect Their Learning?," in *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

[7] L. Nilson, *Teaching at Its Best: A Research-Based Resource for College Instructors*, 3rd ed., San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

[8] L. Deslauriers, E. Schelew and C. Wieman, "Improved Learning in a Large-Enrollment Physics Class," *Science,* vol. 332, pp. 862-864, 2011.

[9] J. Handelsman, S. Miller and C. Pfund, "Chapter 2: Active Learning," in *Scientific Teaching*, New York, W. H. Freeman, 2007.

[10]S. Freeman, S. L. Eddy, M. McDonough, M. K. Smith, N. Okoroafor, H. Jordt and M. P. Wenderoth, "Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,* vol. 111, no. 23, p. 8410–5, 2015.

[11] P. C. Brown, H. L. Roediger and M. A. McDaniel, *Make it Stick: The Science of Successful Learning*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 2014.

[12] C. Dirks, M. P. Wenderoth and M. Withers, *Assessment in the College Classroom*, New York: W. H. Freeman, 2014.

[13] S. A. Ambrose, M. W. Bridges, M. DiPietro, M. C. Lovett and M. K. Norman, "Chapter 7: How Do Students Become Self-Directed Learners?," in *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

[14] J. Handelsman, S. Miller and C. Pfund, "Chapter 4: Diversity," in *Scientific Teaching*, New York, W. H. Freeman, 2007.

[15] S. A. Ambrose, M. W. Bridges, M. DiPietro, M. C. Lovett and M. K. Norman, "Chapter 6: Why Do Student Development and Course Climate Matter for Student Learning?," in *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

[16] M. B. Rowe, "Wait Time: Slowing Down May Be a Way of Speeding Up!," *Journal of Teacher Education,* vol. 37, pp. 43-50, 1986.

[17] S. L. Eddy, S. E. Brownell and M. P. Wenderoth, "Gender Gaps in Achievement and Participation in Multiple Introductory Biology Classrooms," *CBE-Life Sciences Education,* vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 478-492, 2014.

[18] C. Moss-Racusin, J. F. Dovidio, V. L. Brescoll, M. J. Graham and J. Handelsman, "Science Faculty's Subtle Gender Biases Favor Male Students," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,* vol. 109, no. 41, pp. 16474-16479, 2012.

[19] D. M. Christophel, "The Relationships Among Teacher Immediacy Behaviors, Student Motivation, and Learning," *Communication Education,* vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 323-340, 1990.

[20] J. H. Kuznekoff and B. S. Titsworth, "The Impact of Mobile Phone Usage on Student Learning," *Communication Education,* vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 233-252, 2013.

[21] C. B. Fried, "In-Class Laptop Use and Its Effects on Student Learning," *Computers & Education,* vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 906-914, 2008.

[23] D.M. Christophel, “The Relationships Among Teacher Immediacy Behaviors, Student Motivation, and Learning, *Communication Education, vol. 62, no.3, pp. 233-252, 2013.*

This form is adapted from the TEP Peer Teaching Observation Guide, University of Oregon Teaching Engagement Program.