Appendix D

Guidelines for Library Faculty Instruction Evaluation

Peer Review of Library Instruction

PURPOSE
To enhance librarians’ teaching skills so that they can better meet the information literacy need of students.

SCHEDULE
Tenured librarians: One session evaluated every three years.

Non-tenured or adjunct librarians: One session evaluated each year.

PROCESS
Selection: Library instructor selects the session to be reviewed and two colleagues to conduct the review. At least one reviewer must be a library faculty peer; the second may be a librarian or a faculty member from another department, including the faculty instructor for the class being reviewed.

Pre-session meeting of instructor and review team: The library instructor meets with the two reviewers prior to the class to discuss such things as goals for the class, areas to be emphasized, and new techniques to be used.

Review team observes session.

Instructor fills out Instructor’s Comments form and shares it with review team.

Review team meets and prepares a short written report.

Review team meets with instructor to discuss the report.

Instructor submits the Peer Review Checklist to the University Librarian.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Instructor’s Comments and Observer’s Confidential Comments for the Instructor are confidential and not made available to the University Librarian or the DPC unless the librarian under review wishes to submit them. Peer Review Checklists will be included in documentation for personnel actions but not in the annual self evaluation.
PEER REVIEW OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION
Instructor’s comments

How did you feel about this session?

What went well?

What did not go well? Why not?

What would you change?

Additional comments?
**PEER REVIEW OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION**

**Peer Review Checklist**

Library Instruction Review for: 

Date: 

Name of Evaluator/s: 

Please rate the effectiveness of the classroom instruction on a scale of 1-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explained the goal of the session</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session was well organized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation was clear and focused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of examples, visuals, etc. clarified the content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material was suitable for the class level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor attempted to engage the class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language used was understandable to the students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions were answered clearly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of the class was accomplished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: ______________________________________________________
PEER REVIEW OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION
Observer’s Confidential Comments for This Instructor

Strengths of the class

Suggestions for improvement

GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE FEEDBACK TO IMPROVE TEACHING

Feedback is more effective when:

- It is given as soon as possible after the class.
- It allows for response and interaction.
- It is viewed as a process, not a one-time quick fix.
- The source is perceived as credible, knowledgeable, and well intentioned.
- It focuses on behavior rather than on the person.
- It is descriptive rather than evaluative.
- It combines a moderate amount of positive feedback with selected and limited negative feedback.
- Positive information is given in the grammatical second person.
- Negative information is given in the grammatical first person, in the grammatical third person, or in a question.