Peer and Supervisory Observation for Faculty Development:
Ways of Providing Written Feedback

Melvin Andrade

Abstract

This paper describes the initiation and development of peer and supervisory observation programs in the Junior College Division of Sophia University. There are several ways to provide written feedback on teaching depending on the aims of the observation and the roles of the participants: unstructured, semi-structured, itemized checklist, informed narration, and combined forms. The author argues that to provide fair and balanced assessment of teaching for supervisory purposes, it is desirable to combine an observation checklist with narrative accounts of teaching performance. Such feedback, however, needs to focus on teaching behaviors that research has found to be associated with positive learning outcomes and student satisfaction.
Key words: assessment, evaluation, faculty development, observation, supervision, teaching

Introduction

The usefulness and importance and classroom observation for the professional development of teachers at all levels of instruction, primary school through university, is well documented in the literature (e.g., Bilash, 2011; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004; Felder & Brent, 2004; Holdaway, Henderson, & Cameron, 2009). For the purpose of this essay, classroom observation of instruction has been divided into two main types[1], *peer observation* and *supervisory* observation. The primary aim of peer observation is to foster mutual professional growth by sharing information and practical teaching knowledge. Supervisory observation, on the other hand, aims to assess or evaluate the performance of the instructor. Examples of supervisory observation are *pre-service* observation of teacher trainees to access their attainment of basic teaching skills and *in-service* observation to access compliance with school policies and standards. At the college and university level, in-service observation of tenure-track and tenured faculty members is commonly one component of periodic performance evaluations (e.g., Gaston College (2011) and Dusquene University (2010) faculty handbooks). Both peer

and supervisory observation can have other purposes as well, for example, identifying candidates for good teaching, innovation, and other types of awards.

As chair of the Faculty Development (FD) Committee and later as chair of the Department of English Language at Sophia University Junior College Division[2] (academic years 2009–2014), I worked with the FD Committee members and faculty at large to establish and implement both peer observation and supervisory observation programs. The two programs we established are described below. This paper has two aims: (1) to familiarize current and newcomer faculty members with the background of these programs and (2) to serve as a reference for other departments that may wish to start their own programs.

Establishing a Peer Observation Program

In 2009, the FD committee started an "English Teachers Symposium" event that is held twice a year, at the end of each semester: September and February. This event typically has included an invited guest speaker from another college, a research presentation by one of our own faculty members, and two Welcome to My Class, presentations, one by a full-time and one by a part-time instructor. The Welcome to My Class persentations have covered compulsory and semi-compulsory English courses so there has been a considerable degree of mutual interest in how one's colleagues conducted the same and related courses.

After several of these symoposia, the FD committee came to a consesus that all teachers could benefit from having more opportunities to experience what and how their colleagues teach. At the February 2010 symposium, guest speaker Christopher Stillwell (2009) of Kanda University of International Studies presented a model of peer observation in his presentation "Peer Observation: 360° of Teacher Awareness." Afterward, the FD Committee reviewed the relevant professional literature in both Japanese and English and drafted its own proposal for a peer observation program under the name "Open Class Days." A key resource for the proposal was Taguchi *et al.*'s (2003) article "Five Types of Open Classes as Faculty Development Activities." The program was accepted by the Faculty Board at the end of 2010 and went into effect at the the start of the 2011 academic year.

The Open Class program has undergone a few minor revisions since 2011, but its aims and components have remained essentially the same. Before the start of the academic year, every teacher receives a set of guidelines that clarify the aims of

the program, the roles of the teacher and observers, and the nature and method of exchanging feedback between teacher and observer. They also receive a questionnaire asking them to designate which days will be their Open Class days. At present, each teacher designates two days each semester as Open Classes (originally one day each semester).

In addition to increasing the number of Open Class days, there have been three other revsions. One was changing the days when the observation period should begin and end. For example, starting too early in the semester did not give teachers and students enough time to adjust to each other. The next one was changing how to inform the observers of which days are open for observation. These days have been published in the course catelog, posted on the bulletin board in the Teachers Lounge, and prepared as a handout. The last revision was changing how many days in advance teachers will be informed that there will be observers: from two weeks to one week. Letting teachers know in advance that there will be observers allows the teacher time to brief them on the aims and content of the lesson. Another reason for advance notice is to make adjustments if too many observers plan to come on the same day. Faculty members who want to observer a class send an email to the office staff member responsible for faculty development affairs, and the staff member informs the teacher.

Guidelines for Peer Observation

The guidelines for participating in peer observation are divided into three sections. The first section clarifies the aims of peer observation: (1) "to share information, practical teaching knowledge, and teaching tips" and (2) "to encourage instructors and observers to reflect on general principles of 'good teaching practice' while recognizing there are many different ways to achieve excellence in teaching and learning depending on the circumstances." This section also explains that peer observation is not intended to be a performance evaluation: "Valid performance evaluation requires specialized knowledge, training, and experience. Moreover, observing one or two classes does not provide a well-balanced picture of a teacher's effectiveness."

The second section clarifies the roles of the teacher and the observer. The *teacher's role* is "to present a typical or model lesson that represents the teacher's concept of 'good teaching practice' in relationship to the topic, class level, and other circumstances of the course." In addition, "the teachers should make an effort to inform the observers before the class of the purpose of the lesson and what they plan to do."

Due to misunderstandings that the peer observer was a "visiting teacher," the following clarification to the guidelines needed to be added: "In principle, the teacher should not ask the observer to help teach the lesson (to be an assistant teacher), nor ask the observer to participate with the students. However, if such approaches are desirable, they can be arranged beforehand by mutual agreement."

In contrast, the *observer's role* is "to learn by observing and to share information for mutual benefit." This guideline also makes explicit that the observer is there "as a peer or guest, not a supervisor or evaluator." The observer is instructed to abide by the following rules: "Arrive at the classroom a few minutes ahead of time and stay for the entired class. Sit where directed by the insturctor and be as unobstrusive as possible. Refrain from photographing or recording the class unless you have received permission in advance."

The third section presents the what, how, and where of discussing the lesson and providing feedback to the teachers. The guidelines present it this way in three subsections:

From the observor: (1) What would you like to know more about? (2) What information do you have that the teacher may be interested in (e.g., materials, websites, teaching techniques you use). (3) What did you learn that you would like to apply to your own teaching? To maintain a positive relationship with the teacher avoid giving directives (such as "You should..." or "You should not...") and avoid asking the teacher to defend why he/she did something.

From the teacher: (1) Did your lesson go according to your plan? (2) Was there anything that was unexpected or not typical of your class?" (3) Were you satisfied with your lesson? (4) Was there anything you would have done differently?

Feedback venue: The instructor and observer should arrange to meet at a convenient time and place to discuss the class. If a face-to-face meeting is inconvenient, participants can communicate by email or other means.

Since the program began, the majority of peer observers have been full-time instructors who are on campus four or five days a week. In contrast, part-time instructors come only one or two days a week, and many of them arrive just before class and leave just after class because of teaching obligations at other schools. Consequently,

many part-time teachers have few opportunities to be peer observers, although they may want to do so. Nevertheless, full-time instructors are able to observer their classes and both are still able to benefit from the experience. Although a formal assessment of the peer observation program has not yet been conducted, my personal experience and comments from participants suggest to me that both teachers and observers have found the observations beneficial.

The Need for Supervisory Observation

The need for adding a supervisory observation program became evident to the FD Committee during the 2013 and 2014 academic years. At that point, our efforts to promote better teaching had included the following: (1) The availability of peer observation for professional development. (2) Symposia (described above). (3) FD lectures and workshops by guest speakers and in-house faculty. (4) Mid-semester and end-of-semester course evaluation questionnaires that students used to evaluate their courses and instructors. (5) Lunchtime meetings at the midpoint of each semester for full- and part-time teachers to reflect on the results of the midterm course evaluation questionnaires and discuss other issues. (6) Feedback sheets (formative assessment) in which teachers reported to the FD committee on what actions they planned to take based on the results of the mid-semester course evaluation questionnaire. (7) Reports to the Faculty Board on the results of the end-of-semester course evaluation questionnaires. Subsequent FD Committess have continued to develop and improve on these and other FD programs.

Anecdotal reports suggest that these activities and events have been well received and have benefited many teachers. On the other hand, despite these efforts, results of the mid- and end-of-semester questionnaires indicated that a small number of teachers received low ratings from students. Contrary to our expectations, it was sometimes the case that the feedback these teachers received from their students on the mid-semester questionnaires did not lead to positive changes in student satisfaction by the end of the course. In addition, on a few occasions, reports from students to their advisers or to office personnel about the performance of a few teachers prompted the FD Committee to consider adopting supervisory observation.

Another reason for adding supervisory observation was the inauguration in 2013 of the Good Teaching Award. Because of the short deadline for drafting and approving the standards for selecting the candidates, it was decided that the first year's award would

be based on the results of the average score over several recent semesters on selected items related to teaching and students' comments on the end-of-term course evaluation questionnaire. The FD Committee and Faculty Board, however, realized the limitations of bestowing a "good teaching" award based solely on students' satisfaction and personal opinions. Accordingly, the Faculty Board approved a provisional award program with the understanding that classroom observations, syllabus review, learning outcomes, and other factors would be included in a revised program to be enacted later. (See Appendix 2 for proposed criteria.)

Development of the Supervisory Observation Guidelines

Stillwell put the difference between Peer Observation and Supervisory Observation this way:

> There is a major distinction between observation for personal development and observation for evaluation. Basically, the literature on peer observation says that peer observation should not be evaluative. Many of the texts go to great lengths to tease apart the concepts of observation and evaluation, to show that observation can be non-judgmental, it can be part of the observer's learning process, it can promote reflection and growth..."

> (Personal communication, Feb. 19, 2010)

With this distinction in mind, the FD Committee added the following information to the Class Observation Guidelines:

> For the purpose of implementing the Teaching Improvement Assessment Policy, a new category of observation, Supervisory Observation, will be established. [The aims] of Supervisory Observation [are] (1) To provide support and advice for teaching improvement as indicated by the results of the midterm and end-of-term course evaluation questionnaires, and other sources. (2) To collect data on "good teaching practices" to share with the faculty. These observations will be implemented by the FD Committee members and department chair.

The guidelines further explain that in contrast to Peer Observation, which takes place on designated days, Superisory Observation can take place anytime during the semester.

To assist with implementing Supervisory Observation in an objective and fair-

minded manner, an observation checklist that could be used for indentifying good teaching candidates as well as for providing explicit feedback to teachers whose teaching and classroom manner need improvement needed to be developed. In the fall of 2014, a pilot version of the checklist (See Appendix 1) based on Andrade (2014) was used by members of the FD Committee and the department chair to assess the performance of several teachers who needed support and advice on improving their teaching. In addition, copies of the checklist were distributed at FD events to raise awareness of the teaching factors associated with positive learning outcomes and student satisfaction (e.g., Canale, Herdklotz, & Wild, 2012; Feldman, 1989). A Japanese translation of the checklist was also prepared.

The pilot version of the supervisory observation guidelines was written based on a review of the literature in English and Japanese related to classroom observation, faculty development, good teaching, teacher evaluation, and similar keywords. The resources found included academic articles and books, in-house faculty handbooks, faculty development websites, and checklists used at colleges and universities in Australia, Canada, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States (e.g., Bilash, 2011; *Gaston College Faculty Handbook*, 2011; Little, Goe, & Bell, 2009; *MIT Guidelines*, 2008). An important consideration was that the checklist be constructed so that it could be used with any type of academic courses taught at the college, both content-centered (e.g., history) and skill-centered (e.g., foreign language) courses (Chickering & Gamson 1987; Learning and Teaching Unit, 2004; McKinney, n.d.).

Although basic principles of effective teaching and learning can apply to any course, it is more likely that content courses strive to develop higher order and critical thinking skills (Paul & Elder, 2008), in contrast to physical education and beginning level foreign language courses, where the emphasis is on learning basic skills. In the latter case, methodologies appropriate for second language acquisition, may not necessarily apply to content-centered courses. Other considerations included objectivity, easy of use, and usefulness for providing concrete feedback for improving teaching and fairly judging candidates for the Good Teaching Award.

Providing Written Feedback

Finding time after the observation to meet in person with the teacher to provide feedback has often been a problem owing to the differences in times and days teachers and observers have classes, meetings, and other obligations. Consequently, written

feedback, often by email, has been a common way to communicate. In my experience, there are several ways to provide written feedback on teaching depending on the aims of the observation and the roles of the participants: unstructured, semi-structured, itemized checklist, informed narration, and combined forms. Examples of each type are below. These examples are edited and revised versions of multiple feedback samples and should not be associated with any individual teacher. They are provided for the purpose of illustrating each genre of feedback.

Unstructured feedback refers to feedback that does not follow any designated form. It is more likely to be used in peer observation. Observers freely write whatever they think is appropriate. As a peer, the writer employs a friendly, informal tone, often sharing feelings and experiences, as illustrated in Example 1.

Example 1: Unstructured Feedback

1. The students seemed comfortable with the class and interested in the lesson. From my vantage point, nearly all of them stayed on task for the duration of the class. You clearly have a good relationship with them. (The student at the back who fell asleep was in my class last year, and she fell asleep in my class, too! Every time!)

2. I noticed that you didn't collect the previous homework assignment for which they wrote an original story about one of the characters in the textbook. Was it intended to be just a warm-up assignment, or will you collect it later for evaluation?

3. I imagine that if I had taught the lesson, I might have asked a few students to read aloud the story they wrote for homework (about the textbook character)—but maybe that would have embarrassed them or created too much anxiety. What do you think?

4. As for the in-class assignment in which they wrote about a picture they brought (or you gave them), I was imagining what kind of story I would write. The first thought that popped into my head was, "Where in the story is this picture? At the beginning, middle, or end?" I'd be curious to know how the students position the picture in their stories. I'd also be curious to know the tone and theme of their stories: Adventure-Action? Drama? Romance? Comedy? Tragedy? Thriller? Heroism? Horror? Heartwarming vignette? Unclear?

5. I picked up that the focus of the lesson was correct use of verb tenses (probably

something that was emphasized in the textbook). I imagine, therefore, the students will be putting emphasis on the narrative aspect of their stories (what happened first, next, then, after that...) rather than the descriptive aspect (adjectives—which is probably another lesson).

6. I haven't had a chance to look at the textbook yet (I will drop by the book store and have a look next week). What do you think of it so far? Or is it too early to say?

7. If there is anything specific you would like me to comment on, please let me know.

Note that although the peer observation guidelines provide a list of questions for guiding the observer's responses, they are not evident in the feedback here. Nevertheless, as peer-to-peer feedback, these comments were appreciated, as confirmed by email correspondence with the instructor.

The second type of feedback, *semi-structured,* can be employed in either peer or supervisory observation. In Example 2 below, the writer used the *aims* and *roles* of the participants as stated in the peer observation guidelines above to structure the feedback.

Example 2: Semi-Structured Feedback

1. *Why did you choose to observe this class?* Answer: Many of my advisees ask me about this course. I wanted to have firsthand experience with it in order to give them good advice.

2. *What did you like about the lesson in particular?* Answer: The smooth flow from task to task. No activity went on too long.

3. *What did you learn that you would like to apply to your own teaching?* Answer: Perhaps I will try a simple research topic as part of one lesson, instead of a more elaborate project that requires a few weeks to prepare.

4. *What would you like to know more about?* Answer: Do you plan to cover the whole book? Do you have any supplementary materials? Did the class go as you expected? Was there anything that you would have changed?

5. *What information do you have that the teacher might be interested in (e.g., materials, websites, teaching techniques you use)?* Answer: I have nothing to recommend now. I think you've got it all covered!

Example 2 exhibits a similar tone to Example, 1 but lacks detail and elaboration. Perhaps the guide questions constrained the observer's responses. On the other hand, the observer may have used them for convenience and to save time. Another possibility is that the observer may have been reluctant to comment in detail on a colleague's performance. The paucity of content in this feedback makes it is difficult to judge the impact of the observation experience.

Another type of semi-structured feedback appears in Example 3. This type uses a limited number of *general categories* based on features of the classroom experience that the observer thinks are important to consider.

Example 3: Semi-Structured Feedback Based on General Categories

Thank you for allowing me to observe your class. For the purpose of "sharing information and learning from each other," here are my comments and questions.

1. *Student-Teacher Relationship.* The students seemed comfortable with the class and interested in the lesson. From my vantage point, all of them stayed on task for the duration of the class. You clearly have a good relationship with them.

2. *Teacher-Talk and Teacher-Student Interaction.* Nearly the entire class was taught in English. It seemed to me that your explanations were clear, well paced, and easy for the students to follow. (I think sometimes I may talk too fast in my classes.) There was a lot of one-to-one teacher-student interaction, mainly when you called on a student directly, but not many volunteers when you asked a question to the class as a whole. I suppose they felt some anxiety about having an observer in the classroom (me).

3. *Student-Student Interaction.* I didn't observe so much one-to-one oral interaction (student-to-student), namely pair work and small group work—although there was some. Compared to my classes, I think you probably put more emphasis on accuracy, whereas in my classes I use more student-centered work and put more emphasis on fluency. Because I observed only one class, my impression may not accurately reflect the overall balance of activities and techniques that you use.

4. *Activities and Pace.* I think your lesson plan was easy for the students to follow. You used several tasks, and each one built on the previous one in a logical way and moved from simple to more complex. As the tasks became more difficult, you provided individual help to students who seemed to be having trouble. In my classes, I have students read aloud in "chunks" as well—both after me

and on their own. Before reading aloud, we listen to the CD, and then after reading aloud, we listen again with books closed for listening practice. I practice vocabulary similar to the way you did it. I also have students re-tell the story (summarize) both orally and in writing. Something like this: "This is a story about ( ). I think there are (three) main points. First ( ). Second ( ). Finally ( ). My opinion is ( ). I have them take notes and write down the opinions of their classmates, which they re-tell to check for accuracy and comprehension: "You said ( ). Is that right?"

5. *Your Impression?* How did you feel about the class? Did the students accomplish as much as you expected? Was it typical?

　　Thank you again for allowing me to observe your class. Although I observed only one class, it seems that we have similar approaches and ways of teaching. If there is anything specific you would like me to comment on, let me know.

Compared to Example 2, this semi-structured feedback using general categories displays more detail and elaboration. In addition, the observer is more engaged and reflective. The aim of "learning from each other" is more evident.

　　The next example is a combination of *narrative* and *semi-structured feedback*. It begins with a narrative description followed by the observer's responses to the aims and roles found in the Peer Observation Guidelines. The strength of this type of feedback is that the narration serves as a mirror, much like a video recording, allowing the teachers to see themselves through the eyes of a colleague.

Example 4: Combined Narration and Semi-structured Approach

Part 1: *Lecture-discussion (60 min.)*

　　The main topic of the lesson was "Small Talk." Subtopics were presented as a slide show.　First, the definition, reasons for, and importance of small talk were taken up. Next, a more detailed description and the "how" of small talk were presented, for example, "get informed," "greet appropriately," "greetings vary," and "be polite." Concerning greetings, the role of nonverbal communication was also taken up (handshake, air-kiss). Besides UK-Japan interaction, the possibility of interaction with other nationalities while in the UK (e.g., Koreans) was also mentioned.

　　Examples of appropriate and inappropriate topics were mentioned, in particular politics and religion. BBC News was mentioned as a source of useful

information. It was compared to NHK. From time to time, students asked questions or provided comments and examples following the teacher's prompts. During the lecture, nearly all students appeared to be highly attentive. During about the last third of the lecture, students began to take notes as the topics became more concrete.

Part 2: *Pair Practice of Small Talk (20 min.)*

The students were paired-up following the teacher's directions. They immediately and enthusiastically began practicing small talk with each other. It appeared that all groups stayed on task in English for about 8 minutes. After that, some groups began speaking in Japanese. Then, several minutes later, some pairs began to merge into larger groups of 4 to 6 members, speaking mainly in Japanese. I could not hear what they were talking about (the class topics or something else?). The teacher worked intensively with at least two groups.

Part 3: *Whole class debriefing (10 min.)*

The teacher asked for feedback from the students. There was a discussion of money, traveler's checks, and credit cards.

Guideline Questions for the observer

1. *Why did you choose to observe this class?* Answer: I was interested in the connection between English II ("Understanding and Respecting Others") and this course. Both deal with intercultural and cross-cultural communication and comparison.

2. *What did you like about the lesson in particular?* Answer: In particular, I was impressed by the relaxed but still serious atmosphere, and the good rapport between the teacher and students, as well as among the students themselves. The students are preparing for a real-life adventure (studying abroad), so they are highly motivated. Asking students to define and provide examples of the topics contributed to active learning.

3. *What did you learn that you would like to apply to your own teaching?* Answer: I liked the video clip on nonverbal communication. I plan to find out more about the differences between British and American culture and include that information in my English II course.

4. *What would you like to know more about?* Answer: I never thought before about the differences between American and British style "small talk." After class, I searched the Internet and learned something new.

5. *What information do you have that the teacher might be interested in (e.g., materials, websites, teaching techniques you use)?* Answer: The American counterpart to NHK and BBC is PBS: http://www.pbs.org. In *English Essentials*, the first chapter deals with "small talk" so it might be a good place to start this topic. Then, using the following website, compare British and American styles of communication: "Small Talk" in Debrett's *Guide to British Behavior (Everyday Etiquette).*

Although the observation above was peer observation, the narrative account of the lesson makes this type of feedback useful for supervisory observation as well. It captures the atmosphere of the class and to an extent the teacher's classroom management and instructional skills.

Example 5 below is also a narrative account but differs from Example 4 in that the observer provides comments on the narration followed by comments without specific reference to guideline questions or categories.

Example 5: Narration with Comments

First part of the class: Presentations

During the class, seven students made three-minute presentations.

1. Teacher explained today's procedure, making reference to the short lectures the students had previously observed as models for students to follow.
2. Teacher listed on the board the presenters for today.
3. Each presenter was accompanied by an MC (timekeeper), who briefly introduced the presenters and distributed a one-page handout to the class members.
4. Student MC introduced the presenter. Presenter started presentation.
5. MC signaled the end of the presentation time. MC asked questions that seemed to have been prepared in advance. Some presenters seemed to have responded with prepared answers, and other presenters' answers appeared to be impromptu.
6. Teacher sometimes interrupted to advise MC to keep to the time limit by directing the the presenter to move on to the next topic.
7. After all the speakers had finished, the teacher provided summative comments for the group of presenters as a whole, not individual comments. Comments, for example, referred to the use of visual aids and time management.
8. Teacher announced practice session for next week's presenters, using email to

make individual arrangements.

My comments on the first part of your class (items 1-8):

Everything went smoothly. I think this class was a good example of class management skills. I have not used MC and timekeepers in my classes, but after observing your class, I think I will try it. Prof. OOOO uses a similar system in his course, which I have observed. In that course, a group of about three students is assigned to be "mentors" (peer advisers), who read the presentation beforehand and prepared questions to ask the presenter. One of them also was a timekeeper.

Regarding item 7 above, I also provide summative comments for the group as a whole. I think it is an efficient use of time and does not embarrass a particular student. Nevertheless, one-to-one feedback is probably more effective in the long run--provided that we have enough time.

Regarding item 8 above, I think your students are very lucky to have a chance to practice with you beforehand. I'm sure this activity has a positive impact on their performance and attitude toward the course. Furthermore, it provides an opportunity for the one-to-one feedback that I mentioned in the previous comment.

Second part of the class: Essay writing

9. Teacher checked the homework assignment from *Essentials*, page 63, regarding the Biblical Parable of the Talents (Mathew 25, 14-30).

10. Activity 1: On the blackboard, the teacher explained the basics of a story grammar (elements of a story).

11. Activity 2: A few students read aloud their homework assignment to the class. The assignment appeared to have been to write a four-paragraph essay. Teacher's response to the read-aloud: mainly praise provided in a friendly manner with much encouragement. Teacher's comments were smooth, neither too fast nor too slow, and showed the teacher's enthusiasm.

12. Activity 3: Students participated in a chain-story activity with each student adding to the story following the elements of the story grammar. Teacher interacted with each student to correct, improve, and guide each each link in the story. Teacher used the blackboard to write down key points and used questions to elicit previously learned knowledge. At the completion of the story, the teacher rhetorically asked what is the main point or message of the story, and then provided several examples as opinion (*iken*) or interpretation (*kaishaku*).

Next, there was a short period of time for silent writing to write down the moral of the story. Students then read aloud their ideas. When one student got stuck and could not express herself clearly, the teacher asked others to help her out. The teacher rephrased the students' comments to model appropriate answers.

13. Wrap-up. Teacher summarized on the blackboard the structure of an essay and the function of each paragraph. She drew a picture on the board (schematic) showing the layout of a one-page essay, including the approximate number of words (*kanji*) in each paragraph.

14. End of class. The teacher appeared to cut short her explanations for item 5 above, because she needed to make several announcements at the end of class.

My comments on the second part of your class (items 9-14):

Regarding item 12, I thought this part of the class especially was an excellent model of good teaching practice. I use a similar method when a student gets stuck and does not know how to respond. Usually I will provide a few hints, hoping that the student will be able to self-correct. If that scaffolding does not work, I will ask other students to help her, as you did. Then, if the result is still not satisfactory, I will provide a direct correction or model answer. Modeling and re-phrasing are good techniques.

Regarding item 13, I do the same thing. It is sometimes difficult to decided how many words students should write in each section. I usually provide a range (for example, 100-200 words) and explain that "A" students usually write longer rather than shorter paragraphs (but length is not the only criteria). Here are some criteria I use when assessing writing in Required English I and II: (1) Was the assignment on time? (2) Was it complete? Was anything missing? (3) Were the contents accurate, appropriate, and clearly expressed? Did the contents include enough details, examples, and support where needed? (4) Was the format correct (margins, font, line spacing, title, date, layout, page numbering, etc.)? Was the paper neat? (5) Were the grammar, punctuation, and spelling correct? (6) If the assignment required note taking or writing a comment, was it well done?

Overall, I was impressed with the class. I thought it was a good example of "a model lesson" except perhaps for being pressed for time at the end. Maybe the announcements could be made at the start of the class instead of at the end? In other classes I have observed, teachers tended to run overtime as well.

Among the five types of feedback above, Example 5, *narration with comments*, provides the richest account so far of what the class was actually like. Accordingly, it could be used along with other data to support a teacher's candidacy for a Good Teaching Award (See Appendix 2). However, for that purpose, what it and the other types of feedback so far lack is explicit reference to those factors that research has shown to be associated with positive learning outcomes and student satisfaction. Example 6 illustrates a solution to this problem. In this example, the observer provides feedback based on a detailed checklist of factors divided into 12 categories (Appendix 1).

Example 6: Feedback Based on an Itemized Checklist (See Appendix 1)

1. *Start of Lesson (Opening)*

Teacher had students' attention from the start. Friendly manner and immediate engagement with the students. No review of previous lesson. No setting of goals or advance organizer of today's lesson. (Content and activities of today's lesson not clear in the syllabus.)

2. *Time Management*

Many short teaching episodes and variety of tasks kept students interested and engaged. (In my opinion, more time could have been spent on some tasks to "optimize" learning of the content, e.g., Episodes 4 and 9).

3. *Contents and Organization*

Systematically followed the textbook except for Episodes 8 and 9: Free conversation and "ask me a question" seemed unrelated to the course objectives. Link of past and present not evident. Transitions clear. Content appropriate to the topic, but "meaningful" to the students was hard to judge.

4. *Delivery*

Orally delivery appeared fine, except voice was too loud on occasion (almost shouting). Classroom doors were left open, so noise may be a problem for other classes. Energetic. Not dull. Pace appeared fine. Rarely used the board—cannot judge. Did not use slides, etc. (More use of the board might enhance student understanding.)

5. *Instruction*

Whole class, pair work, and silent individual work are evident. Little one-to-one practice between teacher and student except for off-lesson free talking. Students were active (e.g., reading aloud, repeating, writing), but little evidence of applied

learning (e.g., making original sentences, unscripted role-play). Very little one-to-one Q&A to assess a student's understanding.

6. *Interaction*

Many chances for students to ask questions, but the teacher did not elicit comments or opinions about the contents of the lesson. Wait time is short. Did not monitor progress by questioning. No evidence of using different question types. The class is small and students spoke audibly so no need for teacher to repeat the question (except to correct grammar or pronunciation). Feedback was sparse. Participation appeared equal. Little elaboration on the contents. Did not personalize the lesson contents ("compare to your experience").

7. *Class Management and Atmosphere*

Students appeared interested. Teacher appeared to enjoy teaching and was in control of the class. Maintained attention but did not call on students by name. Teacher was respectful and fair. Students spoke out without hesitation. They seemed confident. No evidence of "high expectations" in the sense of pushing and encouraging the students to perform with more accuracy, fluency, complexity, and elaboration. No disciplinary problems.

8. *Materials and multimedia*

This class used only a textbook with the accompanying audio CD. The textbook appeared "attractive."

9. *End of Lesson (Closing)*

The lesson ended (the bell rang) while students were engaged doing a written task in the textbook. Told students to finish the lesson for homework. There was no mention of other homework. No review, no reflection, no preview, and no question time.

10. *Cognitive Level of Instruction*

Today's lesson involved only lower-order thinking skills, which appeared appropriate for learning foreign language (English) vocabulary, grammar, and sentence patterns. High-order language skills needed to perform well in the workplace were not the focus of the textbook lesson.

11. *Critical Thinking*

As above, today's lesson involved only lower-order thinking skills, which appeared appropriate for learning foreign language (English) vocabulary, grammar, and sentence patterns.

12. *Promotes Second Language Acquisition*

Teacher and students used English 99 percent of the time. Today's lesson was limited to dialogue and sentence level practice, primarily oral practice. Content was not personalized, except for elementary-level free conversation not related to the lesson. Cultural comparison was not evident and probably not needed. There was little evidence of teacher modeling, scaffolding, examples, prompts, and feedback during whole-class activities. Error correction, etc. (if any) was done during pair work when the teacher circulated around the room.

13. *Other comments*

The students were attentive, cooperative, and engaged throughout the class. They seemed to enjoy it and the teacher did, too. The topics and activities in the syllabus did not appear to match today's lesson.

The itemized checklist above can be used as an assessment tool for supervisory observation as well as for personal reflection and self-monitoring of good teaching practices (Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Richards & Farrell, 2005). As an assessment tool, it can help ascertain the presence, absence, and extent of "good teaching" practices. In addition, it can help provide a more balanced picture of teacher whose course evaluation results indicate need for improvement.

The next example includes excerpts from a narrative account of the same class observed in Example 6. It allows the reader to create a mental picture of what direct observation of the class was like. Unlike the narration in Examples 3 and 4, this narration takes into account the explicitly stated factors associated with positive learning outcomes and student satisfaction covered in Example 6. In this regard, as a supervisory tool, this form of "informed narration" combined with the summative responses in the checklist (Franklin, 2001). provide the good way to assess candidates for the Good Teaching Award (Appendix 2) and to provide support for teachers needing faculty development support for some aspects of their instruction practices.

Example 7: Informed Narration Based on the Itemized Checklist (Excerpts)

Opening (9:20). I arrived about 8 min. before class began. The teacher was chatting in a friendly manner with several students. At about 9:15, the teacher turned on the CD player and did a sound check. Class began promptly at 9:20. Sixteen Students were present and one more arrived a few minutes late. The

teacher began by asking students one by one about who had taken the recent TOEIC test. He had brief, conversational exchanges with some students. At 9:27, the teacher took attendance, calling students by their given names and chatted briefly with each one (e.g., How are you? Have a nice weekend? Who went to bed after midnight?).

Episode 1 (9:30). Written task. The teacher began the textbook lesson. No review of the previous lesson. He confirmed orally that all students were on the right page (p. 36). Teacher lent a textbook to student who forgot hers. (Did not scold student but treated her politely.) Teacher read aloud the guide questions and told students to write their answers in the book. Teacher told them working with a partner was OK and that if they needed help to raise their hand. Teacher circulated around the room and gave advice to several students. Students worked quietly and stayed on task. I did not notice anyone working with a partner. Teacher asked if anyone needed more time. No one raised a hand, so the teacher proceeded to the next activity.

Episode 2 (9:42). Oral practice (read aloud and role-play). Teacher told the students to "Do the conversation with your partner. Put the book between you. Both of you read it." The teacher circulated around the room listening to each pair. He told them to correct any mistakes they noticed. A student asked what "correct" meant, and he wrote on the board "Correct = Make something right." After a few minutes, he assigned new partners, played the CD, and students listened with books closed. Next, the students did a role-play using the textbook. One student was the "Manager" (book open) and the other student was the "Customer" (book closed). After a short time, the teacher told them to switch roles. A few minutes later, the teacher stopped the activity and briefly summarized the content and language functions. There was no one-to-one oral practice between teacher and student as a whole-group activity. (While students were practicing, he gave additional instructions, but he did not get their attention first, so some pairs continued talking and didn't hear them.)

Episode 4 (10:05). Written task. The teacher directed students to do the matching exercise in the textbook (written task). After a few minutes, the teacher read aloud the number of each question (1, 2, 3, etc.) and its corresponding answer (A, B, C, etc.). The words were not read aloud, just the numbers and letters. There was no practice or discussion of the content of the exercise.

Episode 8 (10:30). Free conversation (unrelated to the lesson). The teacher announced "free talking" about "anything that makes you happy." The teacher circulated among the students and answered a few questions. All students were actively engaged in speaking English.

Episode 9 (10:34). Written task. The teacher directed the students to look at Exercise 1 on page 42, read aloud the instructions, and told them to fill in the blanks. After 5 minutes, the teacher read aloud the answers and asked if there were any questions or any different answers. The wait time was very short (about 3 seconds). There was no practice or discussion of the content of the exercise. The teacher directed the students to look at the next exercise.

Closing (10:49). The teacher told the students to finish the exercise for homework and ended the class. A few students approached the teacher to ask questions. The others waited for the bell to ring before leaving.

Narrative descriptions such as the one above can be used to compare teacher behaviors and teaching practices. These comparisons can serve as material for professional development discussion groups where participants discuss the pro and cons of various classroom practices and consider alternative approaches. To illustrate, compare the Opening and Episode 1 in Example 7 above with those in Example 8 below (a class taught by a different teacher).

Example 8: Informed Narration of an Opening and Episode 1

Opening (9:20–9:25). Twenty-three students were present at the start of the class, and two more arrived late. Students sat scattered throughout the classroom. The teacher entered classroom on time and began distributing attendance slips silently. The teacher told students to return slips. These words were the first words the teacher spoke since entering.

Episode 1 (9:25–9:45). Correcting textbook exercise. The teacher announced the start of the lesson (unit and page). Using the attendance slips, the teacher called on a student to provide an answer to a textbook exercise. There was a long pause, and the student finally answered in low voice. (I sat behind the last row, and it was hard to hear the student's voice. Perhaps some others students could not hear her clearly as well.) The teacher explained the correct answer and why the student's response was incorrect. (Note: all explanations were in Japanese.). The

teacher commented on vocabulary (e.g., *practice* = training vs. *practice* = profession (e.g., medical practice). The teacher compared the current grammar pattern with previous grammar patterns. The teacher wrote vocabulary items on board and pointed out easily confused items (*bring up* vs. *grow up*). The teacher continued using the attendance slips to call on students one by one to respond to the textbook exercise items. About 10 minutes after class began, two students in the back began chatting. Teacher did not notice. The teacher rarely made eye contact with the class. After calling on students, in most cases, the teacher paused until the student responded. Sometimes the pause was very long, but eventually the students made an effort to answer. The teacher continued to add vocabulary items to the board as they came up during the lesson. The teacher's writing was legible.

Two comparisons, among several that could be pointed out, are the ways these two teachers differ in the emphasis they put on rapport building and time management at the start of the class. The first teacher chats in a friendly manner with the students before and during the taking of attendance. In contrast, the second teacher skips any "warm up" activities and gets the students immediately involved in the first leaning task (correcting homework), marking attendance while calling on students one-by-one to answer questions. How these and other teacher actions affect student satisfaction and learning outcomes, as well as reflect good teaching practices, need to be thoughtfully considered.

Conclusion

Imagine that at your college or university you have the opportunity to observe a colleague teach, and you are expected to provide written description to the teacher and/or to your faculty development committee on what you observed. If you are given no advice on how to write such feedback, what do you do? First of all, ask yourself: What is the purpose? What is my role? How will this information be used? When providing feedback in peer observation, you have considerable freedom to share personal experiences on what and how to teach without being judgmental. When providing feedback for supervisory purposes, it is important to provide a fair and balanced assessment by combining an observation checklist with narrative accounts of teaching performance. In either case, feedback needs to focus on teaching behaviors that research has found to be associated with positive learning outcomes and student satisfaction.

End Notes

1. Other types of observations, for example, are (a) the Open Class, during which members of the campus community and prospective students observe a model or "typical" lesson, and (b) ethnographic, naturalistic, and other methods for collecting detailed data on teacher and student behavior for research purposes.
2. Sophia Junior College was renamed as Sophia University Junior College Division in 2012.

Appendix 1

Supervisory Observation Itemized Checklist

Teaching Factors Associated with Positive Learning Outcomes and Student Satisfaction

Instructor:		Date:		Period:
Course:		Observation time (start-finish):		
Type of course:		Room:		
Enrollment:	Attendees:	Observer:		

To the observer: As appropriate, consider whether the following behaviors were Highly Evident (5), Evident (4), Somewhat Evident (3), Seldom Evident (2), Not Evident (1), or Not Applicable (0) to this class. Write your comments to support your judgment

1. Start of Lesson (Opening) 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Gets students' attention, greeting, attendance, review, today's goals, homework check, etc.

2. Time Management 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Starts **on time**. The **pace** of the lesson is appropriate. **Optimizes** instructional time. Finishes **on time**.

3. Contents and Organization 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Contents **appropriate** to the course goals and objectives. Has a clear **lesson plan**. Topics presented in **logical** sequence with clear **transitions**. Links past and present learning. Content is **meaningful**.

4. Delivery 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Speaks **clearly**, **audibly**, and at an appropriate **pace**. Adequate **eye contact**, effective **body** language, etc. **Writing** on the board, slides, etc. is legible and not too small, etc.

5. Instruction 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Gives clear directions. Clearly explains the material. Uses a **variety of techniques** to convey information (questions, explanations, models, visuals, etc.). Uses **examples** and relates new ideas to familiar concepts and previous learning. **Emphasizes** important points and key vocabulary. **Summarizes** from time to time. Lesson has variety of **formats** (lecture, whole class discussion, Q&A, pair work, small group work). **Active learning** is evident. **Assesses** students' understanding (quiz, etc.).

6. Interaction 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Asks questions to monitor students' progress. Provides sufficient **wait time** for student's response. Gives satisfactory **answers** to students' questions. Uses a variety of **question types** (literal, analytical, interpretive, etc.) Provides opportunities for **students to ask questions** and make comments. Makes sure student's questions and comments are **heard by all** (teacher repeats, paraphrases, etc.). Keeps discussions on track and encourages **equal participation**. Provides appropriate **feedback** (praise, hints, corrections, requests for elaborate, etc.).

7. Class Management and Atmosphere 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Calls students **by name**. Maintains student **attention**. Makes class session **stimulating and interesting**. Shows **enthusiasm** and interest. Shows **interest**, **concern** and **respect for students**. Treats students **fairly**. Maintains classroom climate conducive to learning. Helps build students' **confidence**. Students feel it is "**safe**" to speak. Communicates **high expectations**. Maintains **discipline** (no private chatting, mobile phones, off-task behavior, etc.).

8. Materials and multimedia 5 4 3 2 1 NA

As needed, provides attractive, organized, and useful outlines, handouts, visual aids, slides, etc. Instructional media and/or materials are appropriately **cited** (source and copyright).

9. End of Lesson (Closing) 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Reviews key points. Encourages students to **reflect** on what they learned today. Relates today's lesson to **future lessons.** Makes **clear** the homework assignment for the next class. Allows **time for questions**, etc.

10. Cognitive Level of Instruction 5 4 3 2 1 NA

(Bloom's Revised Taxonomy). As appropriate, includes several cognitive levels, lower to higher: (1) **Remembering:** recognizing, listing, describing, identifying, retrieving, naming, finding, defining. (2) **Understanding:** comparing, explaining, classifying, exemplifying, summarizing. (3) **Applying:** implementing, carrying out, using. (4) **Analyzing:** comparing, organizing, outlining, finding, structuring, integrating. (5) **Evaluating:** checking, hypothesizing, experimenting, judging, testing, monitoring. (6) **Creating:** making, designing, constructing, planning, producing, inventing. (Overlaps Critical Thinking)

11. Critical Thinking 5 4 3 2 1 NA

(Paul and Elder)**.** As appropriate, promotes the following: (1) **Elements of Thought:** Purpose, problem or issue, assumptions, point of view, information and evidence, concepts and ideas, inferences and assumptions, implications and consequences. (2) **Intellectual Standards:** Clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, significance, depth, breadth, logic, fair-mindedness. (Overlaps Cognitive Level)

12. Promotes Second Language Acquisition 5 4 3 2 1 NA

Integrates all language skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking). Uses English as **comprehensible input** as much as possible. Students **use English** as much as possible. Relates contents to the **students' background experiences and lives**. The use of language is **realistic** and **authentic**. Provides **cultural instruction** as needed. Provides **support** (modeling, scaffolding, examples, prompts, and feedback). Deals with errors appropriately.

13. Other comments

14. Narrative summary. Describe the flow of the lesson including the opening, instructional episodes, and closing. Note approximate time for each episode (e.g., 10:05 −10:15).

Appendix 2

Sample Criteria for Selecting Candidates for the Good Teaching Award

1. *Eligibility and number of awards:* The candidate must be a currently employed full- or part-time instructor. There is no limit on the number of awards given each year, provided that all evaluation criteria are met.

2. *Evaluation Period and Course Load.* Full-time Instructors: One academic year and a minimum of 8 courses. In the case of a sabbatical, the fall semester of the previous academic year will be included. However, data from a previous award cannot be applied to subsequent awards. *Part-time Instructors:* At least 4 semesters of teaching and a minimum of 8 courses. If the teacher has not taught 8 courses during that period, then courses from early years can be included. A part-time teacher who has received an award can be considered for another award after 4 or more semesters of teaching. However, data from a previous award cannot be applied to subsequent awards.

3. *End-of-Semester Course Evaluation Questionnaires.* To be considered for an award, the following criteria must be met: (1) In principle, at least a 50-percent response rate in all courses and at least 100 respondents in total during the evaluation period. (2) A total average score of at least 4.5 (out of 5.0 with 5 being the best score) rounded up on both overall satisfaction and items related to instruction and content with no course less than 4.0. See note below. (3) The number and contents of positive comments. (4) The number and seriousness of negative comments. (5) If a questionnaire was not administered in a course, or if the response rate was less than 50 percent, the instructor must submit a written explanation, and the FD Committee will decide if the instructor will lose eligibility or not.

4. *Syllabus Evaluation.* Based on the course evaluation results of the spring semester, the FD Committee will evaluate the syllabi of the top scoring candidates on the following criteria: (1) compliance with the syllabus guidelines, (2) compliance with the diploma policy, (3) appropriateness and explicitness of learning objectives and evaluation criteria, (4) appropriateness of teaching and learning activities, and (5) other relevant criteria. *Evaluation scale:* "Exceeds expectations," "Meets expectations," "Does not meet expectations."

5. *Supervisory Observation (Fall Semester).* Based on the results of the spring semester course evaluations and syllabi review, candidates will be observed, in principle, on at least two occasions during the fall semester using the Good Teaching Guidelines

Observation Form. The observer on each occasion will be different.

6. *Final Review*. Based on data from all the relevant Course Evaluation Questionnaires, syllabi, and observations, the FD Committee will rank the top scoring candidates and present its findings and recommendations to the president for final selection of the winners of the good teaching award.

Selected references: Barre (2015), Centra (2003), Eiszler (2002), Felder & Brent (2004), Greenwald & Gillmore (1997), Mori & Tanabe (2011, 2012), Spooren, Brockx, & Mortelmans (2013), Stehle, Spinath, & Kadmon (2012).

References

Andrade, M. (2014, Feb. 4). "What Makes a Good Teacher? Ideas, Strategies, and Recommendations from the Faculty Development Literature." A presentation given at the English Teachers Symposium. Sophia University Junior College Division. Hadano, Japan.

Andrade, M. (2015, Nov. 22). Writing Feedback About Teaching: Peer and Supervisory Observation of College and University Instructors. Presentation given at the JALT 41st Annual International Conference, Granship, Shizuoka, Japan.

Barre, E. (2015). Student ratings of instruction: A literature review. Center for Teaching Excellence. Rice University. Retrieved from http://cte.rice.edu/ blogarchive/2015/02/01/studentratings

Barre, E. (2015). Rice CTE student ratings of instruction literature review. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/DEOruot_gcM.

Bilash, O. 2011. Best of Bilash: The value of observation. University of Alberta. Retrieved from http://www.educ.ualberta.ca/staff/olenka.bilash/ best%20of%20 bilash/observation.html.

British Council. (2015). Continuing professional development (CPD) framework for teachers. Retrieved from http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/ CPD%20framework%20for%20teachers_WEB.PDF.

British Council. (2015). Continuing professional development for teachers. http://www. teachingenglish.org.uk/teacher-development/ continuing-professional-development.

Canale, M., Herdklotz, C., & Wild, L. (2012). *Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness.* Office of Faculty Career Development. The Wallace Center at Rochester Institute of Technology. Retrieved from http://nortonsafe.search.ask.com/ web?q=Evaluation+of+Teaching +Effectiveness.+Office+of+Faculty+Career+Develo

pment.+The+Wallace+Center&o=apn10506&prt=cr.

Centra, J. A. (2003). Will teachers receive higher student evaluations by giving higher grades and less course work?" *Research in Higher Education, 44* (5), 495–518.

Chickering, A., & Gamson, Z. (1987). *Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education.* Washington News Center. Retrieved from http://www. lonestar.edu/multimedia/SevenPrinciples.pdf.

Duquesne University Faculty Handbook. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.asjmc.org/ contemporary/tenure/university%20wide%20t_p/Duquesne%20University.pdf.

Echevarria, J. J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2004). *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Eiszler, C. F. (2002). College students' evaluations of teaching and grade inflation. *Research in Higher Education, 43* (4), 483–501.

Felder, R., & Brent, R. (2004). How to evaluate teaching. *Chemical Engineering Education, 38* (3), 200-202. Retrieved from http://www.ncsu.edu/felder-public/ Columns/ Teacheval.pdf.

Feldman, K. A. (1989). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. *Research in Higher Education, 30* (6), 583–645.

Franklin, J. (2001). Interpreting the numbers: Using a narrative to help others read student evaluations of your teaching accurately." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 87*, 85–100.

Gaston College Faculty Assessment and Evaluation System. (2011). Texas: Gaston Community College.

Learning and Teaching Unit. (2004). *Guidelines on Learning that Inform Teaching at UNSW.* Sydney: University of New South Wales. https://teaching.unsw.edu.au/ guidelines.

Holdaway, M., & Henderson, H., & Cameron, S. (2009). *Classroom Observations: The Basics.* Arizona Charter Schools Conference (Arizona Charter Schools Association). Retrieved from http://sekmodernlanguagedepartment.wikispaces. com/file/view/ Cameron_ ClassObservationBooklet.pdf/239286853/Cameron_ ClassObservationBooklet.pdf.

Greenwald, A. G., & Gillmore, G. M. (1997). "No pain, No gain? The importance of measuring course workload in student ratings of instruction." *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89* (4), 743–51.

Lewis, K. G. (2001). Making sense of student written comments. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 87*, 25–32.

Little, O., Goe, L., & Bell, C. (2009). *A Practical Guide to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness*. Washington, D.C.: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

McKinney, K. (comp.) (n.d.). A sampling of what we know about learning from scholarship of teaching and learning and educational research. Handout Materials, Papers, Tutorials, and Bibliographies. The Office of the Cross Chair in The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Illinois State University. Retrieved 2014 from http://sotl.illinoisstate.edu/resources/materials/.

MIT Guidelines on Learning that Inform Teaching. (2008). Cambridge, MA: Teaching and Learning Laboratory. Retrieved from https://tll.mit.edu/sites/default/files/ guidelines/ learning-guidelines-2008.pdf.

Mori, S., & Tanabe, Y. (2011). Students' course evaluations and the their roles in faculty development (2): Analyses of students' perceptions toward required English classes. *Kinki University English Journal, 7*, 17-36.

Mori, S., & Tanabe, Y. (2012). Effects of perceived teacher personality on student class evaluations. *Kinki University Center for Liberal Arts and Foreign Language Education Journal, Foreign Language Edition, 3* (1), 163-181.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2008). *The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools*. Foundation for Critical Thinking Press. Retrieved from https://www. criticalthinking. org/store/products/critical-thinking-concepts-amp-tools/156.

Protocol for Classroom Observations. (2004). Anneberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University. Retrieved from http://www.annenberginstitute.org.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional Development for Language Teachers: Strategies for Teacher Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013): "On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research, 83* (4), 598–642.

Stehle, S., Spinath, B., & Kadmon, M. (2012) "Measuring teaching effectiveness: correspondence between students' evaluations of teaching and different measures of student learning." *Research in Higher Education, 53* (8), 888– 904.

Stillwell, C. (2009). The collaborative development of teacher training skills. *ELT*

Journal, 63 (4), 353-362. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccn068.

Student motivations and attitudes: The role of the affective domain in geoscience learning. (2015). The Geological Society of America. Retrieved from http://serc. carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/affective/motivation.html.

Taguchi, M., Fujita, S., Shinto, T., & Mizukami, S.. (2003). FD to shite no kokai jugyo no ruikeika: 13 daigaku no jitsurei wo moto ni [Five types of open classes as faculty development activities: A study of 13 cases]. Nihon Kyoiku Kogakukai Ronbushi(Nihon Kyoiku Kogaku Zashi 27, SuppD: 25-28. Retrieved from http:// ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110003026524 .