

INDIAN ACADEMY DEGREE COLLEGE - AUTONOMOUS

POILICY ON REVIEW OF TEACHING

1. Purpose

Review of teaching is shall be carried out at Indian Academy Degree College Autonomous (IADCA) for the following reasons:

- 1.1 High quality teaching is essential if all IADCA students are to be given the opportunity to reach their full potential.
- 1.2 Review of teaching is a mechanism through which each lecturer in the College receives annually constructive feedback from colleagues on his/her teaching, which in turn provides a basis for reflection on, and renewal of, his/her teaching beliefs and practices.
- 1.3 When individuals reflect on their teaching beliefs and practices it is likely that they will continue to question what they do in class, to renew and extend their pedagogical repertoires and, by so doing, to serve as stimulating teachers for IADCA students.

2. Procedure

- 2.1 Each full-time lecturer in the College will undergo review of teaching once per year.
- 2.2 If part-time lecturers are employed, they will not normally be subject to this review process. Instead, Heads of Department will be responsible for providing constructive feedback to them in any way they deem suitable.
- 2.3 Each lecturer will have their teaching reviewed according to a cycle in which, they will have been reviewed by:
 - a. Their Head of the Department
 - b. Director of Academic Excellence
- 2.4 Reviews carried out by the Director of Academic Excellence/HoDs will take place from October to June in order to allow the Director of Academic Excellence to spread his reviewing load appropriately.
- 2.5 Written feedback will be given to reviewees on Form ROT (see Appendix) which draws strongly on relevant parts of the College's document *Standards for Teaching and the Support of Learning*.
- 2.6 Review of Teaching will be a Internal Quality Assurance Committee (IQAC) agenda item once per semester, at a time judged to be appropriate by the Chair. Recommendations from the Director of Academic Excellence about any changes to

the Review of Teaching process or about any other relevant actions to be taken will be forwarded to Principal.

2.7 The Director of Academic Excellence will give a report to the principal along with the senior management once per year on general strengths and weaknesses of the teaching he has observed, and make suggestions for staff development sessions and/or recommendations for any other relevant actions to be taken. This report will normally be tabled at the beginning of a year and will comment on the previous year's teaching.

2.8 Head of the Department reports and Director of AE reports produced will be consolidated into a single report by the DAE once per year.

2.9 Responsibility for operationalization of Review of Teaching lies with Director of Academic Excellence, who will liaise with Heads of Departments and the as necessary.

3. Specifics

3.1 Reviewer must be present as the class begins and must spend at least one hour and not more than two hours in the reviewee's classroom.

3.2 It is generally expected that the reviewer will take no active part in classroom activity, but simply observe. In so doing the reviewer should take every possible precaution to minimize any effect that s/he may have on what takes place in class.

3.3 It is expected that the reviewer will note during the class any aspects of the teaching that are particularly praiseworthy or that seem to him or her to be questionable or below expectations. This can be done with a pen and paper or via a small device such as a tablet computer.

3.4 As soon as possible after observation, and certainly within 24 hours, the reviewer should give the reviewee verbal (spoken) feedback on noteworthy aspects of his/her teaching. This feedback should be constructive (that is, it should be supportive while offering suggestions, where appropriate, for further thought), and it should be given in a professional and helpful manner, as one colleague and team-member to another.

3.5 During the meeting to give verbal feedback, the reviewer should ask the reviewee to show him/her how the college's LMS and such other facilities has been used to support student learning. The reviewer should use this information so as to provide a rating for the final question of Part 3 of the ROT form.

3.6 Within a week of the review taking place, the reviewer should send a soft copy of the completed ROT Form (see p.4 below) to:

- The reviewee
- Senior Management
- The principal
- The Head of Department

3.7 The form should reflect and not contradict the verbal feedback already given to the reviewee. For instance, the reviewer should be careful to ensure that largely positive verbal feedback is not followed by rather negative written feedback.

3.8 Full-time academic staff are required to keep all completed ROT Forms (those relating to cases where their teaching was reviewed) in a folder on their work PC and (as with all important documents) to back this up. They are also expected to reflect carefully on the written and oral feedback received from the reviewer.

3.9 If any reviewee thinks that oral feedback and/or a particular ROT Form do not accurately reflect his/her performance during observation, then s/he should contact the Director of Academic Excellence to request an additional observation by a second person of the same category (if the original reviewer was HoD), or should contact the principal (if the original reviewer was the Director of Academic Excellence). In this latter case, the principal can either:

- Accept the Director Academic Excellence original review as being valid or
- Conduct a second review of the person's teaching himself.

ROT FORM

The content of this form reflects the IADC-A Standards for Teaching and the Support of Learning. Any qualitative comments (explanations for a rating, additional remarks) should be added in the space after each item. In the case of a zero rating (0) such comments are obligatory.

Part 1

Name of reviewee: _____

Name of reviewer: _____

Date and time of class reviewed: _____

Amount of time (minimum one hour) spent in the classroom by the reviewer: _____

Course being taught: _____

Main focus of the class: _____

Number of students present (approximately): _____

Level of this Course (1st Year/2nd Year/3rd Year): _____

Part 2

Performance should be rated using the following scale:

- strong evidence (3);
- some evidence (2);
- only a little evidence (1);
- no evidence (0).

- The lecturer made clear to the students the purpose/aims of the lesson:

- The teaching observed was well structured (boundaries between activities):

- The lecturer showed good classroom management skills:

- The lecturer gave clear instructions/directions to students:

- The lecturer used visual aids effectively to promote learning:

- The lecturer used technology effectively in class to promote learning:

- The lecturer made use of well-chosen examples to support learning:

- The lecturer defined key terms clearly:

- The lecturer checked periodically that students understood lesson content:

- The lecturer related classroom learning to the real world outside:

- The lecturer actively encouraged verbal contributions from students:

- The lecturer elicited responses from a range of students (not just one or two):

- The lecturer responded effectively to student queries:

- Peer-assisted learning (student to student) took place in the class:

- Pair work took place in the class:

- Group work (team work) took place in the class:

- Student presentations took place in the class:

- Collaborative problem-solving took place in the class:

- Students in the class seemed well-motivated:

Part 3

Please use the following descriptors in Parts 3 and 4:

- excellent (3);
- good (2);
- acceptable (1);
- needs attention (0)

I would describe the lecturer's use of English in class as:

The relationship between the students and the lecturer seemed:

The level of what was taught in relation to the level of the students seemed:

The lecturer's use of technology/LMS to support student learning is:

Part 4

Overall, and bearing in mind the ratings I have given above, I would describe the reviewee's teaching in the class I observed as:

The main points of his/her performance that I would advise the reviewee to reflect on and seek to improve are¹:

Reviewer's signature:

PRINT NAME:

Date:

Reviewee's signature:

PRINT NAME:

Date:
