

POLICY ON REVIEW OF TEACHING

1. Purpose

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

- 1.1 High quality teaching is essential if all IADC-A students are to be given the opportunity to reach their full potential.
- 1.2 Review of teaching is a mechanism through which each faculty member of the Institution receives constructive feedback from colleagues on the teaching style, which in turn provides a basis for reflection on and renewal of the 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 doing so, to serve as stimulating teachers to the student community at IADC-A.

2. Procedure

- 2.1 Each full-time teaching faculty member of the institution undergoes review of teaching once per year.
- 2.2 If part-time faculty members are employed, they will not normally be subjected to this review process. Instead, Heads of Departments will be responsible for providing constructive feedback to them in any way they deem suitable.
- 2.3 Each faculty member 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 the ROT form (Annexure – I) which draws strongly on relevant parts of the Institutions' document *Standards for Teaching and the Support of Learning*.
- 2.6 Review of Teaching will be an Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) agenda item once per semester, at a time judged to be appropriate by the IQAC Director. 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 the Principal.
- 2.7 The Director of Academic Excellence prepares an annual report on general strengths and weaknesses of the teaching 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 Reports from the HoDs and Director of Academic Excellence produced will be consolidated into a single report by the Director of Academic Excellence once per year.
- 2.9 Responsibility for execution of Review of Teaching lies with Director of Academic Excellence, who will liaise with Heads of Departments.

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.
- 3.5 During the meeting to give verbal feedback, the reviewer should ask the reviewee to show him/her how the institutions' 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, the reviewer should send a soft copy of the completed ROT Form to:
- The Reviewee
 - The Head of the Department
 - The Principal
- 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 faculty members 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 they 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 Academic Excellence Director's original review as being valid or
 - Conduct a second review of the teaching

Annexure - I

Review of Teaching 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 faculty member made clear to the students the purpose/aims of the lesson: ☐

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

- The faculty member showed good classroom management skills: ☐

- The faculty member gave clear instructions/directions to students: ☐

- The faculty member used visual aids effectively to promote learning: ☐

- The faculty member used technology effectively in class to promote learning: ☐

- The faculty member made use of well-chosen examples to support learning: ☐

- The faculty defined key terms clearly: ☐

- The faculty member checked periodically that students understood lesson content: ☐

- The faculty member related classroom learning to the real world outside: ☐

- The faculty member actively encouraged verbal contributions from students: ☐

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

- The faculty member 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 Faculty members' use of English in class as: ☐

The relationship between the students and the faculty member seemed: ☐

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

The faculty members' use of technology/LMS to support student learning is: ☐

Part 4

Over all, 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 are:

Reviewer's signature:

Date:

Reviewee's signature:

Date: