



Peer Review of Instructional Development Consultant

Consultant: _____

Peer Reviewer: _____

Reviewer's Relationship to Instructional Development Consultant:

Departmental Peer External Peer
Position _____

Setting of Observation:

Instructional Skills Workshop Other workshop (TEK, TWEET, etc., (please specify) _____

Portfolio of Workshop Materials Reviewed Yes No

Date/Time of Observation: _____

Directions:

Thank you for agreeing to carry out this Peer Review. The results of this review will be used to provide valuable feedback to this consultant who will use it to identify any areas where skills and expertise may be further developed.

The review focuses on the IDC's presentation skills and knowledge. Each item is to be assessed according to the following scale:

S	SR	U	
Satisfactory	Satisfactory with Reservations	Unsatisfactory	No Opinion

No Opinion is the appropriate response where you have insufficient data or you are otherwise unable to assess the item. Items indicated by an asterisk are to be left blank if you are not qualified to make an assessment. Please note that reviewer comments are welcome when particularly effective or otherwise noteworthy performance is observed.

Satisfactory with Reservations or **Unsatisfactory** are appropriate responses where you cannot rate the consultant as satisfactory on the item. When choosing either of these options, you must clearly explain why a rating of **Satisfactory** could not be given. If no explanation is provided the response will be scored as **No Opinion**.

Content Currency

- * 1. The consultant demonstrated currency in the topics considered. S SR U No Opinion

- * 2. The consultant referred to up-to-date processes, systems and/or equipment. S SR U No Opinion

- * 3. Instructional resources(e.g., handouts) were current. S SR U No Opinion

Depth and Breadth of Knowledge

- * 4. The consultant demonstrated an adequate **depth** of knowledge. S SR U No Opinion

- * 5. The consultant demonstrated an adequate **breadth** of knowledge. S SR U No Opinion

** Asterisked items are to be left blank if the reviewer is unqualified to judge.*

Instructional Skills

6. The consultant appeared at ease in the instructional setting. S SR U No Opinion
7. The consultant explained the purpose of the workshop. S SR U No Opinion
8. The consultant's presentation of the session material was easily understandable. S SR U No Opinion
9. The Consultant presented material in a logically developed sequence. S SR U No Opinion
10. The Consultant clearly established definitions and core concepts. S SR U No Opinion

Instructional Skills (cont'd)

11. The consultant's use of voice was effective. S SR U No Opinion

12. The consultant used instructional media effectively. S SR U No Opinion

13. The consultant's pace of delivery seemed matched to student comprehension levels. S SR U No Opinion

14. The consultant demonstrated good time-management skills during the workshop. S SR U No Opinion

Interaction with Participants

15. The consultant seemed to have good rapport with the participants. S SR U No Opinion

16. The consultant provided opportunities for questions. S SR U No Opinion

17. The consultant responded effectively to questions. S SR U No Opinion

18. The consultant was able to clarify any misunderstandings. S SR U No Opinion

Instructional Materials

The following items are only to be responded to after analysis and review of the consultant's portfolio of instructional materials (e.g., manuals, handouts, assignments, etc.)

- * 19. The consultant's instructional materials were easily understood. S SR U No Opinion
20. Overall, instructional materials had a professional appearance. S SR U No Opinion
21. The consultant's instructional materials were at an appropriate level. S SR U No Opinion
- * 22. Assignments and exercises were relevant to the session topics. S SR U No Opinion

** Asterisked items are to be left blank if the reviewer is unqualified to judge.*