**EVALUATION OF TEACHING: PEER EVALUATION REPORT**

**Krista McDonald**

**CANDIDATE**

The peer evaluation is designed to provide information to the instructor about teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluations are shared only with the individual librarian being evaluated and their supervisor/department head. Probationary librarians are required to submit peer evaluation reports as supplementary material to the annual review. Librarians with continuing contract are strongly encouraged to include peer evaluation reports as supplementary material to the annual review.

Sources of information for the peer evaluation include but are not limited to: schedule of classes, syllabus, handouts, instructor description, student evaluations for sessions observed, assignments, papers, and projects.

For guidance, please refer to *Teaching Evaluation Plan, Peer Evaluation Criteria, p. 6.*

**SUMMARY**

**I. DATES AND TITLES OF COURSES, CLASSES, WORKSHOPS ATTENDED:**

- February 11, 2008 – ENT 137
- February 19, 2008 – NSG 262
- February 19, 2008 – EDL 110

**II. STRENGTHS**

- Krista had a strong and confident presence in the classroom. She clearly stated her teaching objectives at the beginning of each session and stayed on point throughout. Her voice projected well and she moved through the classroom rather than staying in one place the whole time. She had an informal style that put the students at ease and facilitated discussion.
- Krista moved through the information at a good pace and explained the material clearly. She touched base with the students periodically to make sure they were keeping up. She demonstrated several useful features of the Ebsco databases, such as searching multiple databases simultaneously and narrowing results using the subject guide. I believe that students would come away from these instruction sessions with a good understanding of basic library research.
- In all of the classes I observed, Krista allowed ample time at the end of the session for the students to get some hands on experience. The nursing students were working on a specific assignment and were able to begin their research. This was a good opportunity for her to work one-on-one with students and assist them with their individual topics. In the other two classes, Krista provided a worksheet that hit some of the key points from her presentation. It was a helpful tool to reinforce what was taught.
- The PowerPoint slideshow Krista used to teach the students in the EDL class about web site evaluation was great. It was an effective way to present the information. She used it as a jumping off point, but supplemented it with live searches and real examples of “good” and “bad” web sites. My impression was that the students enjoyed this segment of the presentation and learned from it.

**III. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Krista did not show the students in any of the classes how to limit their results in the library catalog to the Hamilton campus. Instead she jumped right into the process of requesting materials from other Miami libraries and through OhioLINK. While I agree that it is important to teach students about materials available elsewhere, I feel this was a lost opportunity to market our local collection.
The search examples Krista used did not always reinforce the points she was making. In some cases, Krista had examples ready to go, but other times, it seemed as if she was coming up with searches on the spur of the moment. As a result, she could not always find what she needed. For example, during one class, she was talking about full text links, but could not find an article to demonstrate that. I find it helpful to experiment with various searches ahead of time, to get specific results that will support the points being made.

Although Krista presented basic library searches very effectively, she could have taken it a bit further, particularly in the nursing class. I feel she could have put together some more sophisticated search statements to challenge the students beyond simple keyword searching. I also think it is a good idea to give examples of searches that do not work well—followed by ideas on how to tweak or modify the search to get better results. It is useful to present two or three different searches that produce varying results—to show students how to cope with a variety of situations.

IV. COMMENTS

Overall, I think Krista is an excellent instructor. Her knowledge of the material is strong and she is able to communicate that to the students very effectively. She has a nice way of explaining things so that students of all levels can follow the presentation and benefit from what she is teaching.
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SUMMARY

I. DATES AND TITLES OF COURSES, CLASSES, WORKSHOPS ATTENDED:
   - February 19, 2008 – EDL 110
   - March 7, 2008 – ENG 111

II. STRENGTHS
   - Krista spoke very clearly and knowledgeable during both sessions. Students appeared to understand the points she was making and the information she conveyed.
   - The two sessions were different in that the first class did not have a required research assignment while the second did. Krista varied her approach well to accommodate these different requirements. She provided a brief follow-up assignment for the first class to review what they had learned. She allowed the second class some free time at the end of the session to work on their individual topics while she offered further assistance.
   - In both sessions, Krista started off with clear outline of what would be covered and kept students’ attention throughout her demonstrations. She also repeatedly asked students if they had any questions and responded well to the issues they raised.
   - Right before the session, Krista checked with the instructor of the second class to make sure that an earlier instruction session to another section (taught by another librarian) had accomplished the instructor’s expectations. She was then able to modify her session slightly to accommodate a slightly modified focus.
   - Krista’s handouts and other instructional materials were very well prepared and effective during the sessions. In particular, her “CRAAP Test” Powerpoint was very engaging in teaching web evaluation skills to the first class. Krista did not simply read from the slides, but addressed points related to each element of evaluation and showed linked web site with examples.
   - Krista checked on students’ understanding of the material throughout with questions. She noted potentially difficult or new terminology that her database demonstrations raised.
   - Krista provided each class with methods to contact her or the reference desk (phone, IM, etc.) to follow-up with future questions.

III. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT
   - Krista could have explained the use of interlibrary loan a bit more to the second class to assist them in finding additional sources for their topics.
- When moving from the OhioLINK Central Catalog to Academic Search Complete in the second session, Krista lost a few students momentarily (the instructor assisted). It would be a good idea for her to slow the pace a bit to ensure that students of varying abilities can keep up.
- In the second session, Krista made reference to storing articles in the Folder in Ebscohost, but she did not demonstrate it or mention the necessity of establishing an Ebscohost account. It can be difficult to find time to cover everything in a single session, and I think this an area that is something of a toss-up in terms of being required. It might have been better to leave mention of the Folder to individual discussions with students.

**IV. COMMENTS**

Krista is an outstanding librarian and instructor. She demonstrated her own expertise and comfort with library research and technology while creating instructional sessions that show an understanding of students’ needs. She communicated very well with students and faculty members during the sessions, both in group presentations and in one-on-one instruction. Krista is very capable and approachable in this role.
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