
Tools: **Interprofessional Academy of Educators**

Interprofessional Academy of Educators

2024

Peer Feedback on Online Teaching Rubric

Brian P. Boerner

University of Nebraska Medical Center, bboerner@unmc.edu

Analisa McMillan

University of Nebraska Medical Center, analisa.mcmillan@unmc.edu

Jana L. Wardian PhD

University of Nebraska Medical Center, jana.wardian@unmc.edu

Elizabeth L. Beam

University of Nebraska Medical Center, ebeam@unmc.edu

Michelle Howell

Univeristy of Nebraska Medical Center, michelle.howellsmith@unmc.edu

See next page for additional authors

Tell us how you used this information in this [short survey](#).

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/iae_tools



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Boerner, Brian P.; McMillan, Analisa; Wardian, Jana L. PhD; Beam, Elizabeth L.; Howell, Michelle; and Skogerboe, Janet, "Peer Feedback on Online Teaching Rubric" (2024). *Tools: Interprofessional Academy of Educators*. 2.

https://digitalcommons.unmc.edu/iae_tools/2

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Interprofessional Academy of Educators at DigitalCommons@UNMC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Tools: Interprofessional Academy of Educators by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNMC. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@unmc.edu.

Authors

Brian P. Boerner, Analisa McMillan, Jana L. Wardian PhD, Elizabeth L. Beam, Michelle Howell, and Janet Skogerboe

RUBRIC: PEER FEEDBACK ON ONLINE TEACHING



The Peer Feedback on Online Teaching Rubric was developed to support online asynchronous educators in improving their design, delivery and teaching presence in the asynchronous learning environment. This tool is not designed nor intended to provide standardized ratings that can be compared over time or between individuals (e.g., performance reviews or research). Rather, **it provides meaningful feedback to individuals to make incremental improvements in their teaching, course development and delivery.** While some individuals may be encouraged by supervisors to seek out peer feedback on their teaching, this process ultimately works best when the individual is seeking out feedback based on their own desire to improve.

THREE WAYS TO USE THE RUBRIC

FOR SELF-REFLECTION

Educators who want to improve their online teaching should begin by using the rubric to self-assess their online course design, learning content and teaching presence.

TO OBSERVE AN EXPERIENCED ONLINE TEACHER

One of the best ways to learn how to develop and teach in an online course is by reviewing an experienced teacher's online course space. Identify an experienced online teacher by asking your department chair for recommendations in your field or ask fellow educators to identify someone in an unrelated field. Many colleagues welcome someone to discuss online teaching strategies with, so don't feel shy about asking them.

While the rubric is not intended to "grade" the instructor or course space, it can be useful to identify important online teaching techniques and see how they are effectively implemented. This is helpful if there are concepts you want to work on based on your self-reflection. If your colleague is willing, schedule a debrief to ask why they made certain choices or to talk through ideas for how you might adapt some of their strategies in your online teaching.

TO RECEIVE PEER FEEDBACK

The Academy has a cadre of members willing to provide feedback on other people's online teaching and course design. Contact us, and we will connect you with a fellow faculty member. For example, if you are most interested in feedback related to your command of the subject and the logical flow of online delivery, we can connect you with someone closely related to your field. On the other hand, if you are most interested in general, non-content-related feedback on your online course, we can connect you with someone in a different department or college with online teaching experience.

Need helping finding a peer
feedback reviewer?

Email iae@unmc.edu, and we will
connect you with someone based
on your needs.

PREPARING FOR ONLINE COURSE FEEDBACK

Here is some advice for how to get the most out of the peer feedback on your online course design and teaching:

- Connect with your course reviewer beforehand. If you have done some self-reflection on your online course/ teaching and have identified specific areas you want to improve, share that with your reviewer.
- Select one or two modules/weeks of content for the reviewer to focus on learning content or allow the reviewer to self-select modules/weeks. If selecting content, consider at least one module that you feel needs work and one that you consider good for a broader range of feedback.
- Determine the time frame for the course review with the reviewer to determine when and how long they will have access to your course.
- Add the reviewer to your course and let them know you are ready for the process to begin in an email or conversation.
- It is also helpful to let them know a bit about your teaching philosophy and the course they will be reviewing. Most importantly, discuss when and how you will receive your feedback, and if the reviewer is willing, schedule a time to debrief after the process is completed.

DEBRIEFING AFTER AN OBSERVATION

Each reviewer will have their own style for how they want to provide feedback on the rubric. There is great value in receiving written feedback from a peer reviewer, but we strongly encourage that this rubric also be used to guide a **debriefing conversation after the review**. Previous participants, instructors and observers, have commented that the true value of the peer feedback process was the conversations stimulated later.

Citation:

Boerner, B., McMillan, A., Wardian, J., Beam, E., Howell, M.C., Skogerboe, J. (2024). *Peer feedback on online teaching rubric*. Interprofessional Academy of Educators, University of Nebraska Medical Center. <https://go.unmc.edu/online-rubric>

PEER FEEDBACK ON ONLINE TEACHING

Educator's Name:

Course:

Feedback Provider's Name:

Date:

Modules/Weeks Reviewed:

Please use the following scale:

4 = Exceptional Demonstration of Criteria

3 = Very Good Demonstration of Criteria

2 = Satisfactory Demonstration of Criteria

1 = Developing Demonstration of Criteria

NA = Not Applicable

Please note the following definitions:

Almost all and **always** are defined as 76% – 100% of the time.

Most and **regularly** are defined as 51% – 75% of the time.

Few and **occasionally** are defined as 26% – 50% of the time.

Almost no and **rarely** are defined as 0% – 25% of the time.

CRITERIA	Asynchronous Peer Feedback				
1. Instructor Presence	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
<p>1.1 Professional background</p> <p>Shared background and contact information with students</p>	The instructor posted a summary (10+ sentences) of their professional background, contact information, photo and link to their faculty webpage on the course introduction module/page.	The instructor posted a summary (2-9 sentences) of their professional background, contact information, and a photo OR link to their faculty webpage on the course introduction module/page.	The instructor posted a brief professional summary, photo or link to their faculty webpage on the course introduction module/page.	The instructor did not post a professional background summary or only included a photo or link to their faculty webpage on the course introduction module/page.	
Rating	Comments				
<p>1.2 Welcome announcement</p> <p>Welcomed students to class</p>	A welcome announcement and a welcome video were available for students on the first day of class.		A welcome announcement or a welcome video was available for students on the first day of class.	Almost no welcome announcement or video was available for students on the first day of class.	
Rating	Comments				
<p>1.3 Weekly announcements</p> <p>Communicated weekly with students</p>	Written announcements with brief updates, reminders, etc. were almost always sent to students throughout the semester.	Written announcements with brief updates, reminders, etc. were regularly sent to students throughout the semester.	Written announcements were occasionally sent to students throughout the semester and/or did not contain relevant course information.	Written announcements were rarely sent to students throughout the semester.	
Rating	Comments				

2. Learning Communities	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
<p>2.1 Collaboration between student and instructor</p> <p>Created opportunities for collaboration</p>	<p>Activities or opportunities (email, office hours, feedback and guidance, discussion board posts, etc.) were almost always used throughout the semester, fostering communication and collaboration between the student and instructor.</p>	<p>Activities or opportunities (email, office hours, feedback and guidance, discussion board posts, etc.) were regularly used throughout the semester, fostering communication and collaboration between the student and instructor.</p>	<p>Activities or opportunities (email, office hours, feedback and guidance, discussion board posts, etc.) were occasionally used throughout the semester, offering limited communication and collaboration between the student and instructor.</p>	<p>Activities or opportunities (email, office hours, feedback and guidance, discussion board posts, etc.) were rarely used throughout the semester, offering no communication nor collaboration between the student and instructor.</p>	
Rating	Comments				
<p>2.2 Collaboration between students and peers</p> <p>Created opportunities for collaboration</p>	<p>Activities or opportunities were almost always used throughout the course, fostering communication and collaboration between the student and peers.</p>	<p>Activities or opportunities were regularly used throughout the course, fostering communication and collaboration between the student and peers.</p>	<p>Activities or opportunities were occasionally used throughout the course, offering limited communication and collaboration between the student and peers.</p>	<p>Activities or opportunities were rarely used throughout the course, offering no communication nor collaboration between the student and peers.</p>	
Rating	Comments				
<p>2.3 Graded discussions</p> <p>Required student participation</p>	<p>Almost all threaded discussion boards required the student's participation and were graded throughout the course using a grading rubric with all criteria provided.</p>	<p>Most threaded discussion boards required the student's participation, and criteria were provided.</p>	<p>Few threaded discussion boards were used within the course, and grading rubrics or written criteria were not provided.</p>	<p>Almost no threaded discussion boards were set up within the course.</p>	
Rating	Comments				

PEER FEEDBACK ON ONLINE TEACHING RUBRIC

2. Learning Communities		EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
<p>2.4 Discussion questions Created discussion prompts</p>	<p>Almost all questions were worded to promote meaningful discourse between peers and/or allow critical analysis of content.</p>	<p>Most questions were worded to promote meaningful discourse between peers and/or allow critical analysis of content.</p>	<p>Few questions were worded to promote meaningful discourse between peers and/or allow critical analysis of content.</p>	<p>Almost no questions were worded to promote meaningful discourse, which limited critical analysis and restricted responses from students.</p>		
Rating	Comments					
<p>2.5 Instructor participation in discussion board Engaged in discussion with students</p>	<p>The instructor was an active participant on almost all discussion boards.</p>	<p>The instructor was an active participant on most discussion boards.</p>	<p>The instructor was an active participant on a few discussion boards.</p>	<p>The instructor was an active participant on almost no discussion boards.</p>		
Rating	Comments					
3. Instructional Design – Modules/Layout		EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
<p>3.1 Course introduction module/page Oriented students to the course space</p>	<p>The introduction contained extensive instructions on getting started, technology support, course information (syllabus, textbook, etc.) and other resources for students.</p>	<p>The introduction contained basic instructions on getting started, technology support details, course information (syllabus, textbook, etc.) and other resources for students.</p>	<p>The introduction had a few details with course information and/or lacked additional resources.</p>	<p>The introduction had almost no introduction nor resources.</p>		
Rating	Comments					

3. Instructional Design – Modules/Layout	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
3.2 Course layout Consistent in course layout	The course layout was almost always consistent throughout the semester, including module titles, headers and content.	The course layout was regularly consistent throughout the semester, including module titles, headers and content.	The course layout was occasionally consistent throughout the semester, including module titles, headers and content.	The course layout was rarely consistent throughout the semester.	
Rating	Comments				
3.3 Module/course sequence Consistent and organized layout	Almost all of the course maintained a consistent, organized sequence of content, allowing students easy access to weekly content, assignments, etc., and enabled students to achieve stated goals.	Most of the course had a consistent sequence, with a few outlying items that broke up the course flow and possibly interfered with students' access to content, assignments, etc.	Few aspects of the course had a consistent sequence, resulting in extensive outlying content that broke up the course flow (file links not embedded on pages, headings not used to chunk materials, assignments not in logical order or places, etc.).	The course had almost no consistent sequence, material was haphazardly organized, and students were unable to access weekly content, assignments, etc.	
Rating	Comments				
3.4 Course open/close and assessment due dates Utilized the LMS dating tools	Almost all assignments, weekly modules, discussions, quizzes and announcements had open and due dates that populate in the student's to-do list and calendar.	Most assignments, discussions and quizzes had due dates that populate in the student's to-do list and calendar.	Few assignments, discussions and quizzes had due dates that populate in the student's to-do list and calendar.	Almost no due dates were used in the course.	
Rating	Comments				

4. Instructional Design – Materials	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
<p>4.1 Instructional delivery methods Learning content delivery</p>	<p>A variety of instructional delivery methods (video lectures, readings, websites, external media, etc.) was used in almost all modules/weeks and included clear directions for students.</p>	<p>A variety of instructional delivery methods (video lectures, readings, websites, external media, etc.) was used in most modules/weeks and included clear directions for students.</p>	<p>Only two instructional delivery methods (video lectures, readings, website, external media, etc.) were used throughout the course and/or directions were not included for students.</p>	<p>No variety of instructional delivery methods was used throughout the course and no direction was given.</p>	
Rating	Comments				
<p>4.2 Knowledge demonstration Assessments and knowledge attainment</p>	<p>Students were almost always provided opportunities and a variety of ways to demonstrate knowledge methods (papers, tests, quizzes, presentations, infographics, media projects, etc.).</p>	<p>Students were regularly provided opportunities and/or diverse ways in which to demonstrate knowledge (papers, tests, quizzes, presentations, infographics, media projects, etc.).</p>	<p>Students were occasionally provided opportunities and/or diverse ways in which to demonstrate knowledge (papers, tests, quizzes, presentations, infographics, media projects, etc.).</p>	<p>Students were rarely provided opportunities (only a midterm and final exam) and only one or two ways to demonstrate knowledge.</p>	
Rating	Comments				
<p>4.3 Content delivery method Content delivery methods and tools</p>	<p>The selected learning content delivery method/tool (lecture, reading, infographic, video, demonstration, etc.) was almost always appropriate and effectively delivered the content, enabling student comprehension and retention.</p>	<p>The selected learning content delivery method/tool (lecture, reading, infographic, video, demonstration, etc.) was regularly appropriate and effectively delivered the content, enabling student comprehension and retention.</p>	<p>The selected learning content delivery method/tool (lecture, reading, infographic, video, demonstration, etc.) was occasionally appropriate and delivered the content, enabling student comprehension and retention.</p>	<p>The selected tool in the delivery of content was rarely effective or appropriate and did not assist in the student's comprehension or retention.</p>	
Rating	Comments				

4. Instructional Design – Materials	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
4.4 Micro-learning Learning material delivery	Almost all materials, including videos and audio, were “chunked” into manageable sections to foster learning.	Most materials, including videos and audio, were “chunked” into manageable sections to foster learning.	Few materials, including videos and audio, were “chunked” into manageable sections to foster learning.	Almost no materials, including videos and audio, were “chunked” into manageable sections and fostered learning.	
Rating	Comments				
4.5 Self-assessments Student mastery and practice opportunities	Four or more opportunities for self-assessment are provided throughout the semester (practice quizzes, study questions, journals, etc.).	Three opportunities for self-assessment are provided throughout the semester (practice quizzes, study questions, journals, etc.).	One or two opportunities for self-assessment are provided throughout the semester (practice quizzes, study questions, journals, etc.).	No opportunities for self-assessment (practice quizzes, study questions, journals, etc.) were provided.	
Rating	Comments				
4.6 External content Learning materials	Almost all external resources (websites, infographics, videos, articles, etc.) were relevant to the content and supported the learning objectives/goals.	Most external resources (websites, infographics, videos, articles, etc.) were relevant to the content and supported the learning objectives/goals.	Few external resources (websites, infographics, videos, articles, etc.) were relevant to the content and supported the learning objectives/goals.	Almost no external resources were relevant to the content nor supported the learning objectives/goals.	
Rating	Comments				

4. Instructional Design – Materials		EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
4.7 Inclusion and belonging Learning materials	Almost all learning materials used in the course design, learning content, lectures and videos supported belonging and an inclusive classroom.	Most materials used in the course design, learning content lectures and videos supported belonging and an inclusive classroom.	Few materials used in the course design, learning content lectures and videos supported belonging and an inclusive classroom.	Almost no materials used in the course design, learning content lectures and videos supported belonging and an inclusive classroom.		
Rating	Comments					
5. Course Technology		EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
5.1 Technology usage and learning Learning technology	Technology (videos, lecture videos, interactive websites, outside LMS tools, etc.) was almost always included, used in a meaningful way, supported learning, expanded vital points and stimulated course engagement.	Technology (videos, lecture videos, interactive websites, outside LMS tools, etc.) was regularly included, used in a meaningful way, supported learning, expanded key points and stimulated course engagement.	Technology was occasionally included and supported learning in a meaningful way.	Technology was rarely included nor supportive, and it interfered with the learning.		
Rating	Comments					

5. Course Technology	EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
<p>5.2 Audio/video: learning content Length of audio or video materials</p>	<p>Almost all information presented in audio or video files was “chunked” and related to a single objective/concept. The content was cohesively organized while remaining under 20 minutes.</p>	<p>Most information presented in audio or video files was “chunked” appropriately, with a few files between 20–30 minutes in length.</p>	<p>Few information presented in audio or video files was “chunked” appropriately; most videos were not organized cohesively and ran consistently over 30 minutes.</p>	<p>Almost no information presented in the audio or video files was “chunked” into cohesive content and most extended over 45 minutes.</p>	
Rating	Comments				
<p>5.3 Audio: quality Audio recordings</p>	<p>Audio was almost always clear and easily understandable; appropriate inflection and pacing was used in voice recording.</p>	<p>Audio was regularly clear and easily understandable, free from distracting sounds.</p>	<p>Audio was occasionally clear with either too low of volume, static interference or distracting background noises.</p>	<p>Audio was rarely clear or easily understandable, and the sound was muffled.</p>	
Rating	Comments				
<p>5.4 Video: quality Video recordings</p>	<p>Videos were almost always sharp, and audio was easily understandable. If a video was of the instructor, the framing was good and in-focus, the camera was set at eye level, the background was not distracting, etc.</p>	<p>Videos were regularly sharp, and audio was easily understandable. Few elements were of poorer quality (unfocused, out of frame, etc.).</p>	<p>Videos were occasionally sharp, and audio was understandable. Videos needed improvement with focus, framing, distractors, etc.</p>	<p>Videos were rarely of good quality due to out-of-focus camera, out-of-frame distractors, and/or the audio was not understandable.</p>	
Rating	Comments				

5. Course Technology		EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
5.5 Audio/video: technical Multimedia access	Audio and video files were easily accessible and played with a free plugin.				Audio or video files were not easily accessible or required a paid plugin to hear/view.	
Rating	Comments					
6. Accessibility		EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
6.1 ADA compliance: text Accessibility	Almost all text types, colors and font sizes were consistent throughout the course and followed ADA accessibility guidelines.	Most text types, colors and font sizes were consistent throughout the course and followed ADA accessibility guidelines.	A few text types, colors and font sizes were consistent throughout the course and only occasionally followed ADA accessibility guidelines.	Almost no text types, colors and font sizes were consistent throughout the course, and they rarely followed ADA accessibility guidelines.		
Rating	Comments					
6.2 ADA compliance: visuals Accessibility	Almost all photos, graphics and other visuals were appropriately identified with alt text.	Most photos, graphics and other visuals were appropriately identified with alt text.	A few photos, graphics and other visuals were ADA-compliant with alt text.	Almost no visuals were ADA-compliant with alt text.		
Rating	Comments					
6.3 ADA compliance: documents Accessibility	Almost all PDFs or documents were screen-reader compatible.	Most PDFs or documents were screen-reader compatible.	A few PDFs or documents were screen-reader compatible.	Almost no PDFs or documents were screen-reader compatible.		
Rating	Comments					

PEER FEEDBACK ON
ONLINE TEACHING RUBRIC

6. Accessibility		EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
6.4 Closed captioning Accessibility	Almost all faculty-created videos had closed captioning and transcripts.	Most faculty-created videos had closed captioning and transcripts.	Few faculty-created videos had closed captioning and/or transcripts.	Almost no faculty-created videos had closed captioning and transcripts.		
Rating	Comments					
7. Copyright/Fair Use		EXCEPTIONAL (4)	VERY GOOD (3)	SATISFACTORY (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	NA
7.1 Material citation Attribution	Almost all resources and materials were appropriately cited.	Most resources and materials were appropriately cited.	Few resources and materials were appropriately cited.	Almost no resources and materials were appropriately cited.		
Rating	Comments					
7.2 Teach Act Learn more: libguides.ala.org/copyright/teachact	Any items used without permission fall under the Teach Act.				Items used without permission do not fall under the Teach Act.	
Rating	Comments					

Overall, how would you rate this online course?

Exceptional

Very Good

Satisfactory

Developing

Additional comments: