**PEER EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING & COURSE MATERIAL**

The following form is to be used to evaluate in-class teaching using consistent rubrics throughout the School of Engineering. It seeks to evaluate:

* Appropriateness and delivery effectiveness of content
* Effectiveness in engaging students
* Effectiveness in presentation

This evaluation is suited to a classroom where there is both instructor presentation and student engagement. Departments and programs are encouraged to develop alternate methods for the evaluation of effective teaching and student learning for courses that deviate significantly from the typical classroom presentation model such as laboratory or design studio classes. The two instructor peers assessing in-class teaching are expected to prepare a consensus in-class peer evaluation report for a single course. This report should be provided confidentially to their department chair or program director.

Directions for Peer Evaluators:

1. The peer evaluators should work with course instructor to arrange a date or dates for the visit(s). The instructor should be reminded that the evaluation will seek to assess appropriateness and effectiveness of content, student engagement and presentation skill.
2. The peer evaluator(s) should read carefully the peer evaluation form prior to the classroom visit(s).
3. The peer evaluator(s) should ask for and receive a course syllabus prior to the visit date and review. This syllabus will be used to assess relevance of content presented in the classroom to stated course goals and content.
4. Just prior to the visit, the peer evaluator(s) should meet with the teacher to describe the process and to hear from the instructor what she/he is planning for the class to be evaluated. The instructor is encouraged to share her/his strategy for the classroom experience.
5. The peer evaluator(s) should instruct the teacher to advise students at the start of their class, that at the end of the class they will be asked to bullet the primary concepts covered.
6. The peer evaluator(s) should work to complete the form as the class progresses, or at least make notes which permit them to complete. At the end of the class, they should summarize main concepts they perceived to be covered. Their summary should be compared to student summaries.
7. At the end of the class the teacher should provide the student bullet lists to the peer evaluator(s). The evaluator(s) should review these to assess student comprehension of major topics in order to complete the content evaluation.
8. A report will be developed by the evaluator(s) comprised of the numerical categorical evaluations and comments. If two evaluators evaluate the same course, even if their evaluations were on different dates, their input must be combined in a consensus report on the course. The consensus report will consist only of the form evaluations and comments.
9. After the report is completed, it will be both shared and discussed with the reviewed faculty as well as the department chair or program director. In the discussion with the reviewed faculty, the peer evaluators should emphasize that their input aims primarily to help them improve in the classroom.

**CLASS CONTENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Effectiveness** |  | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** | **Comment on any unsatisfactory aspects of classroom content** |
| **Main concept(s) was(were) clearly stated** | There was no clear statement of the main concept(s) and clarity in connecting to main concepts was lacking; topics covered didn’t relate to the main concepts. | The main concept(s) was posed at the beginning and end of the class and addressed fairly clearly. There was some digression from the main concepts. | The main concept(s) was (were) clearly posed at the beginning of the class and summarized at the end. The content connecting to main concept was exceptionally clear. |  |
| **Main concept(s) was(were) relevant to the course syllabus and goals** | The main concept(s) covered was (were) not relevant to course syllabus and goals. | The main concept(s) covered was (were) fairly relevant to course syllabus and goals. | The main concept(s) covered was (were) completely relevant to course syllabus and goals. |  |
| **Main Concept(s) covered was (were) appropriately scoped in challenge level** | The main concept(s) covered was (were) not well situated relative to existing student knowledge and skills. | The main concept(s) covered was(were) appropriately built on student’s existing knowledge and skills. | The main concept(s) covered was (were) completely at a level congruent with student’s existing knowledge and skills. The future relevance of the main content was established. |  |
| **Main concept(s) was (were) reinforced with effective application** | There were no applications of main concept(s). | Applications of main concept(s) were presented with adequate effectiveness. | Applications of main concept(s) were very effectively presented. |  |
| **Class organization was logical and engaging** | Students cannot understand presentation – no logical sequence of content. | Instructor presented information in a mostly logical and understandable sequence. | Instructor presented information in a completely logical and interesting/engaging sequence. |  |
| **Main concept(s) was (were) understood by the students[[1]](#footnote-1)** | Few, if any, students demonstrated a clear statement of the main concept(s). | Roughly 50% of students were able to demonstrate the main concept(s) in the class. | All or nearly all students were able to demonstrate the main concept(s) in the class. |  |

**STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Engagement** |  | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** | **Comment on any unsatisfactory aspects of classroom content** |
| **Students were engaged in the classroom** | Students were not engaged in the classroom at all; no questions or actions were asked of them; they asked no questions; there was no attempt to gauge their understanding of the concepts addressed. | Students were engaged in the classroom; questions or actions were asked of them; there was openness to student questions; there was some attempt to gauge their understanding of the concepts addressed. | Students were engaged substantially in the classroom; questions or actions were asked of them; there was openness to student questions; there was significant attempt to gauge their understanding of the concepts addressed. |  |
| **Multiple teaching methods employed to address different learning styles** | Selected methods (visual, auditory, hands-on, serial, big- picture) were inappropriate for students to understand the main concept(s); addressed only one type of learning styles. | Selected methods were mostly appropriate for students to understand the main concept(s); addressed few learning styles | Selected methods were tailored to the students to help them understand the main concept(s); addressed multiple learning styles. |  |
| **Instructor ascertained and responded to needs of students** | Instructor was not aware of and did not respond to student needs, when such needs were obvious. | Instructor responded somewhat to student needs, when such needs became obvious. | Instructor actively worked to identify student needs and responded to them appropriately. |  |

**PRESENTATION SKILL**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation skill** |  | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** | **Comment on any unsatisfactory aspects of classroom content** |
| **Non-verbal communication enhances content delivery** | Instructor did not move from the front of the room; made no eye contact; did not attempt to interact with students. | Instructor moved around the classroom occasionally; made eye contact; called on students directly. | Instructor moved around the room freely; made excellent eye contact and called on all students by name. |  |
| **Oral communication enhances content delivery** | Instructor mumbles; incorrectly pronounces words; speaks too quietly for back of room to hear the lesson. | Instructor voice is fairly clear; pronounces most words correctly and without hesitation. | Instructor voice is clear, pronunciation of terms is correct and precise. |  |
| **Written communication enhances content delivery** | Writing is illegible and disorganized. | Writing is legible and well organized. | Writing is completely legible and organized to assist students in effective note-taking. |  |
| **Makes effective use of instructional technology to enhance content delivery** | Visual aids and technology were not clearly or effectively used. | Visual aids and technology were clearly and effectively used. | Visual aids and technology were effectively used to enhance clarity of course content. |  |
| **Demonstrates enthusiasm for course content and learning** | The instructor demonstrated only a monotone, disengaged speaking style. | The instructor varied voice tones some; brought some enthusiasm to the classroom. | The instructor used enthusiasm to both excite students and to emphasize most important concepts. |  |
| **Paces delivery to sustain engagement** | The pace of the class was excessively slow or fast. | The pace of the class was mostly appropriate. | The pace of the class was excellent and ensured continuous engagement. |  |

**PEER EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEARNING**

The following form is to be used to evaluate the teaching portfolio and student learning. This form seeks to evaluate:

* Effectiveness in course materials in addressing stated course outcomes
* Level of challenge/rigor (complex problem-solving)
* Effectiveness of students in achieving outcomes

The faculty being reviewed is expected to:

* provide the evaluators a course syllabus with a clear statement of course objectives;
* provide all course materials used for the course, organizing each by the stated objectives for the course;
* provide all assignments/projects/assessments organized by course objectives; and
* provide evidence of student work relative to outcomes, at high, mid and low performance levels.

The evaluators should reference the course objectives to either ABET course descriptions/objectives or stated objectives for the graduate program in which the assessed faculty belongs.

**APPROPRIATENESS OF COURSE MATERIALS ADDRESSING COURSE OBJECTIVES**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** | **Comment on any unsatisfactory aspects of the course materials** |
| **Content Effectiveness** | **Syllabus accurately states course objectives** | The syllabus does not provide a statement of course objectives. | The syllabus presents course objectives fairly clearly. | The course objectives stated are exceptionally clear. |  |
| **Course objectives stated reflect departmental objectives (ABET if appropriate) and expected objectives for course** | The course objectives do not align with stated departmental and program objectives for this course. | The course objectives align fairly well with stated departmental and program objectives for this course. | The course objectives align perfectly with stated departmental and program objectives for this course. |  |
| **Concepts/topics listed in syllabus were addressed completely** | The course materials provided show poor coverage of course objectives / content. | The course materials provided demonstrate fairly good coverage of course objectives / content. | The course materials provided demonstrate complete coverage of course objectives / content. |  |
| **Course content delivered addressed all stated course objectives** | The course materials provided demonstrates that all stated objectives were addressed poorly. | The course materials provided demonstrates that all stated objectives were addressed fairly well. | The course materials provided demonstrates that all stated objectives were addressed very effectively. |  |
| **Assignments addressed all stated course objectives** | The course assignments addressed all stated objectives were addressed very effectively. | The course assignments adequately addressed all of the stated objectives. | The course assignments addressed perfectly all stated objectives. |  |

**LEVEL OF CHALLENGE OR ACADEMIC RIGOR**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of Challenge/Rigor** |  | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** | **Score** |
| **Course materials provided by faculty to students were at an appropriately challenging level for the students** | Course materials provided to students were either much too simple or difficult for student understanding. | Course materials provided to students were adequately challenging and comprehensible for students. | Course materials provided to students were challenging, comprehensible to students and at an appropriate level or rigor. |  |
| **Assignments were at a level of challenge appropriate to the topic and student experience** | The assignments were either far too challenging or too easy for all levels of students. | The assignments were challenging to some levels of students, but not all. | The assignments were challenging to all levels of students. |  |

**STUDENT LEARNING**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning** |  | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Exemplary** | **Score** |
| **Students demonstrated learning of course objectives** | Course materials do not demonstrate that all students passing the course (> D UG and >C for G) achieve stated course objectives. | Course materials demonstrate that most students passing the course (> D UG and >C for G) achieve most stated course objectives. | Course materials demonstrate that all students passing the course (> D UG and >C for G) achieve stated course objectives. |  |

**SUMMATIVE COMMENTS FROM IN-CLASS AND STUDENT LEARNING EVALUATIONS**

Provide a consensus summary evaluation of evaluators’ assessment of in-class performance and student learning, highlighting both the numerical assessments and general comments in the previous forms.

**Signatures:**

Peer Evaluator 1: Date:

Peer Evaluator 2: Date:

1. **Students Are Successfully Able to Take Away Main Concept(s) from the Class:** Students will be asked to write bullet point concepts at end of class and submit to evaluator to assess whether students were able to identify the main concepts addressed in the class. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)