

Peer Evaluation of Teaching – Face-to-face Class Version

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Name of Instructor & Rank | |
| Course Number/Title | |
| Number of Students Enrolled | |
| Day/Time of Course | |
| Name of Evaluator & Rank | |

Section A: Self-review on instruction

Briefly review your goals and approach/methods for this course. Describe your strengths in teaching, as well as your goals for instructional growth (these may be goals established from a previous peer review).

Section B: Review of syllabus, course structure, and examples of instructional materials

List all the materials that were reviewed.

(e.g., syllabus, assignments, tests, Canvas site or other online structure, etc.)

1a. Does the syllabus contain the following information as designated in The College and ASU guidelines?

| Content | No | Yes |
|---|----|-----|
| Contact information | | |
| Course description | | |
| Learning outcomes | | |
| Listing of assignments | | |
| Grading policies and percentage/points | | |
| Readings and daily/weekly itineraries and due dates | | |
| Technology support | | |
| Policies on absences and make-up work, including ASU policies for religious holidays and university sanctioned activities | | |
| ASU academic integrity statement | | |
| ASU disability accommodations statement | | |
| Expected classroom and/or online behavior | | |
| ASU policy against threatening behavior | | |

1b. Overall, does the syllabus communicate in a clear fashion the learning objectives, grading policies, and expectations of student conduct for the course?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|------------------|---|----------------|---|------------|
| Not at all clear | | Somewhat clear | | Very Clear |

1c. Provide supporting information to explain your rating.

2a. Is the instructor covering the major content areas that should be covered in this course?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Many major areas are not covered | | Some major areas are covered | | All major areas are covered |

2b. Provide supporting information to explain your rating.

3. Provide feedback on the examples of instructional materials (e.g., presentation materials, assignments, exams, etc.) that were provided in the pre-review meeting, including both strengths and suggestions for improvement.

Section C: Evaluation of instruction for face-to-face class (live or video-recorded)

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Date/Time of Course | |
| Course Title/Number | |
| Presentation Type | Live Recorded |
| Number of students in attendance for observation | |

Please provide a quantitative rating for each item and then explain your rating below.

1a. Was the instructor well-prepared for class? This includes having necessary visuals and handouts ready at the start of class and smoothly transitioning between different activities/topics.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Instructor did not have necessary materials for class and appeared to be unprepared | | Instructor was somewhat prepared for class (e.g., had some materials ready, but not others). | | Instructor was well prepared and had all materials ready at the start of class |

1b. Provide supporting information to explain your rating.

2a. Was the instructor knowledgeable about course material as demonstrated by the presentation and by dissemination of accurate and up-to-date information based on current research, theory, and/or methods relevant to the course topic area?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Instructor did not demonstrate accurate knowledge of course material | | Instructor demonstrated some accurate knowledge of course material | | Instructor demonstrated accurate knowledge of all course material |

2b. Provide supporting information to explain your rating.

3a. Were the instructional methods appropriate for accomplishing the goals of the course? That is, considering the nature of the course and topic content, were the methods for delivery (e.g., lectures, demonstrations, discussions, group activities, etc.) appropriate?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Methods were inappropriate for course goal | | Methods were somewhat appropriate for course goal | | Methods were very appropriate for course goal |

3b. Provide supporting information to explain your rating.

4a. Was the class session delivered or facilitated in an organized and clear manner? Was there a logical flow and pedagogically-appropriate structure throughout the course session?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Course session was not organized | | Course session was somewhat organized | | Course session was very organized |

4b. Provide supporting information to explain your rating.

5a. Did the instructor treat students with respect during the course session, including how she/he handled questions, comments, and other interactions with students?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Instructor was disrespectful to students | | Instructor was somewhat respectful | | Instructor was very respectful |

5b. Provide supporting information to explain your rating.

6. Provide an overall assessment of your observation, including both what worked well and suggestions for improvement.

Section D: Instructor's response to evaluation and instructional goals

1. Briefly share your reflections on the class or instructional unit observed and, if desired, respond to particular aspects of the feedback received in this peer review.

2. Identify two instructional goals based on the feedback you were provided. These may be evaluated in future peer-evaluations of teaching.

Instructor's signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator's signature: _____ Date: _____