

Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching for Assistant/Associate/Professor X¹

1. Introduction

The Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering conducts periodic, peer evaluations of the classroom teaching of all faculty. Assistant and associate professors may choose an evaluator in consultation with their mentorship committee; for full professors, it is conducted by a committee of two other full professors, one selected by the Department Chair and one by the faculty member being evaluated. Per the Faculty Code, the minimum frequency of these assessments is annual for assistant professors and once every three years for associate and full professors. The assessment includes (1) a review of recent student course evaluations in all courses taught by the faculty member, (2) a review of the content of at least one course, and observation of at least one session of that course, by the peer evaluator(s), and (3) a discussion with the instructor.

This document summarizes this peer teaching evaluation of Professor X, conducted during xx quarter, 20xx, by Professors Y and Z.

2. Student Course Evaluations

End-of-quarter student evaluations of courses taught by Professor X between [specify time period] were conducted according to University guidelines and were examined by the peer evaluators. During this period, Professor X taught CEExxx, CEEyyy, and CEEzzz. Some results from these evaluations are summarized in the following table. (Note: Q1-Q4 refer to (Q1) the course as a whole; (Q2) the course content; (Q3) the instructor's contribution; and (Q4) the instructor's effectiveness). The peer evaluators also reviewed the students' responses to other questions and the written comments of the students in the end-of-quarter evaluations.

Course	# Enrolled	# Surveyed	Median, Q1	Median, Q2	Median, Q3	Median, Q4

The evaluations suggest that, in the students' view, [describe overall results and comment on any specific areas of strength or needing improvement with regard to, e.g., the material, the means of presentation, and the students' comfort level with the instructor. Perhaps also comment on evaluations of the course when other instructors teach it.]. Professor X's interpretation of and response to these evaluations are included in Section 4.

3. Detailed Review of CEExxx

Professor X provided a syllabus, sample assignments and examinations and [note any additional course materials] for CEExxx. These documents suggest that [comment on choice of topics, breadth, depth, rigor, etc., to the extent that you are qualified to assess those topics].

¹ Form approved at CEE Faculty Meeting, May 21, 2009.

2. Modified by Faculty and Departmental Affairs Committee in May 2020

After consultation with Professor **X**, session[s] of **CEExxx** were attended by Professors **Y** and **Z** on **mm/dd/yyyy** and **mm/dd/yyyy**. On these dates, Professor **X** covered [**identify topics**]. The classroom activity included [**summarize activities, e.g., lecture with blackboard/ overhead/ powerpoint, Q&A, work in small groups, etc.**]. [**Discuss relevant aspects of the class, such as clarity and organization of the lecture, classroom environment (relaxed, formal, etc.), student engagement, different pedagogic styles employed, etc.**] Overall, based on these observations, it appears that Professor **X**...

4. Discussion with Professor X

A discussion was held with Professor **X** on **mm/dd/yyyy** about **his/her** teaching, at which all the above observations were reviewed. Professor **X** [**summarize the discussion, including any observations/ comments regarding Professor X's efforts to revise course content or teaching style, develop new courses, obtain input from CELT or CIDR, respond to issues raised in prior assessments, etc.**]

5. Overall Assessment

[**Summarize review, identify areas of strength and those where improvement is a priority, describe plan for improvement, etc. Be specific—vague statements are of little value.**]

Note: This document is offered as a template for conduct of peer evaluations of classroom teaching. It is not a requirement that evaluators use this document.