



**Point Loma Nazarene University
Faculty Evaluation**

**Peer Evaluation – Face-to-face course version
(revised April 2015)**

Instructions for completing the peer teaching evaluation

Objective: To obtain a holistic assessment of the teaching effectiveness of a faculty member by appropriate professional peers.

1. The faculty member will select a course to be evaluated. A different course should be selected each time a full evaluation is required until all courses have been evaluated.
2. The faculty member will select three faculty members from the list of possible trained peer evaluators (TPE) and submits these three names to (name of staff member).
3. (Staff member) will assign an evaluator based on three factors: 1) spreading assignments evenly among the trained peer evaluators, 2) faculty member and TPE are not in the same department, and 3) TPE's teaching schedule allowing for a visit to the particular class. (Staff member) will notify the faculty member and TPE of the assignment.
4. The faculty member will upload the following course materials to LiveText: Course syllabus and schedule, a sample exam, and a sample major assignment. Additional materials may also be uploaded at the faculty member's discretion.
5. The faculty member notifies the TPE of 3-4 possible dates for the class visit; the TPE chooses a date and notifies the faculty member.
6. The faculty member and the trained peer evaluator will hold a pre-observation meeting. This meeting should include a brief overview of the class session to be evaluated, and the goals/objectives for the class session, as well as a description of what students are expected to do to in preparation for the class session.
7. The TPE will visit the class. TPE should sit in a location in the classroom that allows for observation of both the instructor and the students (preferably in the back of the room).
8. The TPE will complete the evaluation form in accordance with the calibration training provided to all TPE, then will submit it to the Academic Unit Leader.
9. Either the TPE or the faculty member may request a second evaluation by a different TPE.



**Point Loma Nazarene University
Faculty Evaluation**

Peer Evaluation – Face-to-face course version

Objective: To obtain a holistic assessment of the teaching effectiveness of a faculty member by appropriate professional peers.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Faculty member: | | Course number and title: | Semester course offered: |
| Date of pre-observation visit: | Date evaluation form completed: | Date sent to Academic Unit Leader: | Date sent to College Dean: |
| Date of classroom visit: | | | |

I. Course Design

Is the syllabus well organized and complete? Are the stated learning outcomes assessed in assignments, projects, etc.? Are the exams, quizzes, assignments, projects, etc. appropriate for the content of the course? Is there clear alignment between course learning outcomes and the course assignments/exams? How is Canvas used in the course (grades, course materials, discussion groups)?

| |
|---|
| <p>Rate the faculty member on <i>Course Design</i> using the categories from the rating scale below (circle one):</p> <p>'1' Below expectations '2' Need improvement '3' Meets expectations '4' Very good '5' Stellar 'NA' – Not applicable (Course not designed by this faculty member)</p> <p>Rationale with evidence:</p> |
|---|

II. Course Facilitation - Student Engagement

Are students are engaged during class? Provide examples (e.g., students are asking questions, answering questions, talking to each other about course content, not texting, etc.)

Rate the faculty member on *Student Engagement* using the categories from the rating scale below (circle one):

- '1' Below expectations
- '2' Need improvement
- '3' Meets expectations
- '4' Very good
- '5' Stellar

Rationale with evidence:

III. Course facilitation - Rapport

Recognizing that building rapport is a two-way process, describe faculty-student interactions within the classroom (e.g., calls students by name, makes eye contact, receptive to student questions and comments, etc.). Do students respond in a way that demonstrates rapport has been developed? Does the instructor relate to the students on a personal level, offering faith perspectives, and/or listening and responding to needs and demonstrate genuine caring?

Rate the faculty member on *Rapport* using the categories from the rating scale below (circle one):

- '1' Below expectations
- '2' Need improvement
- '3' Meets expectations
- '4' Very good
- '5' Stellar

Rationale with evidence:

IV. Course Facilitation - Class Session Organization

Was the class session well planned and implemented (i.e., pre-class planning is obvious, pacing of materials is appropriate to student level, goals are met for the classroom session, etc.)?

Rate the faculty member on *Class Session Organization* using the categories from the rating scale below (circle one):

- '1' Below expectations
- '2' Need improvement
- '3' Meets expectations
- '4' Very good
- '5' Stellar

Rationale with evidence:

V. Course facilitation - Pedagogy

Note the teaching methods employed during the class session. Do the methods employed effectively enhance or hinder the learning environment (i.e. instructor checked for understanding, students had a chance to think/talk about concepts, instructor welcomed student questions, etc.)? How so? Were the session goals identified by the faculty member in the pre-observation meeting met during the class session? Does the instructor promote critical thinking with probing questions, persuasive arguments, and/or related but controversial topics?

Rate the faculty member on *Pedagogy* using the categories from the rating scale below (circle one):

- '1' Below expectations
- '2' Need improvement
- '3' Meets expectations
- '4' Very good
- '5' Stellar

Rationale with evidence:

VI. Faith integration and hospitable engagement

Describe any evidence from course materials, the pre-observation meeting, and/or the class visit.

VII. Suggestions for Improvement (Please list 3 or more suggestions for improvement)

VIII. Affirmations (Please list 3 or more areas where faculty member is doing well)

XIV. Overall Rating

Rate the faculty member on overall teaching (average of all sections above) using the rating scale below (circle one):

- '1' Below expectations
- '2' Need improvement
- '3' Meets expectations
- '4' Very good
- '5' Stellar