



ECPS SUMMATIVE PEER TEACHING EVALUATION FORM

This form is to be used by each member of the peer evaluation team to evaluate the instructor's course and teaching. NOTE: This is only one portion of the Faculty of Education's Summary Peer Review of Teaching (SPRoT)

Please complete both parts of this form:

Part A: Course Evaluation

Part B: Teaching Evaluation

Rate each aspect of the course and the instructor's work, using the following rating scale:

- 5 – Outstanding (*Award Worthy*)
- 4 – Exceeding Expectations
- 3 – Meeting Expectations
- 2 – Approaching Expectations
- 1 – Needs Improvement

Select the appropriate rating in the box adjacent to each item. Space is provided with each item for EXPLAINING the rating. Please attempt concise but informative explanations.

IMPORTANT: Before sharing the form with the instructor, please print it out as PDF file so it is no longer fillable.

Names of Reviewers:

Name of Instructor Being Evaluated:

Course Evaluated:

Term (Summer, Fall, Winter):

Year:

Summary Numerical Ratings Part A Mean:

Part B Mean:

Date of Initial Meeting/s with Instructors:

Dates of Class Observation:

Date of Follow Up Meeting/s with Instructors:

Date of Evaluation Submission:
(completed by department)

PART A: COURSE EVALUATION

Part A of the evaluation is conducted prior to classroom observation, and is based on information provided in the course outline/content and in discussions with the instructor.

Specifically, evaluations are to be based on:

1. A review of course outlines, reading lists, student handouts, examinations, assignments, course websites, etc.
2. A discussion with the instructor prior to the class observation about the nature, the content, goals and their understanding and plan for course delivery and assessment.

NOTE: If the course was not designed by the instructor being evaluated or if the course content is mandated by other considerations (e.g., requirements dictated by external agencies, accreditation, etc.), some questions in this section may not be directly applicable. In such cases, please identify these limitations in the question's comments, and assess these items on the quality of the candidate's contributions (if any), as well as their understanding and plan for delivery/assessment of the course outline. If a question does not apply at all to the instructor being evaluated, please indicate N/A (not applicable) in the comment box.

Date of Initial Meeting/s with Instructors:

PART A: COURSE CONTENT AND DESIGN

1. Intellectual integrity of course content

Considerations: Given the course title and description, is the course content significant? Accurate? Coherent? Complete? Is it scholarly and intellectually stimulating? Are the text(s) and reference materials appropriate, credible and up-to-date? Are all resources and materials used in the course appropriately cited and referenced? Does the instructor demonstrate a high level of comprehension of the course content?

Scale:

Comments:

2. Preparation and organization of the course

Considerations: Is the course outline complete, clearly stated, and organized logically and sequentially? Does the course syllabus clearly specify course objectives, appropriate assigned readings or equivalent, assignments, evaluation procedures, policies, and useful secondary references? Do the stated plans for delivery of the course match with the outline?

Scale:

Comments:

3. Course evaluation procedures

Considerations: Are the evaluation procedures appropriate to the course content? Is evaluation based on a sufficient number and diversity of assignments (e.g. tests, essays, reports, etc.)? Are individual evaluation instruments well designed and relevant to course objectives? Are implementation plans for marking/grading clear and well defended by the instructor? Does the instructor clearly articulate their plan for student feedback and does this plan fit with the course outline and content?

Scale:

Comments:

4. General or overall evaluation of course quality

Considerations: The overall organization and content of the course and materials as seen in the course outline and described by the instructor. The general quality of the course delivery plans for both presentation and evaluation. Note: If this rating differs from those for items 1 – 3, please explain.

Scale:

Comments:

PART B: TEACHING EVALUATION

Part B of the evaluation is based on an observation of the instructor during class as well as an in-camera session with students in the course.

Specifically, evaluations are to be based on:

1. At least 1 hour of classroom observation
2. And a 10-15 minute in-camera session to obtain student input.

NOTE: The course instructor **must not** be present during the in-camera session and the instructor is not informed about the results of the peer teaching evaluation until after the course grades are submitted. Student input can be obtained through written comments or a large class discussion.

Prior to the peer review class visit, the instructor should inform students of the date of the class visit indicating the role of PRT and UBC's commitment to excellence in teaching.

Dates of class observation:

5. Organization of class

Considerations: Is the instructor prepared and organized for class? Is the timing of the class well managed (starting and ending on time, breaks as appropriate, etc.)? Are the activities and materials relevant, well planned and well executed? Does the class content fit with the course plan and objectives as stated in the outline? Are the learning outcomes linked to student assessment for the course?

Scale:

Comments:

6. Academic Rigor

Considerations: Is the course content presented accurate, up-to-date, and appropriate to the level of the students in the class? Does the content presented in the class include key theories/theorists where appropriate? Does the instructor demonstrate command of subject matter and familiarity with recent developments in the field? Is the instructor able to answer students' content-focused questions with accuracy and clarity? Does the instructor encourage students' deeper thinking?

Scale:

Comments:

7. Presentation Effectiveness

Considerations: Is the overall rate at which new ideas are presented appropriate in relation to student understanding? Are the content and related materials and activities clearly presented? Does the instructor check to ensure students are understanding the class material? Is the instructor able to clarify and respond to questions when elaboration is needed or asked for? Does the instructor use appropriate teaching techniques and teaching aids for the content? Was the instructor's delivery clear, with varied tone, and appropriate eye contact?

Scale:

Comments:

8. Student Engagement

Considerations: Are students engaged during the class presentation/activities? Does the instructor encourage students to be involved in the learning, to ask questions, and to contribute to the class? Does the instructor utilize student participation methods to enrich educational experiences? Does the instructor foster student critical thinking and engagement in the course content? Do students feel that the instructor has created a positive learning community?

Scale:

Comments:

9. Feedback and Evaluation

Considerations: Does the instructor provide regular/frequent feedback that is prompt and useful for students? Do the students find the feedback informative and helpful for completing quality evaluative activities (assignments, tests, etc.)? Do the formal evaluation procedures follow course content and course outline expectations? Are the expectations and criteria clearly explained by the instructor or in the course outline or materials?

Scale:

Comments:

10. Overall Classroom Atmosphere

Considerations: Are students treated in a humane and respectful manner? Do students report feeling supported and safe to participate freely in the class? Does the instructor demonstrate sensitivity to student diversity and recognize and accommodate different learning needs? Is the instructor respectful of a wide range of intellectual positions? Does the instructor deal effectively with problems that can adversely affect learning (e.g. inappropriate student behaviour)? Does the instructor provide a productive learning environment that fits with expectations for a quality course?

Scale:

Comments:

11. Additional (optional) Information

(a) Other information from classroom observation:

(b) Other information from student comments:

Date of follow-up Meeting/s with Instructors:

NOTE: After the follow-up meeting with the instructor, notes can be added to the peer review to reflect the views of the instructor being evaluated.