Revised Peer Evaluation Process

During the past academic year, the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee adopted a “common elements” peer evaluation instrument at the request of the NEASC team that visited the college in 2009. The Committee developed an instrument that will foster healthy dialog between faculty with a focus on course materials-syllabus, learning outcomes, scoring rubrics and a review of examples of student work. The Peer Evaluation Process provides faculty members with an opportunity for an open exchange of and critical inquiry into pedagogy and is intended to strengthen and reinforce sound teaching practice. In other words, Peer Evaluation should avoid simple summative language and promote excellent teaching through conversation between colleagues.

The Committee requests that faculty within each academic department review their current peer evaluation instrument and process during August and September 2012 and make adjustments to that process so that at a minimum, the items outlined below are included. The Faculty Evaluation Review Committee would like to have each department forward a copy of their newly adopted instrument/process by October 1, 2012 as part of their departmental plan to Dean Woodberry.

**Process**

The department chair will start the Peer Evaluation process by discussing with the instructor being evaluated (heretofore known as the Instructor) the purpose for the evaluation and will identify one or more mutually agreed upon peer evaluators. The Instructor will provide the peer evaluator with all of the documentation necessary at least one week prior to complete the Peer Evaluation Process, including syllabi from each course prep and examples of student work. After the evaluator and Instructor have met, the evaluator will submit a narrative to the chair that describes the Instructor’s syllabus, assessment of student learning and overall teaching effectiveness. This narrative will be shared with the Instructor. The evaluation should include, but is not limited to, the following:

**Evaluation of the Syllabus**

- Has the instructor included the Recommended Elements of a Syllabus (*adopted 4/2012*).
- Are there two hours of out-of-class work/homework assignments for each class hour, as required by NEASC standards?
- Is the grading scale reasonable/understandable?
- Does the instructor include additional elements that would enhance the syllabus, including links to web sites, additional resources, etc.?
- Are the student learning outcomes identified?

**Assessment of Student Learning**
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- What samples/evidence of student work or other assessment did the instructor provide?
- Does the student work reflect the student learning outcomes identified in the syllabus?
- Has the instructor provided selections of high quality student work as well as those that need improvement?
- Has the instructor provided appropriate feedback (comments, suggestions for improvement, etc.) to the student?

Classroom Observation (optional by department)

- Does the instructor speak clearly?
- Does the instructor show enthusiasm when teaching?
- Does the instructor encourage student questions?
- Does the instructor respond appropriately to student questions?
- Is the subject matter presented clearly?

Summary:

Overall, has the instructor shown that he/she has thought about how students learn and what part he/she plays in the process?

Should you have any questions about the new common elements for peer evaluation, please contact Dr. Peter N. Woodberry, Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee.