**Peer Evaluation of Associate Faculty, Feather River College**

Thank you for being willing to assess the instructional ability of your faculty peer in order to improve instruction. This form lays out your responsibilities and provides a checklist for the process.

Your name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Program: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Person you are evaluating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Program / Class: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Personally contact the associate faculty member to arrange a classroom visitation for instructors who are teaching face-to-face. For online classes, contact the instructor so you can access the online course area in Canvas. For ISP, course materials (packet) and graded work will be available for review in the Office of Instruction.

Date of classroom visit (not applicable for ISP and DE courses): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Class: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Review faculty member’s self-evaluation materials.
2. Review the student evaluations for the course.
3. Complete this form, meet with the evaluee for review and signature (this can occur electronically if the instructor is not in the area), and return it to the Instruction Office within 2 weeks of the completion of peer evaluation activities, or no later than \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_..

Describe your observations/findings from your classroom visit or from your review of the course materials:

Based on your review of the self-evaluation, classroom visit/review of course materials, and the student evaluations, please rate the faculty member in the following areas:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not** **Applicable** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Needs** **Improvement** | **Satisfactory** | **Exceptional** |
| Evidence of concern for continued self-evaluation and professional growth. *(e.g., staying current in the discipline)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparation and organization*(For ISP – providing thorough and constructive feedback to student work in reasonable amount of time)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Responds to student questions and needs*(e.g., ISP instructors responding to student questions on ISP Office Hours form or through other means)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Achievement of course objectives as defined in course outlines and catalog description*(Course objectives are available in a course syllabus or course outline of record. For ISP – does the course material include content, assignments, activities relevant to the course objectives?)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment of student learning outcomes*(i.e., for all instructors: feedback, such as use of rubrics or assignment criteria, is clear and encourages learning of the material. For continuing instructors: the individual has participated in the reporting on SLO assessment)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity of presentation and course materials |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communication with students of varying abilities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Encouragement of critical thinking |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear methods and procedures*(e.g., for ISP, the syllabus and instructions directing students through the course and assignments make sense)* |  |  |  |  |  |

Points for clarification and consideration for faculty teaching in ISP related to the categories included above. It is centrally important that the instructor provide thorough, constructive, and timely feedback to students. Typically, first-semester instructors will use inherited course materials and as such, the materials may not be directly reflective of the instructor’s work. Instructors who have repeatedly taught courses in ISP have had the opportunity to improve the course materials: the materials can be used to provide feedback on the instructor’s performance in categories such as “Achievement of course objectives” and “Clarity of presentation.” In cases of first semester instructors, responses to these may be N/A.

**Elaborate on any of the above (such as low or high ratings) and provide overall commentary:**

Peer Evaluator Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Signature\*: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 \* Does not necessarily indicate agreement, but that you have read this evaluation and met with the evaluator