



School of Veterinary Medicine Policy Document 32.52: Guidelines for Peer Evaluation of Teaching and Peer Evaluation Forms

- Related TTU OPs:**
- 32.01 Promotion and Tenure Standards.
 - 32.32 Performance Evaluation of Faculty.
 - 32.34 Continuing Appointment and Promotion of Faculty in Lecturer, Professor of Practice, and Research Professor Titles
 - 32.38 Third-Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty
 - 32.31 Comprehensive Performance Evaluations of Tenured Faculty Members and Faculty Members Who Receive an Academic Promotion

PURPOSE: This SVM O.P. outlines the process for peer evaluation of teaching at the SVM.

DATE OF POLICY: 18JAN2023

REVIEW: This SVM OP will be reviewed in the Spring semester of even-numbered years by the Assistant Deans and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs.

INTRODUCTION & AUTHORITY: Effective teaching is central to the faculty’s mission at the School of Veterinary Medicine, regardless of faculty rank, title, or continuous appointment status. TTU OP 32.01 Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures requires *“Evaluation of teaching shall include effectiveness of course content and delivery, student learning outcomes, and demonstration of up-to-date knowledge of the candidate’s discipline”* (p. 5). OP 32.01 also requires, *“Each department is to apply its documented procedures for peer evaluations of teaching to each tenure-track faculty member at least annually. Candidates for promotion should also be provided peer evaluations of teaching in, at latest, the semester prior to application for promotion”* (p. 5). OP 32.32 Performance Evaluation of Faculty states, *“Discipline-specific evaluation procedures such as goal setting, peer evaluations of teaching, or comparisons with mission and goal statements of the academic unit may be developed”* (p. 2). OP 32.34 also allows *“procedures for promotion of faculty within these ranks (e.g. Lecturer, Professor of Practice, and Research Professor) are to be determined primarily by the faculty member’s home unit based on the expectations stated at the time of appointment and as continued or modified with annual reviews or reappointment.”* Since SVM values providing the highest quality education within both the DVM and graduate program, evidence of effective teaching, whether didactic or experiential in style, is required of all faculty. Peer evaluations of teaching present one possible line of evidence. Indeed, additional evidentiary facts can and should be presented by faculty to substantiate their claim as effective teachers as required by TTU Promotion, Tenure, and Performance Evaluation policies. However, this document shall apply to only peer evaluation of teaching.



Peer Evaluation Guidelines.

1. **Frequency of Evaluation.** Faculty who have not achieved continuous appointment should be evaluated no less than once per year, on average. Faculty who have received continuous appointment should be peer evaluated, at a minimum, in the semester prior to seeking promotion OR when undergoing a six-year Comprehensive Performance Evaluation.
2. **Our Approach to Evaluation.** The faculty will be divided into working groups of 4 members. Members of a group have the responsibility of providing an annual peer-review of teaching for other members within their group upon request. Biennially, membership of groups will be reassigned to give faculty the opportunity to view different instructional styles. Evaluators should consider and be tolerant of the diverse nature of education and instructional styles within the SVM unit. When evaluating, consider how the instruction observed builds practice-ready veterinarians or professional scientists. On occasion, faculty may have a remote appointment or be absent from the SVM campus for extended period of time. In such situations, monitoring of lectures electronically may occur. If this modality does not capture the full student experience, a replacement peer-reviewer can be arranged through the faculty members direct supervisor. In addition, all faculty have option to include one peer reviewer of their choice each year.
3. **Mechanism of Peer Review.** To arrange a peer review, the instructor should decide upon a date and invite the peer reviewer to attend the class meeting. At this time the instructor provides the reviewer with a copy of the course syllabus and other relevant materials and discusses specific information regarding the course (as needed). At this time, the instructor should specify whether the course should be considered lecture based or lab/clinical format. In addition, the time and location of the expected peer review should be stated by the instructor. Optimally, this occurs via email or calendar invitation. Once a date and time is agreed upon, the Peer Observer will attend the presentation, arriving approx. 5 minutes prior to scheduled start time. The reviewer will use the appropriate SVM Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form (attached) to evaluate the presentation. At the conclusion of the evaluation, the observer must submit the form (preferably electronically) to the office of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs (through RaiderVet Central), the faculty member, and the faculty member's Assistant Dean. If desired, a follow up meeting may be arranged between the evaluator and instructor to discuss in detail the performance.
4. **Use of Peer Reviews.** Summaries of peer evaluations of teaching can be included in dossiers for Tenure and/or Promotion, third-year review, annual reports, and Comprehensive Performance Evaluation materials.



SVM Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form (Lecture)

Date of Review: _____ **Name of Reviewer:** _____
Faculty Being Reviewed: _____ **Course and Lecture Title:** _____

Instructions for Evaluator: Complete the following form. Please make comments for each topic as needed. If a query does not apply, please indicate (N/A) in the comments. When completing the form please consider the goal is promoting effective teaching within our unit. This can take many different forms! Be flexible and offer constructive insights.

Criteria I: Instructional Organization:

1) Was the faculty member well prepared for the class and arrive on-time for prompt start and finish?

Comments:

2) Did the instructor effectively begin the class with a transition from previous content into clearly stating the learning objectives for the current lecture?

Comments:

3) Did the presented materials pertain to the assigned/scheduled topic?

Comments:

4) Were the slides/audio presentations/videos/handouts clear and adequate to support the learning?

Comments:



- 5) Did the instructor summarize key points of emphasis prior to the end of class?

Comments:

Criteria II: Classroom Presentation:

- 1) Were the materials presented & explained logically and orderly?

Comments:

- 2) Was class-time was managed efficiently including smooth internal summaries and transitions?

Comments:

- 3) Did the instructor involve the students in the learning process? If so, how?

Comments:

- 4) When and if the students were involved, was the instructor helpful to students when they had questions or problems?

Comments:

- 5) Did the faculty member speak clearly & audibly?

Comments:

Criteria III: Course Organization & Content:

- 1) Was the lecture consistent with course objectives outlined in the syllabus?



Comments:

- 2) Was the lecture content representative of current developments in veterinary medicine?
Please mark N/A if One Health Sciences course or if you feel unable to judge.

Comments:

- 3) Was the lecture well-aligned with competencies required for future workplace activities intended to meet community, patient, employer or client needs?

Comments:

Comments. Use this space to outline teaching strategies that were well-executed and summarize constructive suggestions for improvement.

When form is complete, please submit a copy to RaiderVet Central, the faculty member's supervisor, and the faculty member being evaluated. Thank you for helping evaluate a colleague.

Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____



SVM Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form (Lab & Clinical Based)

Date of Review: _____ **Name of the Reviewer:** _____

Faculty Member Being Reviewed: _____

Course and Lecture Title: _____

Role: lab lead / instructor: _____

Other instructors/techs in Lab: _____

Instructions for Evaluator: Complete the following form. Please make comments for each topic as needed. If a query does not apply, please indicate (N/A) in the comments. When completing the form please consider the goal is promoting effective teaching within our unit. This can take many different forms! Be flexible and offer constructive insights.

Criteria I: Instructional Content Preparation & Design:

1) Was a complete lab plan submitted by the due date established by the course directors? Was the faculty member well prepared for the class and arrive on-time for prompt start for prelab meeting?

Comments:

2) Has Instructor made sure all equipment and supplies are in place prior to lab?

Comments:

3) If the instructor is the assigned lab lead, did they hold a pre-lab meeting to give clear instructions to other instructors for the lab and the assessment?

Comments:

4) Have clear learning objectives been stated, and referenced during lab?

Comments:



5) Are students given clear directions on how the lab will flow and what to expect?

Comments:

6) Has a complete set of videos or other instructional content been made available for students to view on skills covered prior to or after the lab

Comments:

7) Does the instructor demonstrate or explain tasks to students using similar/consistent technique as lab-leader?

Comments:

Criteria II: I. Classroom Presentation & Interaction with Students:

8) If pertinent, did the instructor introduce the instructional staff at start of class?

Comments:

9) Did the instructor clearly introduce the topic for the lab and provide some examples using clear speech and body language setting a good tone?

Comments:

10) Does the instructor discuss common errors or difficulties and gives ideas on how to avoid?

Comments:



11) Does the instructor remain within the area they are assigned to teach and work to maximize student interaction?

Comments:

12) Does the instructor close the session with recap of skill, use of skill, and review of common mistakes?

Comments:

13) Is instructor respectful of students and of other faculty and staff?

Comments:

14) Does instructor actively engage students to assess their progress and ask if they have questions?

Comments:

15) Does instructor give constructive & detailed feedback to students that includes both positive and negative aspects of the performance?

Comments:

16) Did this lab flow seamlessly and within allowed time limits due to good organization?

Comments:



17) Throughout the session, did the instructor invite and answer student questions, listen, and respond accordingly?

Comments:

18) Is the instructor aware of student participation / nonparticipation / passiveness and works to address student quietly and professionally to assure key skills are developed?

Comments:

General Comments on Instructional Content:

General Comments on Presentation & Interaction with Students:

When form is complete, please submit a copy to RaiderVet Central, the faculty member's supervisor, and the faculty member evaluated. Thank you for helping evaluate a colleague.

Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____



SVM Teaching Peer Review Groups – Established for Spring 2023 – membership to be shuffled in Spring 2025.

Group Number	Member 1	Member 2	Member 3	Member 4
1	Brown	Mills	Schmidt	Faculty choice
2	Awosile	Black	Fritzler	Faculty choice
3	Anderson	Shah	Zimmerman	Faculty choice
4	Dutton	Garcia	Koziol	Faculty choice
5	Chelikani	L. Dascanio	K. Williams	Faculty choice
6	Artemiou	Morales Luna	Myers	Faculty choice
7	J. Brown	Chapman	Trindade de Rosa	Faculty choice
8	Radhakrishnan	Roof	Cruz Penn	Faculty choice
9	Schilling	Calle	Tumban	Faculty choice
10	Carlson	P. Gibbons	Johnson	Faculty choice
11	J. Gibbons	Wagner	R Williams	Faculty choice
12	Hunyadi	Levent	Rowe	Faculty choice
13	Arnold	Thompson	Villalba	Faculty choice
14	Fon Tacer	Rodriguez Mori	Shringi	Faculty choice