

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION**  
**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**INDEPENDENT PEER EVALUATION FORM**

THIS FORM IS TO BE USED BY EACH MEMBER OF THE  
PEER EVALUATION COMMITTEE TO EVALUATE  
THE CANDIDATE'S COURSE AND TEACHING

USE A SEPARATE FORM FOR EACH OF THE COURSES  
TAUGHT BY THE CANDIDATE

THIS FORM HAS TWO PARTS: PLEASE COMPLETE BOTH PARTS

PART A:        COURSE EVALUATION  
PART B:        TEACHING EVALUATION

NAME OF REVIEWER:  _____	
NAME OF INSTRUCTOR BEING EVALUATED:  _____	
COURSE EVALUATED:  _____	
TERM: ____ SUMMER ____ FALL ____ WINTER ____ YEAR ____	
SECTIONS  _____  _____  _____	NUMERICAL RATING  _____  _____  _____
DATE OF EVALUATION:  _____	
MEMBERS OF THE PEER EVALUATION COMMITTEE:  1. _____  2. _____  3. _____	

PART A: COURSE EVALUATION (based on interview)

Part A of the evaluation is to be conducted without classroom observation. Your evaluations are to be based on:

1. Reviewing course outlines, reading lists, student handouts, examinations, assignments, etc.
2. Discussing with the instructor the nature, the content, and the conduct of the course.

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

- 7 - Outstanding
- 6 - Superior
- 5 - Very good
- 4 - Good
- 3 - Adequate
- 2 - Poor
- 1 - Inadequate

Record 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.

**CAUTION**

Some evaluation topics may be only marginally applicable to the candidate because (e.g.) the course taught was designed and organized entirely by another person (or by a committee). If so, please identify such limitations in your explanations, and assess such items on the quality of the candidate's contributions to those tasks.

PART A

1. Intellectual integrity of course content.

Explanation: Given the constraint of the course title and description, is the course content significant? accurate? coherent? complete? Is it scholarly and intellectually stimulating?

Comment(s):

Numerical rating:

2. Preparation and organization of the course.

Explanation: Is the course outline complete, clearly stated and organized logically and sequentially? Does the course syllabus state course objectives, evaluation procedures, and useful secondary references? Are the text(s) and reference materials appropriate and credible? How is the course content "updated"?

Comment(s):

Numerical rating:

PART A

3. Course evaluation procedures.

Explanation: Are the evaluation procedures appropriate to the course content? Is evaluation based on a sufficient number and variety of tests, essays, reports, etc.? Are individual evaluation instruments well designed and relevant to course objectives? Are tests, essays, papers, etc., marked carefully, systematically, and objectively?

Comment(s):

Numerical rating:

4. Performance feedback to students.

Explanation: Is feedback provided regularly, frequently enough, promptly, and efficiently? Do the students consider the feedback informative and helpful? What type of feedback is provided?

Comments:

Numerical rating:

PART A

5. Course assignments.

Explanation: Are assignments seen as a useful and integral part of the course? Do they promote learning? Are assignments too long or too short? Are assignments modified during the course? If so, how and under what conditions?

Comments:

Numerical rating:

ADD ITEMS CONCERNING ANY OTHER ASPECTS OF THE INSTRUCTOR'S WORK HE/SHE WISHES THE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER.

Examples:

1. use of visual aids
2. special problems or difficulties
3. seminar nature of course
4. compulsory course
5. working conditions

PART A

6. General evaluation of course quality.

Explanation: the overall organization and content of the course materials. The general quality of the course and its presentation: (If this rating differs from those for items 1 - 5, please explain the reasons).

Comments:

Numerical rating:

PART B: TEACHING EVALUATION (Based on classroom observation)

To carry out PART B of the evaluation, the committee member should generally observe at least three hours of class time.

Rate how well the instructor has done each of the tasks listed, using the following scale:

- 7 - Outstanding
- 6 - Superior
- 5 - Very good
- 4 - Good
- 3 - Adequate
- 2 - Poor
- 1 - Inadequate

Record 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.

The instructor should be invited to add to this list any items he/she deems appropriate, with the proviso that the committee must consider itself capable of assessing any item so added.

PART B

1. Relationship between course content and course objectives.

Comments:

Numerical rating:

2. Rate at which new ideas were presented in relationship to student understanding.

Comments:

Numerical rating:

3. Clarity of presentation as well as clarification of material when elaboration was necessary.

Comments:

Numerical rating:

4. Provision of appropriate examples, illustration or visual aids, especially for important concepts.

Comments:

Numerical rating:



PART B

5. Opportunity for students to ask questions. Encouragement of students to ask questions and get involved.

Comments:

Numerical rating:

6. Response to students' questions. Accuracy, clarity and enthusiasm of the response.

Comments:

Numerical rating:

7. Treatment of students in a humane and respectful manner.

Comments:

Numerical rating:

8. General classroom atmosphere. Rapport with students. Attitude of students.

Comments:

Numerical rating:

PART B

9. Other:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

10. Other:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**SUMMARY OF PEER EVALUATION**

This form is to be completed by Review Committee to summarize results of evaluation,  
review/discuss with instructors and submit signed copy to Department Head

IF MORE THAN ONE COURSE IS EVALUATED, THE NUMERICAL RATING FOR EACH ITEM IS THE  
AVERAGE OF SCORES FOR THE DIFFERENT COURSES.

NUMERICAL RATING SCALE:

- 7 - Outstanding
- 6 - Superior
- 5 - Very good
- 4 - Good
- 3 - Adequate
- 2 - Poor
- 1 - Inadequate

NAME OF INSTRUCTOR BEING EVALUATED:

COURSE EVALUATED:

TERM: \_\_\_ SUMMER \_\_\_ FALL \_\_\_ WINTER \_\_\_ YEAR \_\_\_

SECTIONS

NUMERICAL RATING

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF EVALUATION:

MEMBERS OF THE PEER EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Initials

1. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

MEETING OF INSTRUCTOR WITH REVIEWERS:

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER(S) \_\_\_\_\_

INVITATION TO RESPOND TO DEPARTMENT HEAD: \_\_\_ YES \_\_\_ NO

PART A: COURSE EVALUATION (based on interview)

1. Intellectual integrity of course content:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

2. Preparation and organization of the course:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

3. Course evaluation procedures:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

4. Feedback to students:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

PART A

5. Course assignments:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

6. General evaluation of course quality:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

Additional comments on items the instructor wishes the Committee to consider, or items the Committee would like to further discuss:

PART B: TEACHING EVALUATION (Based on classroom observation)

1. Relationship between course content and course objectives:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

2. Rate at which new ideas were presented in relationship to student understanding:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

3. Clarity of presentation, including clarification and elaboration where necessary:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

4. Use of appropriate examples, illustrations or visual aids (especially for important concepts):

Comments:

Numerical rating:

PART B

5. Opportunity for students to ask questions (students encouraged to ask questions and get involved):

Comments:

Numerical rating:

6. Response to students' questions: accurate, clear, enthusiastic response:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

7. Humane and respectful treatment of students:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

8. General classroom atmosphere. Rapport with students. Attitude of students.

Comments:

Numerical rating:

PART B

9. Other:

Comments:

Numerical rating:

10. Other:

Comments:

Numerical rating: