## AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY

## **Enhanced Peer Evaluation Report: Formative & Summative**

(Faculty seeking Retention for Years 2-5)

Faculty Member Being Evaluated:	Faculty Member's Rank:			
Faculty Member's Department:	Semester of Evaluation:			
Years of Prior Credit Awarded toward T	enure:			
Number of Years of Probationary service	e at APSU including present year:			
Course Number: (e.g. COMM 2045):	Course Title:			
Course Meeting Time (e.g., MWF 9:05 a	a.m.—10 a.m.)			
Course Modality:				
Face-to-face □				
Fully Online □				
Hybrid □				
Hybrid Light □				
Desktop Video Conferencing □ Other (please explain):				
<b>Formative Evaluation Information:</b>				
Date of Evaluation:	Time Range: (e.g., Class observed from 09:35 -10:40 am)			
Online Platform (if synchronous, e.g., Zoon	n) or Room Location (if in-person, include Building & Room #):			
Number of students enrolled: Number of students in attendance (if evaluation synchronous or in-person):				
Formative Feedback Information: week of evaluation date.	Note meeting must occur with evaluator and faculty member being evaluated within one			
Date of Meeting:	Time Range: (e.g., met from 10:30-11:00 am)			
Meeting Location (if in-person, include Bui	ilding & Room #l; if virtual, list platform):			
Summary of Observed Strengths and Ar	reas for Improvement as discussed with faculty member being evaluated:			

Summative Evaluation Information:				
Date of Evaluation:	Time Range: (e.g., Class observed from 09:35 -10:40 am)			
Online Platform (if synchronous, e.g., Zoom) or Room Location (if in-person, include Building & Room #):				
Number of students enrolled:	Number of students in attendance (if evaluation synchronous or in-person):			

## **Summative Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

Rating Scale: (1 = Poor, 2 = Weak, 3 = Average, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent, NA = not applicable)

Each College determines criteria to be ranked. Potential components are included below as a starting place for each college for 2022-2023; we strongly recommend at least one representative from each department participate in the process to determine criteria for future years)

Faculty RTP Policy Committee has recommended the following sample criteria for 2022-2023:

Rating Scale: (1 = Poor, 2 = Weak, 3 = Average, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent, NA = not applicable)

Content						
Main ideas are clear and specific	1	2	3	4	5	
Higher order thinking is required	1	2	3	4	5	
Definitions are given for vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Provides tangible connections with						
other disciplines or real-world examples	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Organization						
Organization is clear and logical	1	2	3	4	5	
Material is paced appropriately	1	2	3	4	5 5	
Connects to students' prior knowledge,						
lessons, assignments, and/or readings	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Interaction						
Encourages students to ask questions	1	2	3	4	5	
Provides informative feedback	1	2	3	4	5	
Works to ensure respectful, open, and						
inclusive learning community	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor incorporates student responses	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Encourages and facilitates dialogue,						
discussion, or student-student						
interaction for all students	1	2	3	4	5	
Use of Media						
Presentation style facilitates learning	1	2	3	4	5	
Computerized instruction is effective	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Audio/visual materials are used effectively	1	2	3	4	5	NA

## Verbal/Non-verbal (If no videos of faculty available in D2L select NA) Instructor communicates effectively 1 2 3 4 5 NA Rate of delivery is appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 NA

Summative Narrative Comments on Observed Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Must include comments on changes between formative and summative evaluations, especially items in formative summary.

Each College determines any additional components for comment. As already in policy, narrative comments will be required...potentially set per college or at university level a minimum and maximum word count or page range.

Faculty RTP Policy Committee has recommended the following for 2022-2023 as Minimum comments:

Topics to comment on (at a minimum):

- 1) Specific examples of observed strengths.
- 2) Specific examples of observed areas needing improvement.
- 3) Specific recommendations and suggestions for improvement of teaching effectiveness.

Evaluator's Name (print):	Evaluator's Department:				
Evaluator's Signature:	Date:				