**Peer Reviewer Summative Evaluation Outline**

CVM faculty members submitting dossier materials for review, promotion, and/or tenure, are required by the college to submit two evaluative reports on their teaching. These reports typically take the form of a formal letter. It is recommended that reviewers use information from pre- and post-conferences with the faculty member, observation(s) of instruction, and the Peer Review Observation Report to develop and structure the final evaluative letter included in the dossier.

Peer reviewers are to:

* Be familiar with university policies and expectations regarding evaluation of teaching.
* Focus on instructional session observation or course/curriculum design in promoting student learning.
* Support evaluative statements with specific examples from the faculty member’s instruction and instructional materials, as well as research-based (disciplinary or teaching scholarship) evidence.
* Include both strengths of teaching and challenges/opportunities for improving instruction.

**REPORT STRUCTURE**

Your peer review report may take the form of a letter or a more formal report. Regardless, CVM recommends peer reviewers include an introduction, a section on design, a section on instruction, and an overall assessment. The summative evaluation should be no more than two single spaced pages, and you are invited to organize it in the following manner. You do not have to nor should you answer all of the questions listed. They are offered as a way of guiding your evaluation, which will take into consideration the type of instructional session observed and the goals you and the faculty member being reviewed set for that observation.

INTRODUCTION

*(Pre-observation of Instruction Form)*

* Who was involved and what process was followed?
* When did the pre- and post-meetings take place? What was evaluated? (Classes, lab sessions, clinical rotation, course materials, assessments, etc.)
* When did the formal portion of the review take place?
* How did the peer reviewer and the faculty member focus the review?

REVIEW OF COURSE OR INSTRUCTIONAL SESSION DESIGN

*(Instructional Session Observation Form: Organization, Instructional Strategies sections)*

* Evaluate the learning outcomes/objectives for the observed session and how they aligned with or reflected the course outcomes/objectives.
* Comment on the quality of teaching materials (presentation slides, multimedia, equipment, etc.)
* Comment on the types of learning activities that comprised the session.
* Comment on the instructor’s organization/structure of the session.
* Comment on the methods by which student learning is measured by the faculty member or in the course.

REVIEW OF INSTRUCTION

*(Instructional Session Observation Form: Instructional Strategies, Presentation Skills, Clarity, Content Knowledge, Student Engagement sections)*

* Did instructional delivery fit the educational context?
* What went well and what did not go well during this session?
* Comment on the instructional strategies used by the instructor (case study/discussion, problem-based structure, mini-lectures with reviews, group discussion, use of video or audio, etc.)
* Evaluate the instructor’s presentation skills. (Did he or she project well? Speak clearly? Use appropriate pace and hand gestures? Use the classroom or presentation or lab space well? Pause for emphasis or questions? Wait enough time for questions?)
* Were examples or cases clear and sufficiently detailed? Were specifics about a case that may have been valuable left out?
* Were narratives or stories effective?
* Was Socratic questioning, Q&A, case discussion effective?
* Comment on the verbal interaction with students.
* Was content correct and appropriate to Day 1 preparation or DVM year?
* How did the faculty member connect with students, engage with students, or build rapport/community with students?

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

* Outline the strengths and opportunities/challenges presented to the faculty member during the post-review meeting.
* What do you believe this faculty member’s top two or three strengths are?
* What did you and the faculty member agree are areas worth developing or refining?
* What did you learn in the pre- or post-observation meetings that influenced your observation and feedback?
* Are there any areas of development you would particularly highlight for the purposes of summative review?
* What resources did you recommend to the faculty member?
* Are there any innovations in scholarly teaching you recognized during this review?
* How effective is the teacher in promoting student learning?
* How does this instructor compare with others in his or her field, department, or level of experience?