Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Peer Evaluation of Teaching—Rubric

This rubric identifies important facets of teaching effectiveness and distinguishable levels of competency. Its purpose is to encourage reasonable consistency and predictability in evaluations across the Pamplin College. Since no rubric can account for all discipline- and course-specific variables, training is provided to peer evaluators to help them make appropriate adjustments.

Prior to the teaching observation, evaluators should ask the instructor to provide some context for the class session to be observed. What are the learning goals? What material will be covered? Has this material been covered previously? What will be the format (lecture, discussion, student presentations, small groups, etc.)? Are there any issues to be aware of? Summarize this information under "Class Context and Learning Goals" below.

During the teaching observation, evaluators should carefully consider the criteria specified in the rubric and make any adjustments they deem appropriate for the topic, discipline, course, and/or class size. Ratings in each category should be explained by noting any significant observations in the "Comments/Rationale" section for that category. Likewise, whenever the evaluator feels the specified criteria do not fit the context of the course being observed, a clear rationale for departing from those criteria should be noted in the "Comments/Rationale" section.

Peer evaluator: _____   Date: _____

Instructor: _____   Week of the semester: _____

Course/section: _____

Location: _____   Time: _____   Number of students in attendance: _____

Class Context and Learning Goals

Structure of the Lesson

Confusing	Awkward	Coherent	Effective	Outstanding
Ideas were impeded by significant confusion that was left unresolved or frequent or severe digressions that were obviously counterproductive.	Ideas were hindered by recurring moments of minor confusion, a moment of major confusion that eventually passed, or digressions that were clearly off topic.	Key ideas were clear and easy to follow.	Key ideas *and* many nuances were clear and easy to follow.	Key ideas *and* many nuances were very clear and revealed in ways that deftly anticipated or addressed students' questions and interests.

Possible factors to consider: Order of presentation, logical flow, clarity/quality of transitions/examples, etc.

Comments/Rationale:

Style of Delivery

Lifeless	Low	Clear	Dynamic	Captivating
Very low on energy, conveying the impression the instructor may be bored, severely fatigued or distracted, or indifferent to the audience.	Inconsistent or slightly low on energy, conveying the impression the instructor may be tired, distracted, ill, or unsure how to make the material interesting.	Alert and polished, but not necessarily enthusiastic; clear delivery but lacking in personality.	Obviously enthusiastic or engaged by the subject, conveying sufficient personality and interest to keep students alert and attentive.	Obviously passionate or fascinated by the subject, exuding personality and interest so effectively that students are visibly captivated or highly engaged.

Possible factors to consider: Volume and tone of voice; pace of delivery; integration of discussion questions, problems, etc.; use of eye contact, gestures, strategic movement around the classroom, etc.; use of narrative, humor, suspense, etc.

Comments/Rationale:

Professional Demeanor

Inappropriate	Lax	Acceptable	Committed	Outstanding
Some aspects of demeanor raise serious concerns about credibility and awareness of professional norms.	Some aspects of demeanor may weaken credibility or invite classroom management issues.	Demeanor is acceptable and does not detract or distract.	Demeanor conveys a positive sense of professionalism, suggesting a serious commitment to serving students well.	Demeanor is of role model caliber and seems to have elevated the professionalism displayed by students.

Possible factors to consider: Punctuality, tone of delivery, familiarity with students, methods of classroom management, attire (if relevant to course/departmental standards), etc.

Comments/Rationale:

Use of Appropriate Instructional Tools (audio/visual aids, chalkboard, handouts, etc.)

Specify tool(s) used: _____

Disruptive	Awkward	Neutral	Effective	Outstanding
Creates substantial delays, distractions, or confusion, either because the tool was used awkwardly or because a seemingly essential tool was excluded (e.g. extensive description of a special painting technique, but no visual illustration).	Creates minor delays, distractions, or confusion, either because the tool was used awkwardly or because a potentially helpful tool was excluded (e.g. comments about the importance of specific geographic factors, but no map).	Coherent and unobtrusive, but adds little value or may seem gimmicky.	Noticeably enhances the lesson.	Greatly enhances the lesson *and* the level of student engagement.

Possible factors to consider: Value added, clarity of format, skillfulness of integration, distractions/delays, etc.

Comments/Rationale:

Student Engagement/Participation

Negative	Reserved	Comfortable	Engaged	Invigorated
Students participate very rarely or never. Class seems apathetic or tense, as if participation is unwelcome.	Students participate very rarely or never. Class seems timid or hesitant, as if unsure whether or when participation is welcome.	Students participate sporadically, but class is attentive. There is no indication students feel unwelcome or unable to participate. At least 10% participated.	Students obviously feel comfortable participating and trust their comments are valued. Over 33% participated *or* at least 20% participated *repeatedly*.	Students obviously feel excited to participate and trust their comments can shape the lesson. Over 66% participated *or* at least 40% participated *repeatedly*.

Possible factors to consider: Participation levels, eye contact, posture, facial expressions, distractions, etc.

Comments/Rationale:

Attentiveness to Students' Active Learning

Rote	Passive	Basic	Engaging	Masterful
Presents lesson with very few or no efforts to assess and adapt to students' level of comprehension or engagement.	Presents lesson with few or generic efforts to assess and adapt to students' level of comprehension or engagement (e.g. "Got it?", "Any questions?", "Get working", etc.). Seems aware of students' non-verbal feedback, but does not require or build on their active engagement.	Presents lesson in ways that encourage students to think about its meaning or importance. Responds to students' verbal and non-verbal feedback by adjusting delivery, but not necessarily by adapting pedagogy. Student contributions have at least some effect on the lesson.	Presents lesson in ways that require students to actively explore the material in greater depth. Responds to students' verbal and non-verbal feedback by adapting pedagogy in ways that are generally successful. Student contributions enrich the lesson.	Presents lesson in ways that require students to actively explore the material in greater depth *and* practice applying it. Clearly attentive to students' verbal and non-verbal feedback, and adapts pedagogy in ways that are impressively effective. Student contributions consistently enrich the lesson.

Possible factors to consider: Use of lecture, discussion questions, in-class assignments, group activities, student presentations, story-telling, previously-assigned work, participation strategies, etc.

Comments/Rationale:

Cumulative Impressions

1. Based on what you observed, what are the instructor's top strengths?

2. Based on what you observed, what are the instructor's top opportunities for improvement?