**College of Engineering**

**Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching**

According to [Georgia Tech Teaching Portfolio Guidelines](https://faculty.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/images/teaching_portfolio_promotion_guidelines_7-5-2018.pdf), all Lecturers undergoing third-year review or seeking promotion must include statement/documentation from the peer review of teaching in their teaching portfolio. Below outlines the College of Engineering’s process for how this review should take place.

1. Lecturers will inform their School Chair /Supervisor that they will by seeking promotion or undergoing third-year review by August 1 of each year.
2. The candidate will suggest the names of three possible teaching evaluators and, independently, the supervisor will suggest the names of three possible teaching evaluators. Potential evaluators should have significant teaching experience and can be from outside your unit. These names will be submitted to the School Chair.
3. The School Chair will make the final decision on who is chosen to evaluate the Lecturer’s teaching. There must a be a minimum of two (2) evaluations done by two different evaluators. If the candidate is teaching multiple courses or teaching at multiple levels (i.e., undergrad and grad), the evaluations should be distributed to evaluate the breadth of the candidate’s contributions in teaching.
4. Each reviewer will have an initial interview with the review candidate to (a) share the course syllabus and other relevant course materials, (b) coordinate an appropriate date/class for the observation to occur, (c) share the rubric that will be used for the review, and (d) discuss any relevant contextual information about the course, mode of delivery, etc.
5. Reviewer will complete the rubric provided and provide as much as feedback as possible about the candidate’s teaching. The completed rubric and comments will be provided to the School Chair/Supervisor and review candidate.
6. Candidate should include a copy of these materials in their teaching portfolio. The candidate may discuss how they used/improved their teaching using peer or Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) evaluations or using comments from mid-semester course evaluations or CIOS.

**The College of Engineering Class Observation Rubric is on the next 2 pages.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Instructor: | Date: |
| Observer: | Class |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Examples, Comments, and Suggestions |
| Students are/appear:   * engaged * prepared * confident |  |
| Students:   * ask questions * exhibit higher order thinking |  |
| Instructor is/appears:   * prepared * organized * respectful of students * equitable and inclusive of diverse perspectives |  |
| Instructor:   * encourages interaction * shows concern for student progress * explains expectations clearly * relates material to prior knowledge * provides clear definitions and explanations * responds effectively to questions * summarizes main ideas |  |
| Appropriate use of:   * technology * media * learning activities * body language |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 Most Effective Strategies Observed | 3 Most Important Suggestions |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |