

Peer Teaching Evaluation Summary Guidance

Faculty members and others involved in the RPT process frequently ask for additional information on what is expected in the dossier Section II.2.b. A summary of peer evaluations of teaching. The following is provided in response to such requests.

Period of time to cover.

Items in this section are to cover the period since initial appointment at NC State **or** since the most recent positive RPT action. An Assistant Professor being considered for reappointment, should summarize their first three years here at NC State. An Assistant Professor being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure should summarize the fourth year of their initial appointment and the first year of their second (current) term. An Associate Professor being considered for promotion to Professor must summarize the period since their promotion to Associate Professor.

Frequency of peer reviews.

Regulation 05.20.10 Evaluation of Teaching states the following:

3.3. Peer review is to be conducted for all faculty with teaching assignments.

3.3.1 Assistant Professors should have a minimum of three peer reviews before going up for tenure, with one of them occurring before reappointment. Each of the reviews must be conducted in a separate academic year.

3.3.2 The review period for Associate Professors should be aligned with post tenure review scheduled every five years. A minimum of two peer reviews is required for consideration of promotion to full Professor. Each of the reviews must be conducted in a separate academic year.

3.3.3 Peer review of Professors must be completed every five years, which is aligned with the post tenure review scheduled every five years.

3.3.4 Peer review of non-tenure track faculty with 0.75 FTE or greater must be completed annually for the first three years of employment in a non-tenure track faculty appointment and then every three years afterward.

Suggested information to include in the peer teaching evaluation summary.

List dates of peer reviews and name(s) of peer reviewers. Briefly (max of 1-2 paragraphs) describe results of each review. Include evaluative statements that describe the quality of the teaching, i.e., average, above average, below average, outstanding, etc.

Describe progress or lack thereof in achieving suggestions for improvement given by peer reviewers. State whether the faculty member has used the review to improve their teaching.