



Procedure Number	Procedure Name	Approval Date	Owner
COP-COM 3.2	Peer Teaching Evaluation/Review	July 1, 2026	Assessment Committee/ Department Chairs

Scope

This procedure applies to University of South Carolina (USC) College of Pharmacy faculty.

Purpose

The USC College of Pharmacy (COP) Peer Teaching Evaluation/Review process provides a mechanism for receipt of summative feedback regarding teaching practices from a faculty peer. Peer Teaching Evaluation/Reviews should enable faculty reflection on teaching practices, thereby promoting continuous improvement in the quality of instruction. Additionally, USC requires units to have procedures for peer evaluations of faculty with teaching responsibilities, as these evaluations are incorporated into the Tenure or Promotion review process. Peer Teaching Evaluation/Reviews also have a role in annual performance reviews. ([USC Faculty Manual](#)).

Procedures

Frequency of evaluation

Faculty are required to be peer evaluated for teaching. The frequency of Peer Teaching Review/Evaluations is determined based on career path progression (e.g. annually for Assistant Professors, at least biennially for Associate Professors, and at least triennially for Professors).

Teaching session selection

An opportunity will be provided for faculty to indicate preferences regarding selection of specific

teaching sessions for Peer Teaching Evaluation/Reviews. Preferences for the upcoming academic year will be collected as part of the Annual Performance Review process for faculty whose documentation is submitted in a timely manner to enable scheduling ahead of the academic year. Whenever feasible, these requests will be accommodated. Once a teaching session and evaluator(s) have been identified and scheduled, faculty will be notified of this information in advance of the session.

Teaching elements

Teaching elements being evaluated during a Peer Teaching Evaluation/Review include the teaching session (e.g. a lecture, lab, recitation, etc.), and any course handouts or written materials provided to students to help facilitate the session.

Evaluators

Evaluators should receive training on the provision of constructive peer feedback and may be selected cross-departmentally. When practically feasible, more experienced faculty will be selected to evaluate less experienced faculty. However, given the value of less experienced faculty evaluating teaching practices of more experienced faculty, this may also occur as an opportunity for professional development. In the case of a conflict of interest or a perception of unfavorable positional dynamics between the individual being evaluated and the assigned evaluator, the individual being evaluated should notify the department chair as soon as possible to discuss any concerns.

Scheduling & Pre-Evaluation Communication

Department Chairs will oversee the scheduling of Peer Teaching Evaluation/Reviews, including the identification of COP faculty to serve as evaluators. These assignments will be communicated to faculty at the beginning of each semester. The *evaluator* is responsible for contacting the individual being evaluated at least one week in advance of the session as a “*Pre-Evaluation Communication*” to confirm the following:

1. If a “*Pre-Evaluation Planning Meeting*” is appropriate/desired by the faculty being evaluated, it can be an opportunity to discuss any goals or content they are excited to showcase, contextualize the session content within the surrounding/overall course content, etc. If a “*Pre-Evaluation Planning Meeting*” is agreed upon, the modality by which the meeting will occur (e.g. phone, virtual, or in person) should be determined for scheduling.
2. Confirm the timing of the session being evaluated, ensuring that the evaluator can attend the entire session unless there is an agreed upon reason for a shorter duration of attendance.
3. Confirm a plan for the individual being evaluated to submit teaching elements (e.g. course handouts or written materials) to the evaluator at least 3 business days in advance of the teaching session. The course syllabus should also accompany the teaching elements, to enable contextualization of the session within the course content.
4. Discuss a “*Post-Evaluation Debrief*” plan and schedule the Debrief Meeting. (If either the faculty member evaluating a peer or the individual being evaluated prefers to have the department chair present during the debrief or prefers that the debrief is only conducted by the department chair and not the evaluator, this should be discussed. The faculty member being evaluated should relay this request to the department chair to enable scheduling of the debrief.)

Post-Evaluation Debrief

The Post-Evaluation Debrief is an opportunity for evaluators and evaluatees to collaboratively reflect on the teaching session in a manner that is supportive and collegial. The suggested timeframe for the debrief session to occur is within 1 week of the teaching session. The completed Peer Teaching Evaluation/Review Tool should be provided to the evaluatee at least 24 hours prior to the debrief for the evaluatee's review to facilitate individualized self-reflection. The Post-Evaluation Debrief should occur in a private location. Evaluators should strive to provide objective comments with concrete examples and suggestions that are idea-generating and constructive. Evaluators and evaluatees should approach this conversation with self-awareness, mutually directed compassion, and a growth-oriented mindset. Evaluators may make notes on the PTER form, highlighting any high importance discussion points.

Deliverables and Outcomes

Finalized deliverables and feedback associated with Peer Teaching Evaluation/Reviews will be submitted to the department chairs within 2 weeks of the teaching session, are summative in nature, are part of the annual performance review process and are required to be submitted as part of the Candidate's primary file to inform Tenure or Promotion-related decisions.

Appeal Process

In the case of faculty concerns that the outcomes of a Peer Teaching Evaluation do not accurately align with the quality of their teaching and wish to request an appeal, the faculty may request that an additional Peer Teaching Evaluation be completed, with results from both evaluations being included in the Candidate's primary file, where the candidate might provide a written explanation of any measures taken to address any discrepancies and plausible rationale(s) for the variance, if desired.

Related Information

USC Faculty Manual:

https://sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/provost/policiesandprocedures/facultymanuals/

History

Date of Revision	Revision
Date 1	New procedure approval
Date 2	Justification

Substantive changes to this procedure require a faculty vote. In cases of unforeseen circumstances, deviations from this procedure will be handled on a case-by-case basis by Department Chairs.

Appendices

Appendix A. Peer Teaching Evaluation/Review (PTER) Timeline and Responsibilities

Timeline	Evaluatee Responsibilities	Evaluator Responsibilities	Departmental Responsibilities
June 1, annually	☐ Submit list of teaching sessions that are preferred and not preferred for PTER in the next academic year		☐ Review faculty session preferences and provide to PTER scheduler
First day of class each semester			☐ Verification of PTER schedule for the forthcoming academic year ☐ Communication of Evaluator/Evaluatee assignments to faculty
	☐ Review PTER Evaluator assignment(s) and notify Department Chair as soon as possible to discuss any concerns (e.g. COI)	☐ Block PTER day/time on calendar to ensure availability	
≥ 1 week before PTER		☐ Conduct “ <i>Pre-Evaluation Communication</i> ” with Evaluatee ☐ Schedule “ <i>Pre-Evaluation Planning Meeting</i> ” before PTER (if desired by Evaluatee). ☐ Discuss “ <i>Post-Evaluation Debrief</i> ” plan and schedule debrief	
≥ 3 days before PTER	☐ Provide teaching elements (e.g. course handouts or written materials) and course syllabus to the evaluator		
≥ 1 day before PTER		☐ Review teaching elements, course syllabus, and PTER form	
Day of PTER	☐ Evaluatee should inform Department Chair if evaluator did not attend session	☐ Attend teaching session and complete PTER form	
≥ 1 day before PTER Debrief	☐ Individualized self-reflection on completed PTER form	☐ Provide completed PTER form to Evaluatee for individualized self-reflection	
≤ 1 week after PTER	☐ Attend PTER Debrief Meeting	☐ Attend PTER Debrief Meeting	☐ Participate in debrief only when specifically requested by Evaluatee or Evaluator
≤ 2 weeks after PTER		☐ Verify submission of final PTER form, including any high importance notes from the Debrief Meeting	