Effective teaching is required for a faculty member’s success in the College of Engineering and Applied Science. Teaching, as defined in UW Regulation 5-803, includes classroom and associated teaching, thesis direction, curriculum advising and individual and group study. UW Regulation 5-800 discusses the establishment of a flexible, faculty-approved teacher effectiveness evaluation system. Specifically, it requires evaluations by students, colleagues, peers, administrators, and self-evaluations. While it provides detailed procedures for the collection of student evaluations, it mandates that the colleges and departments will develop their own procedures for peer evaluations. This document provides the guidelines and protocols to be used by the College for peer evaluation of teaching.

Peer Evaluation Guidelines

1. Reviewers are to be chosen by the department head. While it is the head’s prerogative to visit classrooms to observe teaching performance, the head should not be a peer reviewer as described herein. Reviewers may be from outside the department or college. Reviewers should be tenured. It is recommended that two reviewers be assigned to each instructor being reviewed, and the instructor has the option to request a replacement reviewer(s) if there is a perceived personal conflict, conflict of interest, etc.

2. An initial peer evaluation should be conducted in the second or third semester of a new faculty member’s time in the College. This is a formative review with no permanent records in the T&P packet. Guidance should be provided to the faculty member on strengths and weaknesses of their classroom teaching. This review can generally follow the protocol below and use many of the same documents that will be developed; however, the informal review may go beyond the formal document to assist faculty teaching expertise. An alternative approach is for a senior faculty member, at the request of the department head, to informally visit an instructor’s classroom and to provide confidential feedback.

3. The protocol for the review is listed below.

4. A peer evaluation review is required for the fourth year of teaching at the University, or one year prior to the year of decision on tenure or on an extended term contract for APs, whichever comes first. It is suggested that the classroom observations be conducted during the first half of the semester.

5. Peer evaluations will be maintained in a designated section of the T&P or extended term contract teaching portfolio.
Protocol for Peer Evaluations

Step 1. Planning Session. Prior to the classroom observations, there should be a meeting between the instructor and the peer evaluators to review the course syllabus, course content and objectives, objectives/goals of the specific class periods to be observed, and the sequencing relevance within the semester.

Step 2. Classroom Observation. Peer evaluators should visit more than one class. Descriptive and specific comments should be placed in context. Aspects of teaching that might be considered include: Was the instructor well prepared for class? Was the instructor knowledgeable about the subject matter? Was the instructor enthusiastic about the subject matter? Did the instructor speak clearly and audibly? Did the instructor make use of appropriate examples? Did the instructor make effective use of appropriate technology? Did the instructor ask stimulating and challenging questions? Did the instructor hold the class’s attention? Was the instructor successful in achieving active student involvement? Did the instructor treat the students with respect? Did the lectures meet the objectives/goals as determined in Step 1?

Step 3. Post-Observation Report. Based on the classroom observation, each peer evaluator will complete the attached Peer Evaluation of Teaching Report. The peer evaluators should provide drafts of their reports to the instructor so that the instructor can visit with them to clarify any confusion that may have occurred. The draft report is an initial discussion document between the peer evaluator and the faculty member. This discussion may lead to revisions in the report. The final reports are then submitted as permanent components of the instructor’s T&P file, and the instructor is free to submit a clarification or rebuttal letter to the file as well.
PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING REPORT
University of Wyoming – College of Engineering & Applied Science

Instructor: _________________________________ Semester: ___________________________

Course Number and Name: _______________________________________________________

Course Type (Lect., Lab, Disc, etc.): ______________________________________________

Dates of Observations (at least two) and Number of Students Present:
______________________________________________________________________________

Evaluator: _____________________________________________________________________

Provide written responses to the following:

A. What were the instructor’s major strengths and weaknesses, as demonstrated in your observations?

B. How organized and clear were the presentations?

C. How effective is the instructor’s teaching style?

D. What was the level of student interest and participation?
E. What specific suggestions would you make concerning how these particular presentations could have been improved?

Provide any additional comments that may help to assess the instructor's teaching capabilities:

Evaluator’s Signature: __________________________________________________________

Date Report Sent to Candidate: _______________________________________________