April 21, 2015

EFC P&T Committee Final Report

Committee Members:  Charles Stanier (chair, term expires May 2015)
                     Gary Christensen (term expires May 2016)
                     Nicole Grosland (term expires May 2017)

EFC Liaison:  Jasbir Arora

General Charge:

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating the criteria for and the appropriateness of all recommendations concerning faculty promotions, tenure, and new appointments in the college and for making such recommendations to the dean and the faculty as it deems necessary.

Specific Charges for 2014-2015 Academic Year:

1. Develop a proposal for modified wording of the general charge for the committee to focus on the process of faculty promotions, tenure and new appointments.
2. Finalize the draft attached P&T flowchart. Seek input from the Dean’s Office, and ensure that information contained on the flowchart is acceptable to the College (Dean’s Office) and University (Kevin Kregel’s Office). Consider establishing links on the flowchart to the CoE P&T manual sections that pertain to the specific items in the flowchart.
3. Monitor the implementation of the new CoE post-tenure review policy that has been in effect since Dec 2012. Review the policy, and suggest changes or revisions as necessary.
4. Observation by peers of classroom teaching: The College policy requires that at minimum three sessions must be observed as part of the peer evaluation for teaching for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. Report on the adherence to this policy and consequences if the policy was not followed. Recommend any changes that are needed.

Report:

The P&T Committee was active in the F2014 semester with several meetings and the drafting of the new flowchart, meetings with DEOs and college staff. Activity picked up again in April with submission of a motion on a newly-worded general charge, additional meetings with DEOs,
development of charges for the next academic year, and compilation of the information collected on peer observation of teaching.

- Develop a proposal for modified wording of the general charge.
  - Complete. See attachment 1.
- Finalize the draft attached P&T flowchart
  - Complete. See attachment 2.
- Monitor the implementation of the new CoE post-tenure review policy
  - Faculty survey completed. All DEOs interviewed. The most common survey response indicated that monitoring of the policy by the EFC was appropriate and that major changes were not needed. There were a number of comments regarding inconsistent adherence to the timetable. DEO and survey comments also reflected that the low frequency of the review (every fifth year) and lack of concrete guidelines for what constitutes acceptable performance limit the use of the 5 year review as a tool for continuous improvement. There were isolated, but perhaps important comments questioning the level of support at the provost level for aggressive action by DEOs for underperforming faculty members. Many faculty members view the 5 year review as a pro forma requirement.
    - See survey results as attachment 3.
  - While we are not recommending a charge on this, we bring to the attention of the EFC problems in notification of DEOs regarding the schedule of which senior faculty require reviews. This inconsistency in notification from year to year will likely be solved by the Dean’s and Provost’s offices, but should be monitored by the EFC.
- Observation by peers of classroom teaching
  - Policies from different departments have been collected for college-wide review. Please see attachment 4. Peer observation of teaching appears to be working well (based on interviews with DEOs). Cases with problems in spreading out reviews over multiple semesters do exist, but seem to be the exception rather than the rule, and can be addressed by individual departments.
- Recommending charges for 2015-2016 committee
  - Work with ITS to reduce the administrative burden on faculty in maintaining updated APR documents.
  - Work with the Dean’s office to design a checklist (possibly online) for each P&T case that will record key policy-relevant milestone dates for each tenure case and allow EFC review of them relevant to the P&T policy.
  - Building on the flowchart created for promotion and tenure review in 2015/2016, create flowcharts for use by candidates, DEOs, DCG, and the Dean’s office for 5 year post-tenure review cases, and for 3 year review of junior faculty.
  - Explore and possibly implement a program that will encourage peer observation by junior faculty of exemplary teachers (both junior and senior, possibly in Departments other than their home department) as a professional development activity.
Attachment 1.  (date 12/19/2014, Promotion and Tenure EFC Committee)

MOTION:
1. The name of the committee will be “Promotion and Tenure Policy Committee”
2. The general charge is changed as follows (insertions italicized):

   previous general charge:
   The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating the criteria for and the appropriateness of all recommendations concerning faculty promotions, tenure, and new appointments in the college and for making such recommendations to the dean and the faculty as it deems necessary.

   track changes version:
   “The Promotion and Tenure Policy Committee shall be responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and monitoring the implementation of the criteria for and the policies on faculty promotions, tenure, review, and new appointments in the college. and for making such recommendations to the dean and the faculty as it deems necessary.”

   final proposed text:
   “The Promotion and Tenure Policy Committee shall be responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and monitoring the implementation of the criteria for and the policies on faculty promotions, tenure, review, and new appointments in the college.”
Background: One of the committee’s charges was to “Develop a proposal for modified wording of the general charge for the committee to focus on the process of faculty promotions, tenure and new appointments.” The change in the general charge puts in writing the fact that the EFC Promotion and Tenure Committee no longer makes recommendations on the appropriateness of individual tenure decisions. Since the committee does not have access to dossier materials and external letters of review, and formal procedures are in place for deciding tenure cases (including grievance procedures), the wording that implied the P&T Committee is advising on the appropriateness of all recommendations (i.e., whether or not each approval or denial of tenure was correct) is unrealistic. Rather the role of the committee is to review whether policies are well-conceived from the perspective of faculty, and whether they are being applied consistently, fairly, and appropriately. We believe this wording change clarifies the roles of the Dean’s Advisory Promotion and Tenure Committee (which does review each dossier and votes on a tenure recommendation) versus the EFC Promotion and Tenure Policy Committee.

The EFC (after reviewing an initial version in December 2014 that did not include monitoring of policy implementation) requested that the general charge include monitoring of policy implementation. For example, the P&T Policy Committee should report to the EFC the number of tenure decisions (anonymous) in each Department, and should report whether the milestone dates were met.
Attachment 2 – P&T Policy Flowchart. (date 12/19/2014, Promotion and Tenure EFC Committee)
[a] the dossier is uploaded to an electronic site; [b] internal peer evaluations of the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service; [c] five working days to submit corrections to statements of fact; [d] DCG recommendation letter, voting result, and report of DCG activities, with copy (possibly redacted) to the candidate. College policy does not mention a candidate letter of response to this, but also does not prohibit a letter of response to the DEO; [e] DEO letter with DEO recommendation & DCG vote provided to Dean*; [f] candidate letter of response (5 working days); [g] report and result of voting; [h] if the advisory committee recommends NO and the DCG or DEO recommended yes, the advisory committee report is available to candidate*; [i] candidate response (5 working days); [j] Dean’s recommendation to the provost*; [k] candidate letter of response (5 working days); [l] provost recommendation is provided to the candidate by the Dean. * Indicates that a copy of a recommendation is made viewable to the candidate for a 5 day period, possibly with parts redacted to protect anonymity of internal and external reviewers making specific comments. Candidate responses (c, f, i and k) are not mandatory but are at the discretion of the candidate.
Attachment 3 – results of survey regarding post-tenure review. (date 12/19/2014, Promotion and Tenure EFC Committee)
Summary

The overall consensus of the respondents (i.e., 17; consisting of tenured faculty, the majority of which have gone through the new post-tenure review process, or have participated in a review as a DEO or member of a DCG committee) is that the current post-tenure review policy is favorable. In terms of the implementation thereof, there was concern that the time-table and requirements remain somewhat nebulous and or inconsistent (i.e., department-to-department). Ultimately the faculty would like to provide a positive experience for the faculty as a whole and avoid busy work for the faculty/administration.

There were no major concerns regarding the wording of the individual sections of the policy. One respondent suggested that section F of the policy be clarified. For example, ‘What are the expected standards of performance?’; ‘How are these standards determined, and how is it determined whether someone if performing below those standards?’; ‘What is a significant period of time?’

Please refer to the following pages for a compilation of the survey responses to each question.
Question 1: Which describes your position best (you may select more than one)

Responses: 17

Comment:
...but should have before this point in time
Question 2: Which response best matches your opinion about post-tenure review?

Responses: 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is working fine -- minimal oversight by the EFC is appropriate, but nothing else</td>
<td>84.71% 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is OK but needs some adjustments</td>
<td>17.65% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not working well and needs major adjustments and/or a big dose of faculty governance</td>
<td>17.65% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a failure in one or more important ways and should be a priority for addressing via faculty governance</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

How can we reduce the extra work for faculty and administrators and provide a positive experience as a whole?
Question 3: Overall feedback about the post-tenure peer review policy and its implementation?

Responses: 17

Make sure it’s not just busy work - faculty and administration are already overloaded dealing with the ramifications of budget cuts and skyrocketing enrollments (i.e., we’re working harder with less resources). Make sure it’s constructive, not demoralizing (see above - faculty are already being pushed to the limits). My impression is that there is still a lot of confusion about when and what needs to be done - both on the faculty and administration side.

I found it to be constructive --- much more so than I thought it would be. A lot has to do with those involved in the review, and their desire to make it a constructive process.

No comment

Works fine.

The policy is fine.

Still quite nebulous as to requirements. Very dependent on department, and is usually a rubber stamp.

The post-tenure review process is working fine.

Working fine.

It is a very cursory and "polite" review of faculty achievements

no opinion since I have not been through it or served on a committee.

It is important to have a process like that, the details are less important.

?

OK

The time table for post tenure review is generally not followed, that is date of the start of the review process and subsequent deadlines, etc. The schedule should be followed.

The schedule is very uneven. The fact that it does not go to the DEO is ludicrous.

If a faculty member remains in the rank of associate professor for a long time (say 10 to 12 years) we should put more teeth in to post tenure reviews that will move the individual off the tenure track. This will cause additional gravity in granting tenure as well as remove the perception that once you get tenure you can put feet on the table.
Question 4: Any problems with (a) wording of the policy section above, or (b) its implementation? – Policy Section A
Responses: 14

The wording is short and to the point. The implementation seems to be the issue: How are we keeping track of who needs to go when and if it was done? How do we add yet another responsibility to the growing list? How do we make this a positive experience that energizes the faculty, not demoralizes the faculty?

None.
No. No.
Fine as printed.
No
No.
Fine.
No
The recommendations have no 'teeth"
none
No
(a) No (b) No
Should apply to ALL administrators as well.

Please see my earlier comment.
Question 5: Any problems with (a) wording of the policy section above, or (b) its implementation? - Policy Section B
Responses: 12

Wording is short and to the point. I cannot comment on its implementation since I have not yet been through an implementation.

OK.

No. No.

Fine as printed.

No.

No

Fine.

No

No

(a) No (b) I have not seen this policy being implemented.

Fine, as long as the reasons are rational and acceptable to the DEO.
Question 6: Any problems with (a) wording of the policy section above, or (b) its implementation? - Policy Section C

Responses: 11

Wording is short and to the point. I cannot comment on its implementation since I have not yet been through an implementation.

No.

No. No.

ok

No

Fine.

Not sure if this includes secondary/courtesy appointments

no

No

(a) No (b) Implementation??

OK
Question 7: Any problems with (a) wording of the policy section above, or (b) its implementation? - Policy Section D

Responses: 11

Wording is short and to the point. One comment is that we no longer have FAS. Now it is the PAR, which is onerous to update and review.

No.

No. No.

FAS should suffice. No need for additional info.

The FAS is now obsolete.

Fine.

I'm guessing we will be using the online system instead of the FAS? This might need to be clarified.

no

No

(a) No (b) no

Fine
Question 8: Any problems with (a) wording of the policy section above, or (b) its implementation? - Policy Section E

Responses: 10

Wording is short and to the point. I cannot comment on its implementation since I have not yet been through an implementation.

No.

No. No.

I think we are going too far with reviews. Is this the only thing that we will be doing, reviews upon reviews. DCGs are already overwhelmed with reviews. This almost sound as we do not trust the tenure process.

No

Fine.

How will the outcome be communicated?

no

No

(a) No (b) Implementation???
Question 9: Any problems with (a) wording of the policy section above, or (b) its implementation? - Policy Section F

Responses: 12

Wording is short and intentionally vague. I cannot comment on its implementation since I have not yet been through an implementation.

No.

No. No.

Please stop creating another layer of bureaucracy.

No

Fine.

No

No teeth

no

No

(a) No (b) Implementation??

what are expected standards of performance? How are these standards determined, and how is it determined whether someone is performing below those standards? What is a significant period of time? This section needs to be clarified.
Question 10: Any problems with (a) wording of the policy section above, or (b) its implementation? - Policy Section H

Responses: 11

This timeline has not been my experience.

No.

No. No.

I think the committee goes too far. Faculty does research, teaching, and service. Their numbers are growing slowly and the number of students is expanding rapidly. This almost looks as a group of faculty having not enough to do attempts to create a new review organization which is a bad idea in an environment that is highly competitive.

No

Fine.

If peer teaching evaluation are required, the timing of the DCG meeting seems very late.

No

No

(a) No (b) Implementation??? The DEOs may need to be reminded about implementing the new policy.

Fine
Attachment 4 – Summary of Peer Observation of Teaching

**Charge to the committee:** Observation by peers of classroom teaching: The College policy requires that at minimum three sessions must be observed as part of the peer evaluation for teaching for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. Report on the adherence to this policy and consequences if the policy was not followed. Recommend any changes that are needed.


6. Observation by peers of classroom teaching. At minimum, three sessions must be observed as part of the peer evaluation of teaching for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. At least two observers, who will be faculty qualified to be members of the candidate’s DCG unless circumstances dictate otherwise, will participate in the visits. The Department Executive Officer, after consulting with the candidate, shall arrange for selection of the observers. Classroom visits need not take place during the semester in which the review is conducted but may take place during the preceding four academic-year semesters. Visits will be scheduled with appropriate advance notice and in consultation with the candidate. Unless prohibited by written department policy, video observation may, with the candidate’s consent, be substituted for direct observation of classroom teaching. Unless departmental policy specifies a particular method of recording observations, individual observers may use their own discretion in recording their findings. The conclusions of the observers shall be incorporated into the peer evaluation of teaching report, a copy of which is provided to the candidate. If provided for by department policy, observers may individually or jointly draft a separate report which is shared with the candidate. Although classroom observations are a required part of the peer evaluation of teaching, it is desirable that the observations also serve to help the candidate improve his or her teaching.
Questions regarding peer observation of teaching. Answers are from DEO interviews and from questionnaires.

1. Does your department have specific written policies regarding peer observation of teaching? Either prohibiting video recording, or specifying methods, personnel, timetables, etc., or laying out rubrics for grades of quality (if so obtain for the committee)

ECE. Yes, ECE has specific written policies regarding peer observation of teaching (see attached). ECE does not use video recording or use rubrics for grades of quality. ECE has a departmental policy that the observation forms are not to be shared directly with the candidate, and that they therefore need to be placed in a part of the electronic dossier not viewable to the candidate.

MIE. Yes (policy)

CBE. No

BME. Yes (policy)

CEE. [email out to Michelle]

2. What are the norms in your department with respect to:
   a. Use of observation forms (get a copy of the form)

   Use of a form?

ECE – yes
MIE – yes
CBE – yes
BME – yes
CEE - yes
b. Selection of the observers – who observes – who typically selects the observers – is there ever contention over selection, difficulty in getting observers, outside-the-department observers?

**ECE.** The DEO selects two members of the DCG as observers for each candidate, in consultation with the candidate and the DCG chair. These observers may change from year to year. Each observer visit two class periods of the selected course so that a total of four distinct class periods are observed. The observers select the class periods in consultation with the candidate. It is desirable that the selected periods be consecutive. In general, any DCG member familiar with the subject area of the class (i.e., is familiar with teaching the course being observed) may be selected as an observer for untenured faculty. The workload of peer observation is spread out over all members of the DCG. If someone has a time conflict, then the DEO asks someone else to do the peer observation. I don’t think there is difficulty in getting observers. ECE does not use outside-the-department observers.

**MIE.** DEO selects a team of two observers.

**BME.** Other faculty are the observers. DEO or candidate typically selects the observers. People generally are selected who have time in their schedule and have some understanding of the subject area and teaching.

**CBE.** DEO or DCG chair selects the observers

**CEE.** DEO selects the observers

c. Is student feedback used in the peer observation process? If so, how?

**ECE.** No.

**MIE.** No.

**CBE.** No

**BME.** No

**CEE.** Email out to Michelle

d. How are results reported to the DCG? to the DEO? to the candidate?

**ECE.** Each observer fills out the questionnaire after each classroom visit. The DCG summarizes the contents of these questionnaires and incorporates the summary in its Annual/Reappointment/Promotion review report. The individual questionnaires are not shared with the candidate, but it is recommended that the observer discuss their observations with the candidate.

**MIE.** The DCG reviews the results on annual basis.
**ECE.** For each probationary faculty member, one course is targeted each year for peer observations, including one in the fall semester of his/her reappointment/tenure review. For each tenured associate professor being reviewed for promotion, the Departmental Consulting Group (DCG) targets one course in the calendar year of his/her review. ECE observes each faculty member teaching at all levels, i.e., introductory courses, major courses, and graduate courses. The peer observation assignments tend to happen within the first 1-3 week of the semester and must be completed within 3-4 weeks of the assignment. This allows the DCG time to write their report before it is due.

**MIE.** The time is agreed between the team and the faculty.

**BME.** Reviews can occur in any semester and any week. They are sometimes planned long ahead, and sometimes happen right at the deadline.

**CBE.** Coordinated by the DCG chair, observations are agreed upon by the candidate and the observer. Observations are spaced out through multiple semesters, but often they occur in the mid-point of the semester prior to each evaluation.

3. **Are there cases where the deadline for a review came and the reviews were not completed? If so, how was this handled?**

   **ECE.** Pressure is applied to the person that did not complete their review on time to complete it as soon as possible. Alternatively, another DCG member is asked to do the peer evaluation as soon as possible. The DCG puts off writing its report until it receives all the reviews. The DCG may not wait for the delinquent review if there is overwhelming evidence and agreement of the DCG of the effectiveness of the instructor.
MIE. This happens rarely. In some cases, a special lecture (rather than a class session) has been used for evaluation purposes.

BME. they are completed as soon as possible so that the DCG reviewers can still include it or them in their deliberations.

CBE. The DCG chair and DEO apply pressure to make sure the peer obs is completed.

4. How is constructive feedback / “need for improvement” type of feedback dealt with? Is there anything beyond just the written documentation of the constructive criticism?

ECE. It is recommended that the observer discuss their observations with the candidate. The candidate gets to see the DCG report but not the observation forms. If substantial improvement is required, then the DEO or assigned mentor will develop a plan to fix the situation in consultation with the candidate. The ECE department continuously stresses the importance of our faculty being good and effective teachers.

MIE. The lecturer performance is scored in a number of categories.

BME. the DEO discusses it with the candidate based on the peer review. If substantial improvement is necessary, the interaction between the DEO and candidate could possibly expand to include tools or documents beyond the written documentation of the constructive criticism.

5. Has there been any controversy or disagreement regarding aspects of the peer observation of teaching and its use in promotion and reappointment decisions?

ECE. Not that I am aware of. The ECE DCG members respect the opinions of the other DCG members. Also, there are many peer observations from many DCG members to consider when making a decision.

MIE. No.

BME. Not to this respondent’s knowledge.

CBE. No

CEE. No

6. Do you have any suggestions to improve peer observation of teaching in the college? or suggestions for modifications to the policy?

ECE. No. Upon learning about CEE’s informal policy of having junior faculty observe teaching by senior faculty, there was a comment that this would be easier to administer if it was a norm or policy within the college.

MIE. We considered reducing the number of observers from 2 to 1. Upon learning about CEE’s informal policy of having junior faculty observe teaching
by senior faculty, there was a comment that this might work better if there were a list of exemplary teachers that junior faculty could be encouraged to observe.

**BME.** possibly, but none come to mind right now

**CEE.** No

**CBE.** No

7. *Are there resources from the college or university needed for either (a) implementation of effective peer observation, or (b) to follow up on findings that come out of peer observation?*

  **ECE.** Resources are needed from the college or university in the case that an instructor needs substantial improvement on how to be a more effective teacher.

  **MIE.** Probably not.

  **BME.** contact Jean Florman in the UI Center for Teaching about this
The Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) adheres to the general policy on peer observation of teaching as set out on pages five and six of the document *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments Evaluations and Promotions in the College of Engineering*. The following provides further details on the goals and procedures to be employed by ECE in implementing the College policy.

All faculty at the ranks of assistant and associate professor will undergo peer observations of their teaching. In conducting these observations and in their evaluation, the observers must recognize that the same material can be effectively conveyed to students in multiple ways, that each instructor has his/her own style, and that these differences in style must be respected in the evaluation.

**Goals:** The goals of these observations will be as follows:

(a) Peer observations will serve to supplement existing mechanisms that assess student perceptions of classroom teaching.

(b) They will focus primarily on aspects of classroom teaching that are better evaluated by faculty members than by students.

(c) They will be used, where appropriate, to interpret and explain student evaluation of classroom teaching.

**Procedures:** For each probationary faculty member, one course will be targeted each year for peer observations, including one in the fall semester of his/her reappointment/tenure review. For each tenured associate professor being reviewed for promotion, the Departmental Consulting Group (DCG) will target one course in the calendar year of his/her review. The DEO will select two members of the DCG as observers for each candidate, in consultation with the candidate and the DCG chair. These observers may change from year to year. Each observer shall visit two class periods of the selected course so that a total of four distinct class periods are observed. The observers will select the class periods in consultation with the candidate. It is desirable that the selected periods be consecutive.

Each observer shall fill out the questionnaire overleaf after each classroom visit. The DCG will summarize the contents of these questionnaires and incorporate the summary in its Annual/Reappointment/Promotion review report. The individual questionnaires will not be shared with the candidate.
# Questionnaire for Peer Observation of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor being observed</th>
<th>Course number/name</th>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Date of observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please give detailed answers to the questions below. Do not restrict yourself to yes and no answers. If you have inadequate data to answer a particular question, please so indicate.

1. How many students were present in the class on the day of the observation?

2. Was the lecture well organized and paced?

3. Was the material covered correct and at an appropriate level?

4. Were concepts emphasized and was there an appropriate balance between different concepts?

5. Was the instructor well prepared?

6. Did the instructor foster a classroom environment that was conducive to learning?

7. Please provide any other comments you deem appropriate.
### PEER OBSERVATION OF TEACHING REPORT

Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Session (Fall/Spring and year)</th>
<th>Date of Observation</th>
<th>Number of student present</th>
<th>Observers</th>
<th>Lecture/Lab/Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of written material</th>
<th>1 - Needs Improvement</th>
<th>2 - Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 – Very Good</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete or confusing classroom materials. Poor quality or with errors, illegible handwriting on board.</td>
<td>Classroom materials for students have only a few, non-critical errors. Handwriting is legible.</td>
<td>Classroom materials for students are clear and complete. No obvious errors. Handwriting is easy to read.</td>
<td>Handouts helpful, insightful and clear. Handwritten materials created during lecture are clear and thorough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of spoken words to the level of students</th>
<th>1 - Needs Improvement</th>
<th>2 - Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 – Very Good</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor diction or sentence fragments that are difficult to comprehend, too fast or slow, or filled with verbal ticks.</td>
<td>Clear diction, coherent sentences, appropriate volume and rate and few obvious fillers. Slight imperfection such as monotone or sometimes quiet.</td>
<td>Clear speech. Use multiple examples. Incorporate out of class experiences.</td>
<td>Clear speech, plus appropriate metaphors, fluid response to questions. Smooth speech cadence and appropriate prosody.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor's enthusiasm for subject matter</th>
<th>1 - Needs Improvement</th>
<th>2 - Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 – Very Good</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unenergetic posture, poor eye contact or sighing, cynical asides, very narrow scope, few connections to broad impacts.</td>
<td>Steady, solid delivery of technical material. Keeps closely to technical subject. Occasional eye contact.</td>
<td>Engaged and active, explains why the material is important.</td>
<td>Energetic and excited to talk about the topic. Seeks eye contact with students. Makes connections between the student experience and the topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization of presentation</th>
<th>1 - Needs Improvement</th>
<th>2 - Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 – Very Good</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incoherent. Rambling. Discontinuous, unexplained jumps.</td>
<td>Clearly defined. Proceeds steadily and predictably.</td>
<td>Manageable, logical sub-components building towards a more comprehensive goal.</td>
<td>Moves through subsections that offer variety and flavor, building towards an intellectually satisfying whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of instructor's command of subject matter</th>
<th>1 - Needs Improvement</th>
<th>2 - Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 – Very Good</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trouble maintaining a steady progress through the topic. Seems unsure and easily stymied by questions or any deviations from narrow, planned path.</td>
<td>Competent, steady progress through material. Realizes small mistakes and simply corrects them. Complex problems might be deferred for later follow-up.</td>
<td>Confident, versatile movement through material, without heavy reliance on notes. Direct and simple response to most questions.</td>
<td>Fluid movement through material. Deftly connects past and future ideas from the course. Responds easily to complex questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of interest and participation of students/Active teaching</th>
<th>1 - Needs Improvement</th>
<th>2 - Satisfactory</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>4 – Very Good</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many students are obviously disengaged. In an active learning environment, the students are distracted or on tangents unrelated to the learning goals.</td>
<td>Students seem to be stoically following the material. Occasionally respond to a question or ask a question. In an active learning the students are listless and disinterested.</td>
<td>Students seem to be following and participating in the flow of the lecture or learning activities.</td>
<td>Students are engaged and responsive. Generally several raise hands simultaneously to ask or answer questions. Students are collaborating and communicating in learning activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provide written comments regarding the observations:

Observers’s signatures:  

Dates: Report ______ Discussed with candidate ______ Sent to DEO ______
RATING FORM FOR
PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING – CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Instructor: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Course Number: ______ Course Title: __________________________
Number of Students Present: ______ Number of Students in Course: ______
Reviewer: __________________________

Brief Narrative Log (time line) of Lecture (use back of page if additional space is needed). Some topics that can focus this section include: What is the instructor speaking about? What specific comments are being made? How are the classroom learning activities organized? What is the level of student interaction? What teaching strategies are being used?

Lecture Evaluation (provide written comments for each of the following items)

Instructor Organization. Issues to focus on include: Was the instructor well-prepared for class? Were the objectives of the class clearly stated? Did the instructor state the relation of the lecture to the previous one? Did the instructor use class time efficiently? Were the learning activities well organized? Did the class remain focused on its objectives? Did the instructor summarize periodically and at the end of class?
Comments (use back of page if additional space is needed):

Instructional Strategies. Issues to focus on include: Were the instructor’s choice of teaching techniques appropriate for the goals? Does the instructor have good questioning skills? Does the instructor raise stimulating and challenging questions? Does the class schedule proceed at an appropriate pace? Is board work legible and organized? Does the instructor effectively hold class attention? Does the instructor provides an effective range of challenges?
Comments (use back of page if additional space is needed):
**Content Knowledge.** Issues to focus on include: Is the instructor knowledgeable about the subject matter? Is the instructor confident in explaining the subject matter? Does the instructor focus on important content in the field? Does the instructor demonstrate intellectual curiosity toward new ideas or perspectives?

Comments (use back of page if additional space is needed):

**Presentation Skills.** Issues to focus on include: Is the instructor an effective speaker? Does the instructor employ an appropriate rate of speech? Is the instructor enthusiastic about the subject matter? Does the instructor make the subject matter interesting? Is the instructor’s command of English adequate?

Comments (use back of page if additional space is needed):

**Rapport With Students.** Issues to focus on include: Does the instructor address students by name? Does the instructor attend to student comprehension or puzzlement? Does the instructor provide feedback at given intervals? Does the instructor use positive reinforcement? Does the instructor incorporate student ideas into the class?

Comments (use back of page if additional space is needed):

**Clarity.** Issues to focus on include: Does the instructor define new terms or concepts? Does the instructor clearly elaborate complex information, and repeat it when necessary? Does the instructor use examples to explain content? Does the instructor respond to questions clearly? Does the instructor pause during explanations to allow students to ask questions? Does the instructor relate course material to practical situations?

Comments (use back of page if additional space is needed):
Policy on Peer Observation of Class Room Teaching
by E.L. Dove, V.K. Goel, and J.B. Park (Chair)
Department of Biomedical Engineering
The University of Iowa
February, 2000

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to define the Department of Biomedical Engineering policy for conducting peer observation of teaching. With regards to peer observation of teaching, the following statement appears in the College of Engineering, promotion and tenure document (CoE, 1999) on p. 5:

6. Observation by peers of classroom teaching. At minimum, three sessions must be observed as part of the peer evaluation of teaching for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. At least two observers, who will be faculty qualified to be members of the candidate's AFG unless circumstances dictate otherwise, will participate in the visits. The Department Executive Officer, after consulting with the candidate, shall arrange for selection of the observers. Classroom visits need not take place during the semester in which the review is conducted but may take place during the preceding four academic-year semesters. Visits will be scheduled with appropriate advance notice and in consultation with the candidate. Unless prohibited by written department policy, video observation may, with the candidate's consent, be substituted for direct observation for classroom teaching. Unless department policy specifies a particular method of recording observation, individual observers may use their own discretion in recording their findings. The conclusions of the observers shall be incorporated into the peer evaluation of teaching report, a copy of which is provided to the candidate. If provided for by department policy, observers may individually or jointly draft a separate report which is shared with the candidate. Although classroom observations are a required part of the peer evaluation of teaching, it is desirable that the observations also serve to help the candidate improve his or her teaching.

In a Memo dated October 14, 1999, Professor Steve M. Collins, Chair, Engineering Faculty Council, noted that the word "sessions" refers to class sessions or lectures.

Peer observation of teaching is an evaluation of the teaching process and its relationship to student learning and is not an evaluation of the course content and organization. It is a review of the instructor's performance through classroom observation and is an assessment that will serve as input for making appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

The guidebook by The Center for Teaching Effectiveness at The University of Texas at Austin (UTA) states that peer observation of teaching involves classroom observations and a review of instructional materials and course design and may be formative or summative. This guidebook is a good reference for background on issues about peer observation of teaching.

Policy

Selection of observers:

The Department Executive Officer in consultation with the candidate will select the observers. There will be two observers performing each peer observation of teaching. If it is necessary to conduct observations for more than one semester, the observers may be, and more than likely will be, different for each semester that an observation is conducted.

Video observations:

Video observations will be considered on a case-by-case basis by two observations. The Appropriate Faculty Group in consultation with the DEO and candidate will consider each case and make a
recommendation. The videos, however, must be of high quality so that the observers can make evaluations equivalent to those in a classroom setting or other settings that are typical of the class.

Recording of observations:

The observers may select any tool that is convenient for recording their observations. The observers must inform the instructor of the tool to be used so as not to disrupt the instructor's teaching. The method for recording the observations must allow the observers to complete the form entitled PEER OBSERVATION OF CLASS ROOM TEACHING REPORT (see section Reports).

Timing of observations:

Both observers will be present at the same time when peer observation of teaching is performed. The observers are expected to consult with the instructor with regard to a time when the observations should occur. The observers should meet with the instructor before the classroom observations to discuss the instructor's objectives for her/his class. The observed instructor should be able to ask questions about the process. Observations should be made of the instructor for activities that are typical of the course level (core, required program, intermediate, graduate) and course type (lecture, discussion, laboratory, etc.). The observers are expected to conduct their evaluation in a manner that minimizes disruptions to the classroom environment. The instructor, if he or she chooses, may inform the class the day before of the visitors who will attend the next class period.

Number of observations:

A minimum of two observations is required.

Reports:

The observers must prepare a single report using the form entitled PEER OBSERVATION OF TEACHING REPORT. The report must be submitted to the instructor within three working days after the last visit. A follow-up meeting for the accuracy of report and to provide additional comments may be appropriate.
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Instructor: __________________________ Session: _______________________

Course number and name: ____________________________________________

Course level (circle one): Core, Req Program, Int, Grad (Efforts should be made to select every level of courses)

Number of students present: _______________

Date (s) of observations: _______________

Observers: (1) __________________________ (2) _________________________

Using the following attributes, provide written responses to the following items:

1. Clarity of written material: _______________

2. Clarity of spoken words to the level of students: _______________

3. Positive classroom environment: _______________

4. Instructor's enthusiasm for subject matter: _______________

5. Instructor's command of subject matter: _______________

A. What were the instructor's major strengths and weaknesses as demonstrated in this observation?

B. How organized and clear is the presentation?
C. What overall impressions do you think students left this lesson with in terms of the teaching process and its relationship to their learning?

D. Describe the level of student interest and participation.

E. What specific suggestions would you make concerning how this particular class could have been improved?

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

In the opinion of the observer, did the presence of the observers disrupt the class?

Observer 1: Yes: ____ No: ____ Comment: __________________________________________

Observer 2: Yes: ____ No: ____ Comment: _______________________________________

Observers' signatures: __________________________________________________ Date:__________

Date report sent to candidate:
PEER OBSERVATION OF TEACHING REPORT
Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering

Instructor: _________________________________ Session: _____________________________

Course number and name: ________________________________________________________

Course level (Core, Req Program, Int, Grad): _________________________________________

Course type (Lect, Lab, Disc, etc.): _________________________________________________

Number of students present: ______________________________________________________

Date (s) of observations: _________________________________________________________

Observers: (1) ___________________________________ (2)__________________________

Provide written responses to the following items:

A. What were the instructor’s major strengths and weaknesses as demonstrated in this observation?

B. How organized and clear is the presentation?

C. What overall impressions do you think students left this lesson with in terms of the teaching process and its relationship to their learning?

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

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

Observer’s signatures: ____________________________________________________________

Date report sent to candidate and DEO: ____________________________________________

Candidate: Please keep a copy of this report to include in your next promotion review.