



Annual Evaluations

Guidelines for Departmental and Peer Evaluations of Teaching

The following guide is not a required list of activities for conducting or reporting on peer evaluation of teaching. Rather it is designed to prompt peers to think about the possible components of the evaluation process and the reporting of outcomes.

Quality of Intellectual Content

The instructor can provide an annotated syllabus for a course, highlighting the decisions made in including material and choosing which particular aspects of the field will be included, excluded, or emphasized.

The evaluator should consider:

- Is the material in this course appropriate for the topic, appropriate for the curriculum and institution?
- Is the content related to current issues and developments in the field?
- Is there intellectual coherence to the course content?
- Are the intellectual goals for students well-articulated and congruent with the course content and mission?

Quality of Teaching Practices

The instructor can provide a brief account of an overall plan for use of the students' time both in and outside of class. Some of this is found in the syllabus and some would be in the annotations to the syllabus.

The evaluator should consider:

- Is the contact time with students well organized and planned, and if so, are the plans carried out?
- How much of the time are students actively engaged in the material?
- Are there opportunities [in or out of class] for students to practice the skills embedded in the course goals?
- Are there any particularly creative or effective uses of contact time that could improve student understanding?
- Are there any course structures or procedures that contribute especially to the likely achievement of understanding by students?

Quality of Student Understanding

The instructor provides samples of assignments the students use to demonstrate their understanding of some of the key goals articulated in the first part of the review. For each assignment chosen for review, there would also be graded student work, complete with the feedback provided (if any). A recommendation is to provide two A papers (or equivalent category of judgment), two B papers, and two C papers, along with the distribution of performance

for the entire class.

- The evaluator should consider:
- Is the performance asked of students appropriate for the course goals, for the level of course, and for the institution?
- Does the performance requested include challenging levels of conceptual understanding and critical evaluation of the material appropriate to the level of the course and of the students?
- Are students being asked to demonstrate competence in the stated course goals? If not, is it possible to identify why?
- Are there obvious changes in the course that could improve performance?
- Are the forms of evaluation and assessment appropriate to the stated goals of the course?
- Are they particularly creative or do they provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their understanding using intellectual skills typical of the field?
- Is the weighting of course assignments in grade calculation coordinated with the relative importance of the course goals?

Summarizing the Evidence of Reflective Consideration and Development

The evaluator should consider:

- Has this faculty member made a sincere effort to insure that students achieve the goals for the course?
- Has the faculty member identified any meaningful relationship between what (s)he teaches and how students perform?
- Is there evidence that the faculty member has changed teaching practices based on past teaching experiences?
- Is there evidence of insightful analysis of teaching practice that resulted from consideration of student performance?

Questions

Contact Faculty Development by email at facultydev@ku.edu or by phone at 785-864-6489