

**Wilkinson College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences**  
**GUIDELINES FOR PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**  
**Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**  
**(Approved February 2020)**

Full-time non-tenure track Assistant Professors may seek consideration for promotion to non-tenure track Associate Professor after six continuously served years at their present rank, unless prohibited by their appointment. Non-tenure track Assistant Professors hired after 2015 are required to undergo two critical year evaluations that coincide with contract renewals. One must be no more than two years prior to applying for promotion. Full-time non-tenure track Associate Professors may seek promotion to non-tenure track Full Professor, after six continuously served years at the rank of Associate Professor, unless prohibited by their appointment. Non-tenure track Associate Professors hired after 2015 are required to undergo at least one critical year evaluation before applying for promotion.

The Wilkinson College Unit criteria for promotion to non-tenure-track Associate/Full Professor states “In ascertaining teaching excellence, Wilkinson College places the greatest emphasis on qualitative measures, including such things as self-reflective statements, student comments, and peer teaching evaluations. Faculty members are required to arrange peer evaluations of their teaching (including a classroom visit) at least three times prior to their evaluation. The faculty member should approach Department Chairs to help facilitate these teaching evaluations, two of which are expected to be conducted by senior colleagues or university teaching mentors.”

Procedure

1. As a general guide, the teaching of faculty members eligible for promotion should be reviewed by senior colleagues, university teaching mentor faculty, or the department chair. Ideally, each review should be conducted by a different faculty member, including one reviewer from outside the department. The outside reviewer should be engaged in teaching in an area substantially related to that of the evaluated faculty member. The department chair, in consultation with the evaluated faculty member, will select the reviewers and offer a written explanation on the peer review form about why the specific reviewer was selected. Early each fall, the department chair will prepare a plan stating who will be evaluated by whom, and share the plan with the department.
2. Peer reviews should be conducted within the immediate years leading up to a review and faculty members are expected to have new peer reviews conducted for each review cycle.
3. Each review shall consist of four related steps; i) Department chair will complete first part of Peer Teaching Evaluation Form and share with faculty member; ii) Faculty members will contact peer reviewer to share course materials to contextualize the day's teaching and arrange in-class observation; (iii) in-class observation occurs; (iv) completion of the Peer Teaching Evaluation Form by reviewer and faculty member.
4. Unless otherwise agreed upon, the reviewer will simply sit in the room to observe and stay for the entire class period. The faculty member will have the option for a “do-over”, that is, to reschedule the reviewer to come back for a follow-up observation.
5. The reviewer will complete and sign their portion of the Peer Teaching Evaluation Form which will be sent to the faculty member, who will write a response, and send the completed form to the department chair. The faculty member will retain a copy for inclusion in the teaching portfolio. In case of a do-over, only the second Peer Teaching Evaluation Form will be sent to the faculty member and chair.

# Wilkinson College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

## Peer Teaching Evaluation Form

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Section: \_\_\_\_\_ Number of students: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_ Room: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair rationale for evaluator selection:

Instructions to evaluator: Please use the scale (checking the appropriate box) and/or written comments to evaluate the following.

### Part A: Preview of Course Materials

1. Syllabus .....
2. Learning Outcomes .....
3. Course Materials .....
4. Assignments .....

Needs Improvement  
Meets Expectations  
High Quality  
Outstanding  
N/A

Comments:

### Part B: Mechanics

1. Addresses students by name .....
2. Communicates clearly .....
3. Has students' attention .....
4. Vocabulary comprehensible to students .....
5. Varies activities .....

Needs Improvement  
Meets Expectations  
High Quality  
Outstanding  
N/A

Comments:

**Part C: Organization**

1. Clear statement of learning goals . . . . .
2. Points out relationship between ideas . . . . .
3. Emphasizes major points . . . . .
4. Establishes link between familiar and new material . . . . .
5. Encourages critical thinking . . . . .

Needs Improvement  
Meets Expectations  
High Quality  
Outstanding  
N/A

**Comments:**

**Part D: Classroom Relationships**

1. Interacts with students . . . . .
2. Acknowledges the value of student ideas and concepts . . . . .
3. Encourages student participation . . . . .
4. Appears interested and enthusiastic . . . . .
5. Remembers and refers to student ideas . . . . .

Needs Improvement  
Meets Expectations  
High Quality  
Outstanding  
N/A

**Comments:**

**Part E: Content**

1. Class content is relevant to course goals . . . . .
2. Provides appropriate context or background . . . . .
3. Presents divergent viewpoints . . . . .
4. Citation of relevant scholarship . . . . .

Needs Improvement  
Meets Expectations  
High Quality  
Outstanding  
N/A

**Comments:**

**Part F: Discipline-specific (optional)**

1.

.....
2.

.....
3.

.....
4.

.....
5.

.....

Needs Improvement

Meets Expectations

High Quality

Outstanding

N/A

**Comments:**

### **Evaluator Written Comments**

Successful aspects of the class session:

Suggestions for improvement:

Overall assessment:

---

Signature: Evaluator / Date

Faculty Member Response:

---

Signature: Faculty Member / Date