

[DRAFT] Peer Observation Protocol

Mechanical Engineering¹

You have been asked to complete a peer observation for an ME faculty member for inclusion in their reappointment, comprehensive review, promotion, or tenure case.

Please complete the following steps for your peer observation:

- ☐ Request and review the syllabus for the course *prior* to your classroom observation.
- ☐ Please talk to the faculty member in advance of the class period you will be observing to understand the objectives for that class and how it fits with the overall course and to provide an overview of the observation you will be conducting.
- ☐ Use the “Evidence / Notes” boxes to make notes regarding each question during the lesson. Please check NA if a particular item did not apply to the class you observed.
- ☐ Review your notes/evidence and prepare a letter summarizing your observations and assessments after the lesson. Note that most letters include some suggestions for improvement - it is not expected that any class would ever be perfect!
- ☐ Please retain this protocol for your records and turn in your letter to the personnel committee representative who requested the observation. Only the letter will be included in the candidate’s promotion and tenure materials.

Observer:	
Instructor:	
Course Name:	
Course Number / Section:	
Date / Time:	

Did the observer receive and review the syllabus prior to class?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
a) Did the syllabus include the Required Syllabus Statements (i.e. Disability Accommodation; Religious Holidays; Classroom Behavior; Sexual Misconduct, Discrimination, Harassment, and/or Retaliation; and Honor Code), per CU Boulder policy?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b) Did the syllabus clearly describe expectations and requirements for the course, including departmentally prescribed learning objectives, if applicable?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>*If no in (a) or (b), what was missing/unclear?</i>	

1. Adapted from the UTeach Observation Protocol (UTOP; Retrieved March 2018 from <https://utop.uteach.utexas.edu/>) by the MCEN Departmental Action Team (Jean Hertzberg, Jana Milford, and Daniel Knight) and developed in partnership with the Teaching Quality Framework Initiative (<https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/>) with sponsorship by the National Science Foundation (DUE-1725959) - any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

Section A: Environment, Structure, and Implementation

A1) Organized. The instructor's activities were well organized, structured, and made good use of time.

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

A2) Engagement. Students were on task throughout the class and engaged in learning (e.g., interested in the lesson, active student involvement, etc.).

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

A3) Resources. Resources selected for the class (board work, PowerPoints, etc.) were educationally appropriate and appeared valuable (e.g., used various materials to foster student understanding, such as drawings, graphs, physical materials, videos, etc.).

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

A4) Participation. The instructor established a classroom environment that gave all students the opportunity to participate fully (e.g., creates a positive climate that evokes interest and questions from diverse students).

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

A5) Formative Assessment. The instructor took advantage of opportunities to gauge student understanding as the lesson proceeded (e.g., opportunities to ask and answer questions, identify anything unclear, use of clickers, etc.).

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

A6) Active Learning. The instructor employed active learning strategies appropriate for the size and structure of the class (see examples below).

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

Examples of active learning include, but are not limited to:

- Clicker concept questions
- Think-pair-share
- Participatory demonstrations and/or games
- Making time for students to discuss concepts with peers
- Active writing (e.g., minute papers) or speaking (e.g., in class presentations)
- Working through problems, scenarios, and/or arguments with students
- Organizing students for group work
- Routinely asking for and welcoming student input and questions
- Fielding questions in a way that encouraged further discussion
- Demonstrating active listening

Section B: Content

B1) Content. The instructor chose examples and details that were appropriate and worthwhile for helping students learn the content in this course.

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

B2) Accuracy. Instructor's written and spoken content information was accurate (information written on board, in hand-outs, and on tests and quizzes).

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

B3) Depth. The instructor delivered content and answered questions in a way that was consistent with a depth of knowledge of the subject.

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

B4) Significance. During the class it was made explicit to the students why the material is important to learn.

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

B5) Connections. The instructor made appropriate connections to other areas of the discipline, or to real-world applications of the topic.

Evidence / Notes:

☐ *Not applicable*

Section C: Optional Open-Ended Responses

C1) Strengths and positive aspects of the course and/or the instructor’s teaching	
Evidence / Notes:	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable</i>

C2) Suggestions for the instructor to improve their teaching	
Evidence / Notes:	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable</i>