

Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows

University of Washington, Tacoma

June 2016

Kim Davenport, Ehsan Feroz, Linda Ishem,
Tom Koontz (co-chair), Sushil Oswal (co-chair)

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction	1
Section 2: Student Evaluation of Instruction	4
Section 3: Peer Review of Teaching	8
Section 4: Self Assessment of Teaching	14
Section 5: Conclusion and Recommendations	19
Works Cited	
Appendix: UW Tacoma Institute of Technology Policy on Collegial Evaluation and Professional Development of Teaching	

Section 1: Introduction

In November 2014, the Chair of the Faculty Assembly gave The Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows the charge of researching best practices in teaching evaluation and developing a specific action plan of policies and procedures for improving teaching evaluation at University of Washington Tacoma. Faculty Assembly and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs jointly funded the overhead costs of this project. The project charge emphasized that “Teaching evaluation is important to ensuring the quality of teaching on campus, as well as providing appropriate metrics for use in promotion and tenure decisions.” This report provides a summary of this group’s findings and makes recommendations for improving the measures for assessing and developing teaching and learning.

In accordance with the directions of our charge, we completed a literature review of best practices for both formative and summative teaching evaluation, including those that are appropriate for teaching development and those that are appropriate for evaluation for tenure and promotion and lecturer contract renewal. We also conducted two campus surveys—one with unit administrators and another with UWT faculty-- to learn about current unit-level teaching evaluation practices and the perspectives of these stakeholders. The spring survey included 10 unit directors/deans/chairs, while the fall survey included 101 faculty respondents (25% response rate). Based on our synthesis of the findings of the aforesaid sources we came up with our recommendations for the suggested best practices for evaluating and improving teaching on the UWT campus. Table 1 shows the group’s tasks and milestones completed.

Table 1: Campus Fellows Tasks and Milestones Completed

Date	Task / Milestone
Fall 2014	Began work, chaired by Dr. Sushil Oswal.
Winter 2015	Prepared telephone survey questionnaire for UWT unit chairs.
Spring 2015	Student worker implemented the survey. Drafted online survey for all UWT instructors.
Fall 2015	Chaired by Dr. Tom Koontz. Implemented online survey
Winter 2016	Began drafting report based on survey analysis results and best practices literature.
Spring 2016	Finished report; presented to Executive Council

History of Teaching Assessment at UWT:

Before reporting our group’s work, we present a brief history of teaching evaluation at UWT and contextualize it within the University of Washington system. After many Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Program (IAS) and UWT faculty members expressed concern about the limitations of the methods used to assess teaching and learning, during 2005-2006 a steering committee consisting of 10 members of IAS and the UWT Teaching and Learning Roundtable led a pilot project to explore “alternative pathways” to evaluate student learning and faculty teaching. Then director of the UWT Teaching and Learning Center was also a member of this committee and a representative of the UW Center for Instructional Development and Research – (CIDR) and played an advisory role. The project

was funded by a Founder's Endowment Grant, and its four categorized goals were to develop new assessment tools in the following areas:

1. To develop new assessment tools to be used to improve student learning;
2. To improve the teaching peer review process by cultivating techniques of effective classroom observation and peer review of teaching/course materials;
3. To develop an instructor self-assessment process;
4. To develop a teaching portfolio framework that would serve as an additional teaching assessment tool by administration for tenure and promotion.

That steering committee organized four assessment development events, each focusing on one of these areas and led by four nationally recognized teaching assessment scholar-practitioners. The teaching assessment advice from these four Writing Across the Curriculum experts was echoed in the faculty evaluation literature reviewed by the committee. While the 2005-2006 assessment workshops trained the 10 participating UWT faculty in the use of these tools, UWT did not implement this four-pronged, comprehensive program of faculty evaluation that would have represented a holistic, formative and meaningful account of teaching effectiveness. Lack of implementation resulted from leadership changes and insufficient resources necessary for implementing the committee's recommendations.

Crucial Details about Teaching Conditions at UWT Campus

During the past ten years, UWT as a campus has doubled in student population, has added numerous new degree programs across its units, and its faculty has also grown accordingly. In addition, the number of non-tenure track faculty has grown several hundred percent.

Based on December 2015 data from the surveys conducted by this committee, most UWT units still depend on the UW Instructional Assessment System's scannable student evaluation forms and yellow comment sheets supplemented by peer reviews. Student responses to the questions on these forms often evaluate the performance of the instructor and not the quality of the course in promoting student learning. We might underscore here that these student evaluation instruments had been developed with the University of Washington, Seattle, student and faculty population in mind and they do not always reflect the realities of UWT Campus—an urban campus catering to a variety of under-served student population with diverse academic, linguistic, and socio-cultural backgrounds who face different learning challenges than the Seattle campus and where high impact practices are therefore critical for student success. The UWT faculty teaching load (2+2+2 courses for tenure line faculty and 2+2+3 for lecturers) also exceeds that of UW Seattle where the maximum teaching load for tenure line faculty is 2+2 and many are assisted by graduate students. Moreover, UW Seattle faculty are required to submit student evaluations for only one course every year whereas most UWT units require student evaluations of all courses taught. Last, these student evaluation instruments do not take into consideration differences of race, color, and disability among the faculty and students and the limited educational resources available to this campus population.

Linking Teaching Assessment to other Campus Initiatives

We are situated in a unique time for teaching assessment to provide valuable contributions to emerging initiatives at UW Tacoma. Thoughtful development of rigorous, systematic teaching assessment protocols can complement campus strategic planning, high impact teaching practices, and student success. In addition, the UW Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at Seattle is currently preparing a guide to best practices in evaluating teaching for promotion and tenure cases and has been in consultation with our group. As our recommendations indicate, The Best Practices included in the university-wide Guide prepared by CTL need attention from all UWT units as they consider this committee's report.

In September 2015 Chancellor Mark Pagano initiated a campus strategic planning process to create a long-term vision and related priorities, goals, and indicators. The 30-person steering committee has completed outreach to over 1,000 faculty, staff, alumni, and community members. The team is in the process of identifying a number of key goals, including those focusing on fostering student success and better aligning tenure and promotion and lecturer contract renewal criteria with mission. Both of these goals can be furthered by teaching assessment that recognizes and supports teaching excellence. Fostering student success depends on teaching quality, which can be developed and rewarded through best practices in assessing teaching. Aligning tenure and promotion criteria with mission will involve greater attention to assessing multiple dimensions of teaching, to recognize contributions that faculty make to the scholarship of teaching.

Recent efforts to enhance student success have focused on high impact teaching practices. These are evidence-based practices found to be most significant at fostering student learning, such as service learning, undergraduate research, and internships, among others. For first-generation and nontraditional students in a diverse student body, these high impact practices are critical for student success. High impact practices require greater teaching creativity and effort than traditional practices, and thus require better assessment, reward and incentive methods to foster effectiveness. Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Melissa Lavitt, also has supported efforts focusing on high impact practices. In addition, UW Tacoma Lower Division is currently examining issues of student success across general education courses in relation to high impact practices. The group concluded that high impact practices are unevenly distributed across curricula.

A parallel campus-wide effort, the Student Success Task Force, is currently engaged in similar work. After an initial period of exploration of the research, the Task Force is currently engaged in proposing pilot projects to address issues raised. While some of their discussions involve need for student support outside of the classroom, most relate, again, to high-impact teaching practices, particularly for first-generation and nontraditional students.

Section 2: Student Evaluation of Instruction

What we know about its effectiveness from the literature

Student evaluation of instruction has been the subject of a substantial amount of research, both qualitative and quantitative. Several themes emerge from the literature. Student evaluation data can be considered reliable, valid, and useful for both individual faculty and administrative purposes. There are also limitations to the value of student evaluation data, in that it reflects only student perspective, and only at a particular moment in time, typically at the end of a course.

While student evaluation of teaching is a crucial element in the holistic evaluation of teaching, there are several areas of concern if relying on student evaluation data as the only criteria for evaluation of teaching (Pratt 2015; Subtirelu 2015; Reid 2010; Turner et al. 2008). These areas of concern include:

- There is evidence that factors such as the instructor's gender, race, ethnicity, or disability affect student ratings and when these differences exist, students tend to offer their opinion of the person rather than the course taught.
- There is evidence that students' reasons for enrolling in a class, as well as expected grade relative to other courses, can affect student ratings.
- There is evidence that student ratings are affected by course delivery format (online vs. face-to-face courses) as well as evaluation delivery format (online vs. paper).

How it is done and perceived at UWT

Two surveys conducted by this committee shed light on current practices at UWT as regards student evaluation of instruction.

In the Spring 2015 unit administrator survey, responses indicated that the following are areas of common practice in terms of student evaluation of instruction across units at UWT:

- Procedures regarding student evaluation of instruction do not vary by rank;
- Typical practice at UWT is to require that every course is evaluated by students, although this is more than required by the faculty code;
- While some units or individual faculty utilize alternative survey instruments, all units utilize the Instructional Assessment System (IAS) instrument.

Some variation of practice across units was identified, relating to handling of the yellow student comment sheets. One unit responded that only the faculty member has access to these comment sheets, disclosing them to others only as they see fit. Other respondents shared that the director/dean/division chair has access to these comment sheets, and that they are used in discussion with individual faculty about teaching. Still other responses indicated that these comment sheets were a part of the merit review process, therefore making them available to additional faculty within the unit.

In the fall 2015 faculty survey, responses allowed us to drill down into a bit more detail on faculty perception of the importance and use of student evaluations.

Paper vs. Online

Survey responses reflected an even split between paper (47%) and online (48%) administration of evaluations. 55% of respondents stated a preference for paper evaluations, citing higher response rates (85%) and higher assurance that evaluations are filled out (61%) as primary reasons. 45% of respondents stated a preference for online evaluations, with justifications ranging from saving class time (65%) and giving students more time to think about their evaluations (77%) to practical concerns such as capturing

feedback from students who may be absent from class (50%) and ease of administration from the faculty perspective (63%).

Number of Courses Evaluated

Faculty responses to questions about the number of courses evaluated annually confirm the policies stated by program directors/deans, that all courses should be evaluated by students. 92% of respondents stated that their unit requires all of their courses to be evaluated, and 64% of survey respondents stated that they have 6 or more courses evaluated per year. (Only UWT lecturers carry a teaching load of more than six courses a year.) When asked how many courses annually would be considered ideal to have evaluated by students, 35% faculty selected 6 or more, while the remaining 65% of faculty selected smaller numbers.

Purpose of Student Evaluations

The survey also posed questions about how faculty perceive that the standard student evaluation forms (IAS forms) are utilized.

A series of survey questions asked faculty to consider how much weight they feel their unit attaches to various methods of teaching evaluation for the purposes of promotion/tenure as well as annual merit. For both purposes, faculty perceive that student evaluations are by far the highest weighted assessment data compared to other assessment data.

A strong majority of respondents stated that they utilize the results of student evaluations to adjust their teaching: 70% state that they utilize the numerical rating form for this purpose, and 93% state that the free-form comment sheets serve this purpose. Although both forms show strong numbers, it is clear that most respondents find the numerical student evaluations less helpful than free form student comments or peer reviews for improving their teaching (36% of respondents rated numerical student evaluations above the midpoint of the scale (3 or 4), vs. 69% for free form student comments, 51% for peer review, and 25% instructor written self-reflections).

Aside from this purpose for reflection on teaching practices, respondents also perceive other uses for student evaluation data, although with some discrepancy between the numerical rating forms and the free-form comment sheets, as follows (note: respondents were invited to check all that apply).

Table 2: Faculty Perceptions about use of Student Evaluation of Instruction Data

Purpose	Numerical Rating Forms	Free-Form Comment Sheets
For Promotion/tenure decisions	51%	20%
For merit raise review	66%	18%
For contract renewal	44%	16%
For accreditation	8%	2%
Other	18%	20%

This discrepancy suggests an understanding on the part of many faculty that the two separate paper forms (which are not separate in the online format) are handled differently and may serve distinct purposes. 51% of respondents stated that they **do not know** who has access to review the free-form comment data from student evaluations.

Finally, faculty were invited to respond to open-ended questions including ‘What suggestions do you have for improving teaching evaluations and teaching assessment?’ and ‘Is there anything else you want to tell us about teaching evaluation in your unit?’ A sampling of responses which related to the topic of student evaluation of teaching are presented below:

Table 3: Faculty Open-ended Comments about Student Evaluation of Instruction

Theme	Comment
Equity	We know there are problems with teaching evals for a variety of reasons. There are also gender and ethnicity/racial factors that impact teaching evaluations. How does one control for that??
Equity	Start acknowledging the power dynamics inherent to faculty status (i.e. lecturers are very vulnerable).
Too much emphasis on student evaluations	Too much emphasis on student evaluations that do not ask the "right questions" to really get at excellence.
Too much emphasis on student evaluations	Student numerical ratings are quick, easy criterion for teaching evaluation. But too much emphasis on it may not be good. When comparing teaching effectiveness of instructors from different disciplines, too much reliance on student numerical ratings is also unfair.
Process	Greater transparency for students might be helpful, too (i.e. "this is how we use your evaluation"). Right now that seems to happen only on an ad hoc basis.
Process	Don't use evaluations for tenure/promotion decisions. It makes the feedback useless.
Process	Let each instructor know what percent of student eval material is being counted. Why not let the students respond but only use one set of data for a year. If instructor teaches 4 courses in the year, let them choose the one set of evaluation data they want to represent their work.
Limitations of IAS forms	Feel my colleagues have settled for a poor system of teaching evaluation because it is easy to just rely on IAS numbers.
Limitations of IAS forms	I would suggest some other type of student evaluation than numerical ranking and written comments. Most comments have nothing to do with teaching effectiveness; consequently, they are not helpful to professors.
Limitations of IAS forms	More varied methods - not such heavy reliance on one type of student evaluation (the bubble forms and comment sheets).
Limitations of IAS forms	Stop using "one size fits" all approaches. Sure there's a variety of forms to select from but they don't take into account the composition of the student population. Some faculty teach mostly freshmen whose ability to evaluate is very different from the senior with more class time experience.

Suggested best practices

As stated at the outset, student evaluation of instruction is a crucial element in the holistic evaluation of teaching when it complements evidence from other means of evaluating teaching both formatively and summatively. UWT's practice of requiring student evaluation of all/most courses taught exceeds that of all other colleges of the University of Washington, and this is also more than what is required by the faculty code. Only 35% of UWT faculty support this practice.

As recommended by the University of Washington's "Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices" (2016) and supported by the comprehensive research conducted by the University of Washington group in charge of developing this guide, our research also overwhelmingly demonstrates that in order to address the problems with the current teaching evaluation practices by the various UWT units, and to design and implement a meaningful and more reliable teaching evaluation system, UWT units should not rely solely on student evaluations for judging teaching effectiveness. Rather, they should give equal emphasis to other constructive measures for faculty growth and judging teaching—peer reviews and self-assessment—and bring UWT's practice of evaluating all courses in line

with other colleges of the University of Washington. Here, it is important to note that a majority of courses at UWT are now taught by non-tenure line lecturers and untenured faculty, who tend not to have reduced teaching loads and also teach most of our first year and required, lower division curriculum. Our consultations with UWT Faculty Assembly Executive Committee and the UWT Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Faculty-of-Color group further underscored that minority faculty are more adversely affected by the current over reliance on student evaluations and by the lack of well-designed peer review and self-assessment instruments and training across the various UWT units.

Finally, we recommend a review of the purpose and appropriate use of the free-form comment portion of the student evaluation. Our survey of program directors/deans reflected varying practices about how this data was used in faculty annual reviews. Our faculty survey also revealed that many faculty in various units do not have information available about who has access to view the data in the yellow comment sheets. It is worth mentioning that the instructions on the paper form quoted below also mislead students to believe that the data is being shared directly with faculty only, rather than being used for faculty annual reviews or any other purpose:

“Your handwritten comments in response to the following questions **will be returned to the instructor** after grades are turned in. We encourage you to respond to all questions as thoughtfully and constructively as possible. **Your comments will be used by the instructor to improve the course.** However, you are not required to answer any questions.”

Teaching assessment literature across the board emphasizes that attention to appropriate use of data such as student comments is important if it is to contribute to a robust system of teaching assessment. This includes clear guidelines and transparency in communicating what data are used for what purposes.

Curiously enough, the last clause of the above instruction on the Student Evaluation Form, “However, you are not required to answer any questions.” Specifically discourages students from putting an effort in providing their professors with some qualitative, and more meaningful, feedback on the course.

Last, the UWT faculty in charge of 2016 Strengthening Educational Excellence with Diversity (SEED) Institute, an initiative funded by UWT Chancellor, communicated to our group a major gap in the present UW and UWT teaching evaluation instruments and guidelines. While several degree programs at UWT presently have curricula engaging issues of diversity and equity, neither student evaluation instruments, nor the peer review guidelines ask for how a faculty's teaching and course content excels in matters of inclusion, diversity, and equity. This gap is particularly glaring for our context because UWT defines itself as an urban-serving campus and diversity issues are of central concern to Tacoma community, but nowhere are we evaluating how we are doing in this crucial aspect of our teaching mission to provide our faculty with feedback.

In addition to the above major recommendations on student evaluation practices, we also recommend continuing to allow both paper and online formats for student evaluations. Faculty responses to our survey questions reflect equal usage of both formats, with valid pedagogical and practical considerations factoring in to either choice.

Section 3: Peer Review of Instruction

What we know about peer review of teaching

Peer review of teaching can provide useful information for a variety of purposes. In particular, this method has strengths in capturing student-teacher interactions and teacher behaviors as they occur in context, documenting nuances and details of practice dynamics, and providing information that is complementary to student perceptions of teaching (AAAS 2013; Berk 2006). On the other hand, challenges include the need for training to obtain reliable data across observers, development of rubrics and tools for observation, and resource intensiveness (AAAS 2013; Berk et al. 2004).

Key considerations in peer review include (1) who will conduct the peer review, (2) which course components will be included in the peer review, (3) how the peer review will be conducted, and (4) what the review will be used for.

(1) While content experts are helpful for assessing course content, non-experts may be at least as well or better positioned to assess pedagogy from the perspective of a “naïve learner” (Chism 1999; Muchinsky 1995-cited in Chism 1999; AAAS 2013).

(2) Berk et al (2004) argue that peer review should include both peer review of teaching materials and class observations. The former is more cost-effective, efficient, and reliable, while the latter provides a better glimpse into teaching in practice.

(3) A report from the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) reviewed a variety of observation protocols for peer review of instruction in 2013. A key recommendation was the use of well-developed protocols to guide observations. The report notes that “unstructured observations by untrained observers are too often used to assess faculty teaching effectiveness, resulting in inconsistency, lack of specificity about what practices or incidents are considered important, and charges of subjectivity” (pp. 29-30). The report recommends that instructors and departments develop a protocol for peer review of teaching, which includes not only classroom observation, but also pre- and post-class meetings between the teacher and the reviewer.

For teachers whose approach centers on active learning, faculty at the University of Washington Seattle have developed an observation tool based on best practices in that approach. Eddy et al. (2015) have developed and tested the PORTAAL (Practical Observation Rubric To Assess Active Learning) in undergraduate science courses. This tool helps observers document teacher behavior around four dimensions of active learning: practice, logic development, accountability, and apprehension reduction. These dimensions are operationalized as 21 observable elements. The authors recommend using this tool while viewing recorded class sessions, rather than “live,” to allow the viewer to pause as needed to record observations. To enhance reliability they randomly selected three class sessions for a particular course taught by a given instructor, and two viewers coded 21 elements in terms of time spent doing each element. The results provide objective, reliable data about the extent to which different teachers exhibit behaviors thought to promote active learning. While this protocol is resource-heavy, the authors argue it provides valuable feedback for teachers wanting to increase active learning behaviors, and summative feedback as part of a suite of teaching assessment data on which to base personnel decisions.

(4) There is some disagreement in the literature about the appropriate uses for peer review of teaching. AAAS (2013) argues that classroom observations can be used for both formative and summative assessment. On the other hand, numerous researchers have cautioned against using peer review of teaching for summative assessment (Berk et al. 2004; Arreola 2000; Centra 1999).

In considering items (1) – (4), a leading scholar on peer review of instruction, Nancy Chism, argues that effective peer review must be situated within a comprehensive system of teaching assessment. She notes that developing such a system requires leadership at the departmental, college, and institutional level (Chism 1999). Moreover, clear guidelines for teaching assessment, including peer review, should be accessible to all. Development of such systems will require resources, such as expert help in creating them and leadership to ensure commitment to the effort (Chism 1999). Sustained discussion among faculty are crucial to gain input, build ownership, and agree on what areas of teaching to assess, what standards should be, how to gather evidence, and where to obtain necessary resources.

How peer review of teaching is done and perceived at UWT

The UW Faculty Code Section 24-57 Part A requires a “collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness” to be done prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion. In addition some faculty ranks must have such a peer review conducted annually: lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor without tenure, or professor without tenure. Other faculty members must have such a peer review conducted at least every three years. The Code leaves it up to the department, school, or college to establish procedures for the peer review.

Two surveys conducted by this committee shed light on a range of current practices at UWT regarding peer observation of teaching.

Peer Observation-related Data from the Survey of Unit Heads

In the Spring 2015 survey, of the 10 directors/deans/chairs responding, 3 indicated a requirement for peer review of all tenure line faculty annually, while the remaining 7 indicated “other,” most following the Faculty Code minimum frequency (including annual review of assistant professors), although two departments/divisions peer review associate professors with tenure every two years rather than every three years.

When asked who is considered a “peer” for peer review of tenure line faculty, 4 respondents indicated any full time faculty, while 3 indicated any faculty member equal or above in rank.

Four respondents indicated their unit has a specific formal process for peer review of tenure line faculty. All four of these units require the peer review to include a classroom observation, and two of these indicated that the peer review protocol exists in written form. In other words, for most units, there is no formalization of what the observation should include or which observation tools should be used.

Of the 10 directors/deans/chairs responding regarding non-tenure line faculty, all indicated a requirement for peer review of full time faculty annually, while there is some variation with regard to part-time non-tenure line faculty. One unit conducts peer review of part-time non-tenure line faculty during the first quarter and then every third or fourth quarter, while another unit does not conduct peer reviews of part-time non-tenure line faculty.

Units use peer review of teaching data for several purposes. Of the 7 directors/deans/chairs responding to a question about use, 6 indicated their unit uses these data for contract renewal, 7 for promotion/tenure decisions, 6 for merit review.

In terms of weight given to peer evaluations versus student evaluations, 1 respondent indicated peer evaluations are more important than student evaluations, while 2 respondents indicated the reverse, and 1 indicated equal weight to both.

Finally, respondents were asked to comment on aspects of teaching assessments that work well, do not work well, and suggestions for improvement. With respect to what works well, two respondents indicated that peer review of teaching is a good way for teachers to learn from each other, and one mentioned it is useful to identify areas of concern. With respect to what does not work well, one respondent indicated that peer review feedback is often too limited in scope, and one respondent mentioned that peer reviews are uniformly positive, which reduces their value for detecting problems. With respect to suggestions for improvement of peer review, one respondent suggested the use of rubrics to provide more meaningful feedback, another suggested it would be helpful to have a variety of peer review assessment tools to better measure teaching, and another suggested collaborative discussions to develop ideas for positive rather than punitive assessments and to engage faculty in sharing teaching ideas.

Peer Observation-related Data from the Survey of All Faculty

The Fall 2015 survey yielded data on a variety of current practices and perceptions:

Frequency of peer review: Most respondents indicated they are peer reviewed once per year (46 %) or once every two years (23 %), with smaller numbers reporting other (13 %), never (10%), once per rank (5%), or once per quarter (4%). When asked about the last 12 months, 68% of respondents indicated having a peer review of teaching done, and of those 71% viewed the peer review as above the midpoint of the scale from Not Helpful to Very Helpful.

Who is a “peer”: Two of the non-mutually exclusive categories were indicated by over half of the respondents, Person of higher rank than me (56%) and Person with teaching expertise from whom I can learn (55%). Sizable minorities indicated the responses Full-time instructor/faculty (41%), Person at the same rank as me (39%) and Tenured or tenure-track faculty (36%). Most respondents reported selecting their own peer reviewers (76%), compared to unit chair or supervisor choosing (19%).

Formal process: When asked if their unit has a formal process for peer review that they follow, most respondents indicated No (49%) or Don't know (22%), while 29% indicated Yes. For those indicating Yes, 59% indicated the process differs by rank. In most cases, the differences were that lower ranked faculty received more frequent feedback. One respondent indicated in their unit untenured faculty get peer review data from multiple sources.

For carrying out the peer review process, the survey asked respondents about 11 practices that could be used, to determine how often they occur at UWT and how useful they are to the respondent (see Table 4). Results indicate that the most common practices are observing one or part of one class session (93% of respondents indicated this occurs), providing a letter of evaluation (90%), reviewing the course syllabus (73%), meeting after the review to talk about teaching (69%), and reviewing other course materials (60%). Regarding usefulness, all of the practices were rated as above the midpoint of the scale by most of the respondents experiencing them, led by meeting after the review to talk about teaching (91% of respondents), providing a letter of evaluation (87%), observing one or part of one class session (86%), and using a rubric to guide the class observation (85%). It is interesting to note that the use of a rubric to guide classroom observation is rated among the top four most-helpful items but among the two rarest practices (11% of the time).

Table 4: Frequency and Usefulness of Various Peer Review Practices

Practice	Proportion of respondents using practice	Proportion of those respondents rating practice above midpoint of scale from Not Helpful to Very Helpful
Met with me before the review to talk about my teaching	47 %	70 %
Observed one or part of one class session	93	86
Observed more than one class session	11	64
Used a rubric to guide the class observation	11	85
Talked with students in the course	21	75
Reviewed my course syllabus	78	67
Reviewed my course handouts, assignments, tests, & other materials	60	77
Reviewed my grading/feedback to students	19	72
Met with me after the review to talk about my teaching	69	91
Provided me or my supervisor/unit chair a letter of Evaluation	90	87
Provided me or my supervisor/unit chair other kinds of written feedback	16	81

Use of peer review data: Peer review data are most commonly used for formative purposes, as 83% of respondents reported using it “to adjust my teaching.” For summative purposes, 65% reported using it for their merit/annual review, 53% for tenure/promotion decisions, and 45% for contract renewal.

Respondents were asked to estimate the relative weight their unit placed on peer review of teaching data in the teaching portion of tenure/promotion decisions. The question asked respondents to apportion weights among four types of data, to equal 100%: peer evaluations, student evaluations, instructor written self-reflections, and other evaluations. Peer evaluations averaged second-highest among the four options, between 20 and 30 %. Similarly, for annual/merit decisions, peer evaluations averaged second-highest, just below 20%.

Perceived effectiveness of peer review compared to other methods: Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of 10 different teaching evaluation methods, as currently practiced in their unit. Peer review of teaching was rated above the midpoint of the scale from Not Effective to Very Effective by 46% of respondents. This is similar to both student evaluation free-form comments and instructor written self-reflections, both of which were rated above the midpoint of the scale by 48% of respondents. In contrast, student evaluation numerical ratings was rated above the midpoint of the scale by only 29% of respondents.

Suggestions for improving teaching assessment: In response to an open-ended question, 55 respondents provided suggestions for improving teaching assessment. 12 wrote specifically about peer review of teaching, focusing mainly on a desire to develop formal processes based on evidence-based practices, have peer reviews done more regularly, have peer reviews foster constructive feedback among colleagues to improve teaching, and reward faculty who provide thoughtful peer reviews (see Table 5).

Table 5: Open-ended Comments on How to Improve Teaching Assessment Related to Peer Review of Teaching

Theme	Comment
Formalize processes	Provide formal guidance for peer review of teaching, to provide evidence based suggestions for improvement
Formalize processes	Specific formal process for peer-review, with well-understood metrics and objectives.
Formalize processes	If we are really serious about producing a body of evaluation data for all faculty, then we should put a formal process of peer evaluation in place and take the time to do it correctly.
Formalize processes	A formalization of the peer review would be helpful.
Formalize processes	I also suggest that more formal mentoring and peer review policies be put into place.
More regular	We should probably have more regular peer review and feedback in our unit
More regular	Have more peer reviews done regularly
Constructive feedback	Require evaluations by peers or supervisors, with the goal of helping me to improve as a teacher
Constructive feedback	Honest peer evaluation that do not just focus on the positive but improvements to be made.
Constructive feedback	The reviewer needs to take the time to give thoughtful, constructive feedback, and the teacher needs to apply that feedback
Constructive feedback	I think it would be more helpful to discuss best practices with peers that teach similar classes
Reward faculty who provide thoughtful peer reviews	The current system doesn't reward faculty for observing others' teaching, talking to them before or after, or even writing letters that actually reflect places of possible improvement or strengths.

Recommendations

Peer review can provide valuable information to improve teaching effectiveness. Best practices suggested by scholars, as well as some of our UWT faculty who responded to the survey, indicate a need to address four components: who will conduct the peer review, which course components will be included in the peer review, how the peer review will be conducted, and what it will be used for. The answers to these questions will likely vary by teaching unit, and in fact the UW Faculty Code is silent on process details. But these answers should not be ad hoc. Rather, it is important for units to engage faculty in developing answers via a protocol for peer review of teaching.

On the question of who should conduct the peer review, current practice at UWT seems to be any full time faculty, with a preference for someone at or above the rank of the teacher being reviewed. It is not known the degree to which the reviewer is a content expert in the teacher's field. Scholarship on peer review of teaching suggests content expertise is not a prerequisite for effective peer review of a teacher's pedagogy. On the other hand, as one UWT faculty member commented on the survey, "it would be more helpful to discuss best practices with peers that teach similar classes."

In determining which course components to include in a peer review, and how the review will be conducted, there is ample scholarship to guide us. In particular, an effective peer review system should include not only classroom observation, but also examination of course materials and meetings with the teacher before and after the observations. Other elements that UWT survey respondents indicated as helpful include observation of more than one class session, talking with students in the course, and

reviewing grading/feedback to students. Peer review processes should be guided by an agreed-upon rubric that fosters reliable, useful feedback. Unfortunately, few unit heads or faculty across campus indicate their peer review is guided by any such formal process. Thus we recommend that units identify the most appropriate practices for their unit, given best practices from teaching scholarship and the learning goals they promote for their students.

To answer the question of how peer review data should be used, we turn to the characterization of teaching assessment into two main types, formative and summative. Scholarship on peer review is divided on the value of peer review for these types. Some scholars argue that peer review data is appropriate only for formative assessment, that is to provide teachers with developmental feedback to improve their teaching. Others argue that peer review data can be useful for both formative and summative assessment – evaluating for personnel decisions such as merit review, tenure/promotion and reappointment. A large majority of UWT faculty indicate peer review data is currently used for formative purposes, while a smaller majority indicate it is used for summative purposes. In Promotion and Tenure cases, UW expects peer reviews as an essential piece in the candidate's dossier. When it is used for summative purposes, faculty perceive it carries less weight than student evaluations. This raises the question, is current practice appropriate for each unit? Should peer review data be used for summative purposes, and if so then how much weight should it be given?

Overall, bringing UWT peer review of teaching practices in line with recognized best practices identified from scholarship and UWT faculty survey respondents will require dedicated resources. While the Campus Fellows group has invested considerable time and effort in analyzing best practices and current practices, much more needs to be done. There is no one-size-fits all solution for conducting effective peer reviews across various disciplines. Local units must develop best fitting practices for their faculty, guided by overall considerations of disciplinary best practices. Thoughtful engagement by a wide range of faculty will require that most precious of resources, time. Current demands of teaching loads, service, and research may very well preclude such engagement. We suggest that units consider ways to free up faculty time to develop effective peer review of teaching protocols appropriate for their units, and to reward such peer reviews. For example, units may consider course buyout for a faculty member to conduct multiple PRTs, or count literature-based peer review of teaching feedback as scholarship of teaching akin to reviewing a journal article or book.

Section 4: Self Assessment of Teaching

Self-ratings are an important source of evidence to consider in formative and summative decisions. Faculty input on their own teaching completes the triangulation of the three direct-observation sources of teaching performance: students, peer (or experts), and self. Berk 2006

Introduction

Higher Education faculty members are traditionally expected to teach, research and perform community service. At research intensive and extensive doctoral granting universities, like University of Washington, research is paramount. In contrast, at institutions like our *urban serving* UW Tacoma campus, teaching is paramount. With these fundamental differences in focus and mission our campus faces challenging incongruities when applying UW Seattle based faculty evaluation criteria. For example, while research is a significant consideration on the Tacoma campus, our tenured and tenure-track faculty carry substantially heavier teaching and service loads than our Seattle peers. Similarly, over half of the classes on our campus are taught by lecturers, whose performance is evaluated solely on their teaching and service.

With student success, teaching and teaching effectiveness foregrounded on our campus; and with tenure, promotion, merit and contract extensions more dependent on teaching assessment; it is imperative that UW Tacoma establish evaluation methods aligned with our mission and values; methods that are transparent, measurable, consistent, and fair. In addition to student and peer assessment, we believe that comprehensive self-assessment is essential for formative (professional improvement and development) and summative (merit, promotion and contract renewal) purposes. A record of self assessment can provide faculty peers and administrators an excellent measure of a faculty member's teaching efforts and long-term improvement in their classroom performance.

Berk's (2006) meta-analysis of faculty self-rating literature published from 1968 through 2004, determined that research on the topic of faculty impartiality in rating their teaching performance was "skimpy and inconclusive" (pg.23). Even in fields invested in instructor training, Berk's findings ranged from faculty rating themselves higher than, equal to and lower than students rated them. Despite the possibility of personal bias, Berk, in agreement with a 1974 AAUP study, concludes that self-ratings, in conjunction with other sources, improve the faculty review and teaching assessment process. Self-assessment allows faculty to reflect upon, evaluate and demonstrate their perceived content knowledge, pedagogy and effectiveness of their teaching.

Self-assessment can take numerous forms. Among the simplest is to rate oneself using the student evaluation form. Then prepare a narrative reflection that critically considers discrepancies between self-ratings and actual student ratings, and focuses on areas for improvement. At the other end of the spectrum is the Teaching Portfolio, an assemblage of many sources of evidence most often associated tenure and promotion decisions. A teaching portfolio (P. 36) may include three categories of evidence: 1. Description of Teaching Responsibilities (courses taught, independent studies, thesis committees, training grant, presentations); 2. Reflective Analysis (philosophy of teaching, innovative pedagogy, mentorship, awards); and 3. Artifacts (syllabi, sample student work, student ratings, peer ratings, videos of teaching).

According to the Faculty Code

UW Faculty Code Section 24-57 Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations

Notably the two paragraph introduction to this section of the Code is silent on teaching, teaching effectiveness, and student learning. While this glaring omission is likely an artifact of UW's R-1 status that subordinates teaching to research and scholarly pursuits; the second paragraph opens the possibility for department, school, college and University goals and expectations related to teaching, as follows:

Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a department holds for him or her and of the manner in which his or her activities contribute to the current and future goals of the department, school, college, and University.

Subsection A, titled *Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness*, explicitly describes the requirements and frequency of student and peer evaluations but makes no reference to self-assessment of teaching. However subsequent Subsections B. **Yearly Activity Report**; and C. **Regular Conference with Faculty** establish a schedule and mechanisms for self-assessment of teaching specifically for purposes of tenure, promotion, merit salary, and in the case of lecturers for contract renewal.

... each faculty member will have the opportunity to provide information on professional activities carried out during the prior year. ... and shall be used as reference and as a source of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. - B

Each year the chair ... shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors and professors "without tenure". ... [topics will include] department's present needs and goals with respect to the department's mission statement and the faculty member's present teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities and accomplishments - C

Self-Evaluation-related Data from the UWT Faculty Survey

While faculty code allows it, and literature supports self-evaluation as an essential component of teaching assessment; UW Tacoma faculty respondents to the autumn 2015 survey expressed mixed reviews of self-assessment. Across campus there is substantial confusion and inconsistency related to the use and purpose of teaching self-assessment. Most believe that self-assessment plays a nominal role in summative decisions. More importantly faculty respondents had no idea how their academic unit (or the campus) defines teaching excellence. Two notable bright spots: first, faculty respondents who conduct teaching self-assessments report satisfaction with the practice and its effectiveness in improving their teaching. Second, despite the perceived absence of rewards/recognition for teaching improvements a majority of respondents (91%) say it is extremely to very important to improve their teaching.

How Used by Academic Unit: More than half of survey respondents acknowledged limited or no use of self-assessment in their programs. When asked how teaching self-assessments are used in their academic units, 55% of respondents reported that the method is not used; 30% use self-assessment to adjust their teaching; 27% said it is used for promotion and tenure; 23% for merit annual review; and 11% for contract renewal.

Weight in T/P decisions: 59% of respondents reported that they believe teaching self-reflections bare no weight in T/P decisions. Another 32% specified a nominal weighting of 10-20%.

Weight in annual Merit Review: An overwhelming 75% of respondents reported that written self-reflections have no influence on merit decisions; while another 17% assigned 10-20% weighting.

Effectiveness of teaching evaluation methods: When asked about written self-evaluation 48% checked N/A; 16% indicated that it was ineffective; while 35% said written self-ratings are very to moderately effective methods of teaching evaluation.

Improving Teaching: Asked whether they had completed teaching self-assessment in the past 12 months 63% said no; and another 25% indicated that they had and found the practice to be moderately to very helpful for improving their teaching. In response to a related question 51% of respondents indicated that the lack of rewards/recognition for improving teaching was no barrier to improving their teaching; and 91% rated improving their teaching as extremely (58%) or very important (33%).

What Best Practices Look Like

Unexpectedly, the quest for best practices in self-assessment of teaching and teaching effectiveness highlights the UW Tacoma Institute of Technology Policy on Collegial Evaluation and Professional Development of Teaching effective 4/18/14 (see Appendix).

<http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/institute-technology/policy-collegial-evaluation-professional-development-teaching>

Although uncertain how effectively the policy has been implemented, the policy itself contains the five desirable, best practice, elements of teaching self-assessment:

1. **Purpose** – to foster a collegial culture of teaching excellence by emphasizing observation as a formative process of professional development. The underlying values for this policy are based on the principles of professionalism whereby all faculty members provide evidence for evaluation of their teaching effectiveness...
2. **Definition of terms** – Principles of professionalism (rather than the preferred teaching excellence)
 - a. Intellectual and public honesty: Faculty members have an implicit ethic that demands we tell ourselves and others truths insofar as we understand them.
 - b. Self-knowledge: Professionals seek to examine and articulate their own behaviors, assumptions, feelings, and thoughts in an on-going effort to gain deeper insight into our professional practices.
 - c. Duty to improve: Each of us has a duty to reflect on our strengths and weaknesses and make use of that knowledge to plan and execute strategies for improvements. The default assumption is that all faculty members, tenured, tenure-track, full-time and part-time lecturers will adhere to these principles. The intent of this policy is primarily to offer the opportunity for every faculty member to provide public demonstration of their professionalism in teaching in order to build mutual respect and trust as a foundation for a collegial culture.
3. **Summative/Formative Uses** – All full-time faculty members will write a teaching narrative as part of their annual reports that will be used by the voting faculty senior in rank, as per Faculty Code, for the purpose of assessing merit status. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to write a clear summary of their experiences with regard to teaching effectiveness, reflect on those experiences and their outcomes, and provide evidence of effectiveness. The narrative should focus on courses taught, their stated outcomes, and evidence that those outcomes were achieved. But it should also include a self-reflection of effectiveness in terms of what methods were adopted, what seemed to work well (and why) and what might have not worked as well as expected (and why). It should include discussions of new methods attempted and reasons for

adopting them. This section of the annual report can include, at the discretion of the faculty member, any testimonial statements given by students that provide additional evidence of effectiveness.

4. **Goal Setting in Meeting with the Director** – All teaching observation activity should be reviewed at the meeting with the Director as part of determining reasonable goals to set for the following academic year. The agreed upon goals should become part of the annual merit letter. Along with this goal setting exercise the Director and the faculty member should review the prior year's goals and discuss what progress had been made toward achieving them. If there are problems in meeting goals then the Director and the faculty member should discuss how the problems can be eliminated.
5. **Process** -
 - a. Summary of Teaching Activities in the Prior Year – Course numbers/titles, quarters (including the one in which the report is written), number of students. Prior experiences with these courses (how many times taught, how many years, etc.) Additional teaching-related activities, which might include: students mentored and advised for research, internships, projects, etc.
 - b. Assessment of Student Evaluation Scores, General Abilities and Motivations – Summarize student evaluation scores and comments for all listed courses. Explain how these scores and comments have changed over time. Describe the general level of student motivation, how they respond to your teaching, and the degree to which students are reaching a course's learning objectives.
 - c. Your Self-Assessment of Effective Teaching and Methods – Provide evidence of “effective teaching” and explain, if appropriate, how your perspective has changed over time. Describe how you implement the methods you use most often (e.g. lecture, discussion, exercises, interaction, active learning), and why they're appropriate in the context of the courses you have taught. Describe any barriers that inhibit effective teaching.
 - d. Summary of Formative Teaching Activities – Provide a list of formative teaching activities you have participated in since the last annual review, including classroom observations and any teaching-related workshops or conferences you've attended. Discuss what you learned from these activities and describe anything new that you have tried in an effort to improve your teaching effectiveness.
 - e. Achievements – Describe your teaching-related achievements attained, such as teaching awards and grants, as well as course or curriculum development activities you have participated in since the last review. You may include achievements that are the integration of activities over several years.
 - f. Other – Please provide any other ideas or thoughts you have and would like to share with the faculty regarding teaching effectiveness.

Recommendations

In light of best practices for self-assessment, and current practices at UW Tacoma, we offer the following recommendations:

1. Define terms: Teaching Excellence, Teaching Effectiveness, and Student Success are key terms that should be in alignment with the strategic planning process and attempts to better define UW Tacoma's distinct mission as an urban serving university. Also efforts to define and improve student success and persistence, reduce attrition and boost the 6 year graduation rate must be informed by student participation. What specifically constitutes student success? And most relevant to this discussion of Teaching Evaluation, what role does teaching effectiveness play in

student success? And how do we define, operationalize and measure teaching effectiveness? Faculty can't achieve a goal (teaching excellence) that has not been defined.

2. Once defined, effective teaching must be supported, encouraged and rewarded. Resources must be available to help with professional development, whether mentoring, workshops, fellowships/scholarships, coaching, etc. for assessment and improvement.
3. Revise the current tripartite system of teaching evaluation based on the recommendations contained in this report. Provide guidelines and be transparent about how each component of teaching evaluation will be used and how the three parts (student, peer and self-evaluation) work together.
4. Teaching effectiveness, its evaluation, promotion and resulting rewards should be taken seriously and foregrounded in association with its centrality to UWT's Urban Serving mission and core values related to access, excellence, diversity, innovation and community.
5. Based on our institutional context and the importance of teaching, all faculty members should be cognizant of their teaching effectiveness and its influence of student success and as a result be required to annually assess the effectiveness of their teaching; as a condition of merit review, promotion, tenure and contract renewal. This can be accomplished as one component of the annual activities report, and it should include reflection on what worked, what didn't, and ideas for improvement.

Section 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

Our literature review, the campus administrator and faculty surveys, and the findings of the CTL group lead by Beth Kalikoff for defining Best Practices for evaluating faculty teaching arrive at the same conclusion. Student evaluations, peer observations, and faculty self-assessment through teaching portfolio and other means appropriate to their discipline together can provide a better measure of teaching effectiveness. These combined measures can also assist faculty members improve their teaching on a regular basis because the former two measures can be designed to provide excellent formative feedback to teachers for improving classroom performance and further developing curricular excellence. The High Impact Practices discussed in the introduction of this document can be further strengthened through well-structured and administratively resourced peer observation and self-assessment practices.

It is important to note that UW Tacoma faculty are open to continuing their teaching development, and meaningful assessment can play an important role. Responding to the question, “Overall, how important is it to you to improve your teaching?” 91% of faculty respondents indicated 4 or 5 on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important). Respondents cited the biggest barriers to improving their teaching as time, teaching load, and class sizes (see Table 6).

Table 6: Faculty reported barriers to improving teaching

Barrier	% indicating 3 or 4 on scale from 0 (not a barrier) to 4 (very much a barrier)
Other obligations crowd out time to improve teaching	59%
Teaching load (number of courses taught) is too big	47%
Class sizes (number of students) are too big	36%
Lack of rewards/recognition for improving my teaching	32%
Lack of opportunities to participate in events to improve my teaching	23%
Lack of information about how to improve teaching	20%
Lack of interest on my part in improving teaching	3%

The UW Tacoma Teaching Evaluation Fellows recommend the following actions:

1. Each unit should review its teaching assessment guidelines to ensure that they match best practices for student, peer, and self-assessment as described in this report and the UW Best Practices Guide. These guidelines should clearly identify which kinds of teaching assessment will be used for which purposes, and how much weight they will be given in merit, contract renewal, and promotion and tenure decisions.
2. Each unit should define teaching excellence for their unit and in these deliberations directly address the diverse needs of our students and equity for our minority faculty.
3. Promoting high impact practices and other teaching innovations, and providing effective teaching assessment, require resources and the removal of barriers. This includes but is not limited to: reducing faculty teaching loads to allow time for training and provision of thorough and systematic peer review, recognizing self-assessments as a critical component in merit review, contract renewal and promotion and tenure decisions, and supporting the participatory development of student success, teaching excellence and of appropriate teaching assessment systems for each teaching unit level.

Works Cited

AAAS (American Association for the Advancement of Science) 2013. Describing and Measuring Undergraduate STEM Teaching Practices. A Report from a National Meeting on the Measurement of Undergraduate Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Teaching, December 17-19, 2012.

Arreola, R. A. (2000). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A handbook for college faculty and administrators on designing and operating a comprehensive faculty valuation system*, (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Benton, S. L., & Cashin, W. E. (2012). Student Ratings of Teaching: A Summary of Research and Literature (IDEA Paper #50). Manhattan, KS: The IDEA Center.

Berk, Ronald A., Phyllis L. Naumann, and Susan E. Appling. "Beyond student ratings: Peer observation of classroom and clinical teaching." *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship* 1.1 (2004).

Berk, Ronald A. *Thirteen strategies to measure college teaching: A consumer's guide to rating scale construction, assessment, and decision making for faculty, administrators, and clinicians*. Stylus Publishing, LLC., 2006.

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. (2016). Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*.

Centra, J. A. (1999). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chism, N. 1999. *Peer review of teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publications.

Eddy, Sarah L., Mercedes Converse, and Mary Pat Wenderoth. 2015. "PORTAAL: a classroom observation tool assessing evidence-based teaching practices for active learning in large science, technology, engineering, and mathematics classes." *CBE-Life Sciences Education* 14.2: ar23.

Huston, Therese A. (2006). Race and Gender Bias in Higher Education: Could Faculty Course Evaluations Impede Further Progress Toward Parity? *Seattle Journal for Social Justice*: Vol. 4: Iss. 2, Article 34.

Huston, Theresa A. (2005). Research Report: Race and Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching. Compiled by Dr. Huston, Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning, Seattle University.

MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2015). What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40(4), 291-303.

Pratt, Carla D. 2015. "Teacher Evaluations Could Be Hurting Faculty Diversity at Universities." *New York Times* Dec 16. <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2015/12/16/is-it-fair-to-rate-professors-online/teacher-evaluations-could-be-hurting-faculty-diversity-at-universities>

Reid, L. D. 2010. The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessors.com. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 3(3), 137.

Subtirelu, N. C. 2015. 'She does have an accent but...': Race and language ideology in students' evaluations of mathematics instructors on RateMyProfessors.com. *Language in Society*, 44(1), 35-62.

Turner, C.S.V., J.C. Gonzalez, and J.L. Wood. 2008. Faculty of Color in Academe: What 20 Years of Literature Tells Us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 1(3): 139-168.

Appendix: UW Tacoma Institute of Technology Policy

<http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/institute-technology/policy-collegial-evaluation-professional-development-teaching>

Policy on Collegial Evaluation and Professional Development of Teaching

Draft Date: 2/13/14

Revision Date: 4/13/14

Adopted Date: 4/18/14

Effective As Of: 4/18/14

Purpose of the Policy

As the Institute expands its faculty and program offerings, we maintain professionalism through a collegial process of teaching review can help faculty develop. Therefore, the purpose of this policy is to foster a collegial culture of teaching excellence by emphasizing observation as a formative process of professional development. The underlying values for this policy are based on the principles of professionalism whereby all faculty members provides evidence for evaluation of their teaching effectiveness in accordance with the requirements of the Faculty Code.

Principles of Professionalism

The following principles are recognized as those guiding the faculty peer reviews of teaching.

- Intellectual and public honesty: Faculty members have an implicit ethic that demands we tell ourselves and others truths insofar as we understand them.
- Self-knowledge: Professionals seek to examine and articulate their own behaviors, assumptions, feelings, and thoughts in an on-going effort to gain deeper insight into our professional practices.
- Duty to improve: Each of us has a duty to reflect on our strengths and weaknesses and make use of that knowledge to plan and execute strategies for improvements. The default assumption is that all faculty members, tenured, tenure-track, full-time and part-time lecturers will adhere to these principles. The intent of this policy is primarily to offer the opportunity for every faculty member to provide public demonstration of their professionalism in teaching in order to build mutual respect and trust as a foundation for a collegial culture.

Policy Scope

The policy will encompass the collegial peer observation process in the following areas:

- Formative Classroom Observations for Professional Effectiveness

- Course Material Effectiveness Review
- Merit Review as it relates to Teaching Effectiveness

These are explained below.

Informal Classroom Observation

The spirit of a voluntary, informal classroom observation is to help faculty members identify and set goals for improving their effectiveness. To that end, every faculty member is expected to visit other colleagues' classrooms during the course of the academic year and invite colleagues to their classroom to observe. During the invited visits observers are expected to make note of particular aspects of teaching practice that raise questions in their minds, and discuss "What I learned from this visit" at a mutually agreeable time with the observee. The purpose of such interactions is for colleagues to think about what they do and may take for granted, as an assist in realizing the second bullet point of professionalism principles above. Prior to the classroom observation, both faculty members should meet briefly to discuss the goals of the particular class to be observed. Observers are to write a brief narrative, guided by the questions outlined in the revised observation form ([click here](#)) following the visit and discuss its contents with the faculty member observed. Reflective summaries of informal classroom observations should be included in the teaching section of faculty annual reports. Names of faculty observers need not be used.

Timing of Visits and Observation Narratives

The visits need to be completed in time to inform every faculty member's annual merit review report. This implies that visits should take place during the first two quarters of the academic year.

Course Material Effectiveness Review

For the purposes of quality control, one's curriculum committee, or a committee-designated course steward, should review course materials for any course being taught for the first time by any faculty member.

Course Material Review

Course material review should begin with one's curriculum committee or course steward reviewing a syllabus and any prepared materials before the onset of the quarter. This initial review is primarily for the purpose of identifying any element of the course plan that is not consistent with the course's master syllabus and/or UWT policies. Questions and concerns that are raised by the committee or course steward should be addressed by the appropriate curriculum committee, course steward, faculty member, and faculty mentor.

Requirements

It is the responsibility of the curriculum committees to ensure that faculty members have provided access to the content management system where course materials have been

maintained, and to collect hard copies, if any of other course materials used during the quarter. The program chair should discuss any serious issues or concerns that may arise from the committee's course material review with the faculty member, involving the Director if need be.

In the case of TINST or other non-degree program instruction, the Director or his/her designee has the responsibility to review.

Merit Review of Teaching Effectiveness

This policy only covers that portion of the merit review concerned with teaching effectiveness, which is just one part of the merit review itself. Policies on scholarly work and service reviews are covered elsewhere.

In the spirit of promoting professional responsibility, the assessment of merit, as per the Faculty Code, shall be based primarily on a faculty member's demonstration of such teaching effectiveness in a narrative report. For purposes of this policy, a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is evidenced by a substantial proportion of students achieving the course objectives as given in the course syllabus, the annual review teaching narrative and student course evaluations.

Faculty Annual Report Section on Teaching

All full-time faculty members will write a teaching narrative as part of their annual reports that will be used by the voting faculty senior in rank, as per Faculty Code, for the purpose of assessing merit status. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to write a clear summary of their experiences with regard to teaching effectiveness, reflect on those experiences and their outcomes, and provide evidence of effectiveness. The narrative should focus on courses taught, their stated outcomes, and evidence that those outcomes were achieved. But it should also include a self-reflection of effectiveness in terms of what methods were adopted, what seemed to work well (and why) and what might have not worked as well as expected (and why). It should include discussions of new methods attempted and reasons for adopting them, and make explicit reference to the classroom observation activities described above. Faculty members' annual reports should include a section discussing any visits that they made during the year, what classes they visited, and what they feel they learned from those visits. They should also discuss the visits made to their own classes and report on what they feel the value, or lack thereof, was from those visitations. This section of the annual report can include, at the discretion of the faculty member, any testimonial statements given by students that provide additional evidence of effectiveness.

Goal Setting in Meeting with the Director

All teaching observation activity should be reviewed at the meeting with the Director as part of determining reasonable goals to set for the following academic year. The agreed upon goals should become part of the annual merit letter. Along with this goal setting exercise the Director and the faculty member should review the prior year's goals and discuss what progress had been

made toward achieving them. If there are problems in meeting goals then the Director and the faculty member should discuss how the problems can be eliminated.

Use of Student Evaluations

While students' perceptions of the effectiveness of teaching are a valued part of determining the merits of a teacher, the quantitative portion of student course evaluations should be used primarily to assess response patterns for possible problems. The numeric results should not be used as a convenient measure of teaching effectiveness. The student comment sheets (the "yellow" sheets) should be made available in the merit review process but only be used to make a more informed assessment, especially of extra-meritorious or non-meritorious, if indicated (e.g., if the numeric ratings are uniformly high or low).

If faculty members wish to do so, they may ask students to provide more in-depth evaluations via anonymous surveys or request of the Director that an SGID to be performed. This additional information may be submitted for the merit review.

Committee Review

Merit recommendations are voted on by a committee of those senior in rank to the faculty member under review. The committee members are expected to have carefully and thoughtfully read the reviewee's narrative and examined any additional evidence submitted by them. The committee may offer additional observations that are pertinent to the discussion of the reviewee's merit. It will be up to the committee as a whole as to whether such observations are, in fact, pertinent.

Teaching Narrative Format for the Annual Report

Summary of Teaching Activities in the Prior Year

Course numbers/titles, quarters (including the one in which the report is written), number of students. Prior experiences with these courses (how many times taught, how many years, etc.) Additional teaching-related activities, which might include: students mentored and advised for research, internships, projects, etc.

Assessment of Student Evaluation Scores, General Abilities and Motivations

Summarize student evaluation scores and comments for all listed courses. Explain how these scores and comments have changed over time. Describe the general level of student motivation, how they respond to your teaching, and the degree to which students are reaching a course's learning objectives.

Your Self-Assessment of Effective Teaching and Methods

Provide evidence of “effective teaching” and explain, if appropriate, how your perspective has changed over time. Describe how you implement the methods you use most often (e.g. lecture, discussion, exercises, interaction, active learning), and why they’re appropriate in the context of the courses you have taught. Describe any barriers that inhibit effective teaching.

Summary of Formative Teaching Activities

Provide a list of formative teaching activities you have participated in since the last annual review, including classroom observations and any teaching-related workshops or conferences you’ve attended. Discuss what you learned from these activities and describe anything new that you have tried in an effort to improve your teaching effectiveness.

Achievements

Describe your teaching-related achievements attained, such as teaching awards and grants, as well as course or curriculum development activities you have participated in since the last review. You may include achievements that are the integration of activities over several years.

Other

Please provide any other ideas or thoughts you have and would like to share with the faculty regarding teaching effectiveness.