



## Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 15, 2016 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

**Present:** Jutta Heller; Mark Pendras; Marcie Lazzari; Jim Gawel; Nita McKinley; Rupinder Jindal; Ellen Moore; Denise Drevdahl; Chuck Costarell; Melissa Lavitt; Huatong Sun.

**Absent:** Matt Kelley; **Excused:** Mark Pagano; Lauren Montgomery; Marian Harris; Alissa Ackerman; Julia Aguirre; Ji-Hyun Ahn; Greg Rose; Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee.

### 1) Consent Agenda

The April 6, 2016 Executive Council meeting minutes were accepted.

### 2) EVCAA Report

- Commencement Tickets: we wish there were more seats; there is an ad hoc group looking at an alternative venue for the future.
- Program to School Proposal: overarching, framing document that gives readiness criteria (numbers, complexity, alignment, representation); there is no timeline in place yet; units will decide they are ready when they are ready; more feedback and updates soon.
- UW Bothell asked UW Tacoma to partner in budget requests: 1) cyber-security; 2) student success – expand summer bridge program, staffing support (institutionalizing high impact practices), building out a learning commons (utilizing library system and expanding services) which will impact retention and graduation.
- There is support for funding law school at UW Tacoma (budget request)
- Internal searches for Associate VC of Research & Associate VC of Undergraduate Education have begun.
- SIAS Dean has been selected!
- Education Director search process is still ongoing. Sometimes failed searches happen, but it is more important to hire well than to just hire. Searches should use the behavioral indicator of “what have you done?” instead of “what will you do?”
- Moving the Career Center into Academic Advising Center – no timeline yet.

### 3) Chair's Report and Discussion Items

#### a) Budget Update Appendix A

**Presentation/Discussion:** The Faculty Assembly Administrative Coordinator shared the FA Budgets handout, explaining that she has been working closely with Jan Rutledge from Finance. Faculty Salaries are currently underfunded according to the payment system in place. FA Admin. and Jan are working to find evidence of funding support for the current payment structure. Otherwise, the Faculty Assembly Office will submit another budget request for the Faculty Salaries to be fully funded (approx. \$8,000 deficit). FA Admin will circulate the budget report electronically as well.

#### b) Faculty Assembly Spring Meeting Appendix B

**Presentation/Discussion:** EC reviewed the drafted agenda and pointed out that the term “Lecturer Forum” might communicate to faculty that this meeting is only for lecturers. EC gave ideas on what title to use instead, i.e. Faculty Mix or Composition. FA leaders will work with Lecturer Affairs’ chair on final title of agenda item. Faculty Affairs in Seattle is also working on lecturer issues, specifically about which titles are available to lecturers within the Faculty Code.

#### c) Proposed New Faculty Orientation Session: SEED Introduction to Inclusive Teaching Appendix C

**Presentation/Discussion:** EC member, Nita McKinley presented. The Steering Committee for SEED is proposing an afternoon session as an introduction on inclusive classrooms. They are asking the Office of the EVCAA for permission and funding to do this session and are hoping to move forward with EC’s endorsement. This session would include some faculty members who have been in SEED before in order to build community and act as resources to new faculty. Every incoming faculty member is strongly encouraged to attend the New Faculty Orientation. Therefore, if the SEED training is added to the Orientation, then it is included in what our faculty need to know about how to teach at UW Tacoma. EC members asked if an afternoon training on inclusive classrooms could also be open to more faculty. Nita will bring this suggestion back to the SEED steering committee. Nita clarified the meaning of the terms “deficit discourse” and “inclusive classrooms.” In an inclusive classroom, teachers see the strengths of their students, whereas, a deficit discourse involves the assumption that there is something wrong with students which needs to be remediated. The goal is to reframe the way that students are talked about and viewed so that their strengths are highlighted and valued.

d) Request to Review from Beth Kalikoff, UW Seattle Teaching & Learning Center Appendix D

**Presentation/Discussion:** The Executive Council of UW Tacoma shared overall support of this document. The conversation ranged from specifics about the Guide to general feedback about what is needed for properly evaluating teaching within promotion & tenure cases:

- The Guide was enjoyable to read both in terms of looking into P&T and also from a lecturer's contact renewal perspective
- Yes, we need a more sophisticated way of evaluating teaching
- In favor of the self-evaluation
  - It is good to recognize changes and improvements, as well as, areas of needed growth
- In favor of the peer-evaluation happening with \*pairs/teams
  - People feel the pressure of putting something permanent in someone else's file; pairs will help with this
  - People often choose people who are like them to do their peer reviews – having pairs will help give more diverse perspectives in the feedback/review
- In favor of looking at evaluating teaching from a broader base
- It is a challenge to have a mind-shift around evaluating teaching in P&T so that it doesn't only focus on student evaluation scores
- The student eval. Score is a useful number, but it doesn't evaluate all factors.
  - We need to shift away from heavy reliance on it and away from the thinness of the ways that we evaluate each other and ourselves
- We need to shift from assessing teaching in potentially punitive ways, to a focus on improving teaching
  - Faculty need continual feedback on teaching, so yearly peer review shouldn't be punitive
- Good P&T cases make a case for how they have improved; they've been proactive and put effort into improving their teaching based on feedback and reflection
  - Within P&T teaching eval. it should be valued if improvements were made
- P&T eval. letters written without any suggestions for improvement are a disservice
  - They should include feedback on what things were good and what things could be better
  - Having \*pairs give evaluations could help with this; more perspectives; less pressure to say only good things; people will feel better about giving constructive criticism
- There once was a time in administration that if a Lecturer received a low score in one class, during one quarter, they would receive a letter from administration containing very punitive language
  - Thankfully, there has been a move away from this practice
- Student evaluations – numbers can be manipulated; we don't know what the numbers mean; we can't measure what we don't understand
- Students approach teaching evaluations with varying levels of seriousness
- You only have one quarter to change a student's opinion about you; how do we teach students to have open opinions?
- Issues of gender, age, ethnicity, etc. impact student views (reflection of society; systemic bias)
  - How do we deal with that in P&T?
- Student evaluations shouldn't be used in a strictly empirical way
  - Need an index to collect and compare scores
  - Situate student scores differently; not listening so heavily to them
- The written comments on student evals were more useful than summary scores
  - More valuable to evaluate teaching; previously termed "yellow sheets"
  - Improve questions on "yellow sheets"
  - Why were these done away with?
- How many instructors do the self-written questions to tailor the eval more to their own class?
- Need a way for faculty to demonstrate commitment to ongoing professional development

- Like a Center for Teaching Excellence where one can have professional development and receive training/ certificates in things like making a good test; grading a test well, etc.
- How do we increase the kind and quality of evidence going into P&T for teaching assessment?
- Looking at this from the lecturer's position for contract renewal – how are student evals and other evals used differently for differently ranked faculty members?
- How often do faculty members have their Tenure in question because of teaching?
- For lecturers, teaching carries more weight in renewal of contract
- If a lecturer is up for promotion, what emphasis is giving to teaching evaluations?
- If one is on a review committee and their colleagues' teaching eval scores are low, how can one help their colleague? Is there help that can come from outside the unit? Other resources available?
- A lot of time/work goes into giving quality evaluations
  - This is why we have used the student eval score number because it doesn't take time
- Is there a way to give quality evaluations while still being efficient with time?
- What are different units doing with student evals and merit reviews?

Suggestions to Add to the Guide/ Guide specific comments:

- Look at the Challenge Engagement Index number (CEI) on student evaluations too, as it reflects how challenging a course is
- Peer evaluations should not be intended to say if someone's teaching is good or bad, but give feedback on how to improve
- Having every faculty member within your department evaluation your teaching will take too much time
- Evaluators should look at previous peer evals to determine if improvements have been made
- Use student evaluation comments again; they are very useful when needing to look deeper into a case
- Teach all faculty how to write peer reviews and give useful feedback
  - Learn what to look for when reviewing someone's teaching
  - Anti-bias training for review committees
  - Tools and tips for how to look closely at teaching excellence
  - Student eval. trends for various faculty demographics

e) Elections Update: Recruiting for 2016-2017

A brief update was given by EC chair, Marcie Lazzari. When the Faculty Assembly Office receives confirmation of the funding needed for a lecturer to be Vice Chair, then the nomination call will go out.

**4) Adjourn**

**Appendix A**

	Budgeted Amount 2015-2017	2015 - 2016 Projected total	2016-2017 Projected total	Balance	Notes
<b>Aux Teaching Staff Salary</b>	\$85,988	\$64,477	\$51,350	<b>-\$29,839</b>	<b>Course releases/stipends:</b> -2015-2016: 10 x \$5000 -Summer Stipend APCC: \$150 x 9 -2 Campus Fellows stipends @ \$3,000 ea. (2015-2016) <b>Issue:</b> budgeted on assumed carry forward; **faculty salaries not fully funded <b>Solution:</b> seeking history of approval on **payment structure; FY 17 budget requests
<b>Classified Staff Salary</b>	\$85,536	\$38,072	\$40,156	<b>\$7,308</b>	Staff not 100% FTE June 2015- November 2015; new FTE staff enters at different rate; 2% COLA
<b>Contractual Services</b>	\$8,650	\$2,033	\$1,883	<b>\$4,884</b>	telephones; technology fee; occasional event cleaning; copies; & staff training
<b>Travel</b>	\$400	\$427	\$3,500	<b>-\$3,527</b>	personal mileage/parking reimbursement for UWS meetings, <i>qualifying under FA Policy</i> Estimated to fund policy: \$3500 yearly
<b>Supplies &amp; Materials</b>	\$3,356	\$300	\$300	<b>\$2,756</b>	Includes office supplies & approved event food; other food money comes from discretionary Excellence Fund
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$183,930</b>	<b>\$105,159</b>	<b>\$102,189</b>	<b>-\$18,568</b>	
				<b>+9850</b>	<b>in requests for 2016-2017</b>
				<b>-\$8,718</b>	

**\*\*Faculty Assembly Payment Structure [CURRENT]**

\*quarter of choice/what works with their academic program

	Vice Chair	Chair	APT Chair	APCC Chair	FAC Chair	APCC Summer work
<b>Fall</b>		\$5,000	\$5,000*			
<b>Winter</b>	\$5,000*	\$5,000		5,000*		
<b>Spring</b>	\$5,000*	\$5,000			5,000*	
<b>Summer</b>	\$5,000 incoming chair	\$5,000 term ends Sept 1 <sup>st</sup>				\$150x9 Faculty
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$1350</b>

Faculty Assembly Leadership Compensation over a fiscal year: **\$51,350**

Chair: 3 course releases + summer  
Vice Chair: 2 course releases +summer

**Faculty Assembly FY 17 Requests for Staff and Program Operational Funds**

**1) Two additional course releases – temporary, as needed**

\$10,000 is requested to provide two additional course releases if a lecturer is elected to the role of vice chair of Faculty Assembly (2016-17) and chair (2017-18). Given the average teaching load of lecturers (7 courses per year) and the demands of the FA leadership roles and corresponding responsibilities, it would not be possible for a lecturer to serve in these positions without additional course releases. Lecturers currently provide significant service, and we believe it would be beneficial to support lecturers who have the expertise and desire to serve.

	Lecturer Vice Chair	Chair	APT Chair	APCC Chair	FAC Chair	APCC Summer work
Fall	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000*			
Winter	\$5,000	\$5,000		5,000*		
Spring	\$5,000	\$5,000			5,000*	
Summer	\$5,000 incoming chair	\$5,000 term ends Sept 1 <sup>st</sup>				\$150x9 Faculty
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$1350</b>

FA Leadership Comp. over a fiscal year with a lecturer serving as **vice chair**: **\$56,350**

Chair: 3 course releases + summer  
(L)Vice Chair: 3 course releases +summer

	Vice Chair	Lecturer Chair	APT Chair	APCC Chair	FAC Chair	APCC Summer work
Fall		\$10,000*	\$5,000*			
Winter	\$5,000*	\$5,000		5,000*		
Spring	\$5,000*	\$5,000			5,000*	
Summer	\$5,000 incoming chair	\$5,000 term ends Sept 1 <sup>st</sup>				\$150x9 Faculty
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>\$25,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$1350</b>

FA Leadership Comp. over a fiscal year with a lecturer serving as **chair**: **\$56,350**

(L) Chair: 4 course releases + summer  
Vice Chair: 2 course releases +summer

**2) Summer Stipend for APCC – permanent**

\$1,350 is requested to provide a small stipend for the nine members of the Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee (APCC) to meet during the summer of 2016, and annually each summer.

The Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee serves a central and critical role in maintaining the integrity of the curriculum across all academic units. Members hold one meeting during the summer months to ensure the flow of curriculum approval across the summer months in anticipation of offering courses in the 2016-17 academic year.

**3) Funding for Faculty Assembly Mileage/Parking Reimbursement - permanent**

\$3,500 per FY is requested to support faculty engagement on the UW Faculty Senate, Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, and the Faculty Appeal Board. The Faculty Assembly Office has drafted a *Mileage/Parking Reimbursement Policy* in alignment with *UW Tacoma Administrative Directive 70.2: Travel Approval*.

**Total FY 17 request: \$14,850** \$4850 permanent annually; \$5000 as needed annually

## Faculty Assembly Excellence Fund

Beginning Balance 2015	\$266.77
Total revenue since 8/2015	\$545.00
Total expenditure since 8/2015	\$317.01
Current Balance	\$494.76
Estimated expenditure for FA Spring	\$130.00

THANK YOU!

### Further Insights

		Notes
Average monthly Revenue	\$65	
Projected annual revenue	\$780	\$65x12 months = \$780
Projected Spending 2015-2016	\$390	\$130 for each FA general meeting x 3 quarters = \$390
Projected Spending 2016-2017	\$390	
Projected annual balance	\$390	\$780-\$390 = \$390

*Continued or increased giving could eventually add up to another Campus Fellow's group stipend.*

## Consider Giving *to the* UWT Faculty Assembly Excellence Fund

Visit the Faculty Assembly *Excellence Fund* Web Page for instructions on filling out the online payroll deduction form: <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/excellence-fund>

*Or*

**Go directly to the UW Foundation Page for the UWT Faculty Assembly Excellence Fund:**  
[https://www.washington.edu/giving/make-a-gift/?source\\_typ=3&source=UWTFAC](https://www.washington.edu/giving/make-a-gift/?source_typ=3&source=UWTFAC)

*~ May be tax deductible as charitable contributions for federal tax purposes as allowed by IRS regulations~*

*Your gift represents a dynamic resource for use by UW Tacoma's leaders for activities not covered by state funds. Through excellence funds, faculty leadership can meet emerging needs, support or create special opportunities for faculty, recognize faculty accomplishments, and fund unique campus events.*

## Appendix B

### **FACULTY ASSEMBLY SPRING | AGENDA DRAFT**

April 22, 2016 – 1:00pm-3:00pm, William Philip Hall



### **FACULTY ASSEMBLY**

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON | TACOMA

---

- 1:00** *Welcome and Updates* Marcie Lazzari, Faculty Assembly Chair  
Melissa Lavitt, ECVAA  
Mark Pendas, Faculty Assembly Vice Chair
- 1:25** *Equity & Diversity* Marian Harris, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair  
Marcie Lazzari, Faculty Assembly Chair
- Faculty Affairs Committee Bylaws Charge Change
  - Catalyst Poll opens Monday April 25<sup>th</sup> at 8am, closes Monday May 9<sup>th</sup> at 5pm (2 weeks for voting)
- 1:35** ~~*Lecturer's Forum*~~ Linda Dawson, Lecturer Affairs Committee Chair,  
Libi Sundermann, Haley Skipper, Alison Cardinal
- 2:05** *Table Discussion* [please have someone take notes]
- 2:25** *Tables Report-Out*
- 2:40** *Table Discussion* [please have someone take notes]
- 3:00** *Adjourn*
- 

## Appendix C

### **Proposed New Faculty Orientation Session**

### **SEED (Strengthening Educational Excellence with Diversity) Introduction to Inclusive Teaching**

Date: September XX

Time: 1-4pm

#### **PURPOSE:**

To introduce new faculty to inclusive and equity-based teaching strategies for UWT courses. To create community for new faculty to enhance their professional and teaching knowledge as part of their induction to UWT.

#### **LEARNING OUTCOMES:**

- Recognize deficit discourse and be able to reframe to a strength-based/asset discourse
- Deepen awareness and apply innovative strategies for inclusive excellence in the classroom.
- Identify resources for support to enhance their professional development with cultural competency

#### **SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES**

- Presentations
- Discussions
- Individual reflection
- Q&A
- Session Assessment

#### **BUDGET:**

- Stipend for presenters/organizers (3-5 people) \$500 each
- Materials including book

## **Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices**

### Table of Contents

Introduction: 1  
Self-Assessment: 2-4  
Peer Review: 4-6  
Student Ratings 6-7  
References 8-9  
Appendices 9-10

### Introduction

Nearly two years ago, some faculty members of color approached then Provost Cauce with a request that we think about a more sophisticated approach to evaluating teaching. Student evaluations, most admit, are limited in their value, and, at times, tell us more about the student evaluators than the faculty being evaluated. This can be especially true for faculty of color, and especially women faculty of color, who face a good deal of pushback from students. In response, the Center for Teaching and Learning was asked to draft a best practices guide to evaluating teaching for use by department and college groups that review tenure and promotion cases. The guide draws on research and on the work of peer institutions.

We hope this guide encourages tenure and promotion committees to seek evidence-based processes that reflect disciplinary norms and the "innovation imperative" that informs our research, leadership, and service at the UW. Given that teaching evaluation is a process--not a moment, a letter, a one-hour class observation, or a swift look at evaluation ratings--we also hope to spark disciplinary as well as interdisciplinary conversations about teaching as a scholarly practice conducted in a community.

The guide has three sections: Self-Assessment, Peer Review, and Student Ratings. Each section focuses on evaluating teaching as part of tenure and promotion committee work, rather than on instructional or formative assessment intended for the faculty member's use. Yet despite differing goals and audiences, formative assessment aligns constructively with summative evaluation, both contributing to an ongoing culture of conversation, innovation, and excellence in teaching.

Many colleagues shaped this guide. Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty; Nana Lowell, Cathy Beyer, and the research team of the Office for Educational Assessment; Jan Spyridakis of HCDE, the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning; the Teaching and Learning Group; and the Campus Fellows on Teaching Assessment. We look forward to gathering additional feedback and comments from other faculty groups. The guide will be finalized and ready for use by June 15, 2016.

Calla Chancellor, Karen Freisem, Beth Kalikoff, Katie Malcolm, and Theresa Ronquillo  
UW Center for Teaching & Learning

### Section 1: Self-Assessment

*"Self-evaluation is one of the most overlooked forms of explicit evaluation. Ideally and logically, this should precede all other forms of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness."*



- Warwick University Learning and Development Centre (2012) [Self Evaluation](#)

*“The individual instructor is in the best position to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of an individual offering of a course, and to suggest approaches to improving future offerings.”*

- UW College of Engineering, [Promotion and Tenure Toolkit](#)

As one element of an evidence-based approach to evaluating teaching, self-assessment is an important tool for understanding teaching effectiveness. According to Berk (2005), self- assessment provides “systematic, ongoing reflection on your teaching and courses” and is used for evaluative purposes in most four-year colleges and universities (p.51).

Faculty members use self-assessment to evaluate their teaching and advance their growth as instructors. Departments decide which kinds of faculty self-assessment to use in promotion and tenure decisions and how often their faculty members should reflect on their teaching--weekly? monthly? quarterly? at the end of the year? In what forms? We recommend that tenure and promotion committees use faculty self-assessment, in the context of articulated department norms around self-assessment, as core data in their evaluation of the candidate’s teaching.

This section focuses on three aspects of instructor self-assessment:

- I. Course reviews
- II. Teaching portfolios
- III. Philosophy of teaching statements

## I. Course reviews

Systematic course reviews allow instructors to reflect on what is working well in each course and make appropriate changes at key points before, during, and after the quarter. Strategies may include:

**1. End-of-term summaries.** Many UW departments encourage faculty members to use end-of-term course summaries to offer assessment data to promotion and tenure committees. The College of Engineering advises candidates to “prepare short (less than one page) written evaluations for each course taught...immediately after each course is offered. A suggested model for the reports is that the faculty member summarize what was done in terms of improvement, innovation, updating, and so on, along with an evaluation of what was effective and what was less effective, and how the course could be improved in the future.” End-of-term summaries may also include instructors’ reflections on their end-of-term student evaluations. See **Appendix A** for samples of guiding questions.

**2. Course portfolio.** A course portfolio may contain (1) course components--syllabus, teaching materials, support materials, and assignments; and (2) critical analysis of teaching and learning, including reflections on teaching. A course portfolio may contain annotations, midterm feedback, and end-of-term summaries, while serving as an essential part of a teaching portfolio (See [University of Wisconsin.](#))

**3. Syllabi, assignments, tests, and class plan/agenda annotation.** Regularly recording brief reflections on course materials help instructors understand what to keep and/or change when they teach the class again. Guiding questions for annotations might include:

- What did I want students to learn (in this lesson, activity, assignment)?

- How did it go (and how do I know how it went)?
- What would I do differently next time?

## II. Teaching Portfolios

Seldin (2005) describes the teaching portfolio as “a collection of materials that document teaching performance....It is flexible enough to be used for tenure and promotion decisions or to provide the stimulus and structure for self-reflection about areas in need of improvement” (p.3). Teaching portfolios are used for promotion and tenure decisions at a number of universities, including the [University of Michigan](#).

Teaching portfolios used for promotion and tenure typically include the following:

1. Teaching Responsibilities
  2. Teaching Philosophy
  3. Teaching Objectives, Strategies, Methodologies
  4. Student Evaluations for Multiple Courses Using Summative Questions
  5. Classroom Observations by Faculty Peers or Administrators
  6. Review of Teaching Materials by Colleagues Inside or Outside the Institution
  7. Representative and Detailed Course Syllabi
  8. Evidence of Student Learning (Cognitive or Affective)
  9. Teaching Recognition and Rewards
  10. Short-Term and Long-Term Teaching Goals
  11. Appendices
- (Seldin, 2005, p.16)

As a “vehicle for structured reflection about teaching” (p.18), the portfolio can provide instructors with comprehensive insight. For more information about teaching portfolios, including links to sample portfolios, see the [University of Virginia’s “Teaching Portfolios.”](#)

## III. Statements of Teaching Philosophy

As a “purposeful and reflective essay about the author’s teaching practices and beliefs” (Vanderbilt 2015), the teaching philosophy statement is another element of self-assessment. Teaching Statements (1-2 pages) often include three elements:

1. **Description:** What you do when you teach, types of activities or thinking in which you engage your students.
2. **Analysis:** Why you teach in the ways that you do, and how your thinking about your teaching has changed over time.
3. **Empirical data:** Experiences or observations of student learning on which your decisions about teaching are based.

(UW Center for Instructional Development and Research, 2003)

Statements of Teaching Philosophy provide an opportunity to reflect on and communicate what individual instructors do and why. To learn more about Teaching Philosophy Statements, including examples, see [Ohio](#)

[State](#) and [Vanderbilt](#) guides. For more on writing a Statement of Teaching Philosophy, see the Center for Instructional Development and Research Bulletin, "[Writing a Teaching Statement](#)."

## Section 2: Peer Review

*"Teaching is perhaps the most privatized of all the public professions. Though we teach in front of students, we almost always teach solo, out of collegial sight – behind closed doors."*

- Parker Palmer, *The Courage to Teach*

As with scholarship, effective teaching takes place in a community, one that generates and analyzes data, draws on research, and develops in collegial, public, and private conversations. Peer review is commonly used for scholarly activities in generative, instructional, and evaluative ways. Given that teaching is a scholarly activity, there is ample support for peer review of teaching as an evidence-based best practice (Gosling, 2014; Kalish, 2015).

Peer review contributes to a culture of continuous improvement by sharing disciplinary norms and assumptions, research-based best practices, and innovations. At UW and its peer institutions, ongoing reciprocal mentoring is a peer review practice with considerable benefits for all participants.

While the [UW Faculty Code](#) calls for peer review in service of effective teaching, the specific goals and practices that support these goals are left to academic departments to determine (see [Faculty Code 24-32 & 24-57](#)). We urge department and college groups responsible for evaluating teaching in tenure and promotion cases to seek out evidence in a candidate's file that the department has engaged in thoughtful, ongoing peer review and has articulated practices that align with disciplinary norms and contexts.

### I Department Recommendations

#### II A Protocol for Effective Peer Teaching Observation

We recommend that departments determine purposes and protocols around peer observation through department-wide discussion or the formation of a one-year teaching assessment committee. We then recommend that departments articulate these purposes and protocols explicitly for tenure and promotion committees, both departmental and college-wide. Questions to address include:

1. What are departmental expectations and purposes for peer review? How might peer review be used for supporting the professional development and growth of faculty members? For example, is peer review used for formative as well as evaluative purposes?
2. Which faculty and instructors perform peer review and how do we define "peer" in this context? A faculty member in the same department? The same area of the field? At the same rank? Or?
3. Will faculty be reviewed by one or more colleagues? Some models of peer observation favor pairs, triads, or quartets of colleagues. If the department selects this model, a "norming" or reconciliation discussion often takes place among the observers before they meet with the instructor to insure more consistent and coherent feedback.

4. What criteria will reviewers use in this process? While many institutions suggest using a shared rubric or template for observations, such templates must still allow for diverse practices, recognizing that effective teaching is not limited to one specific approach or set of practices.
5. What is the expected protocol that reviewers and reviewees are to follow? Once departmental guidelines have been established, faculty should be provided with a standard protocol. Below is an example of one such protocol.

#### A Protocol for Effective Peer Teaching Observation:

1. The reviewee and observer meet with each other to clarify goals and context. The reviewee describes the course and may share course materials (such as syllabi and course websites) to provide context for the observation. The discussion includes what elements of the course helps students learn, what the challenges are, and what kind of feedback the faculty member will find most useful.
2. Agree on a protocol for teaching observation. How many times to observe? For what period of time? More importantly, what is the peer observer looking for? What are observable practices that departments consider most useful? What kind of protocol is broad enough to encourage diverse practices and innovations while precise enough so that colleagues are looking to answer the same questions about a peer's teaching?
3. Follow up with a conversation. The observer gets together with the faculty member to say what she or he saw and speaks, if possible, to the faculty member's specific questions. The focus is on observed effective practice, open-ended questions, and the faculty member's goals.
4. Collaborate on writing a report. The faculty member and observer collaborate on a summary report that describes the conversation, which may include observable strengths of the class session and what could be improved or refined, why, and how.

The appendix offers some resources for and examples of effective peer review practice.

### Section 3: Student Ratings

Student ratings provide one source of data for tenure and promotion committees: the student perspective at a particular moment in time, the end of the course. Even though students don't yet know, at this point, how they'll use what they learned or how they'll view the course after they've graduated, the ratings data are still useful, because students are experts in evaluating their experience and perceptions as learners. For example, when we ask students to rate how confident they are in their instructor's knowledge (Item #11 on many of the IASystem forms), they rate their perception of their instructor's knowledge. What they can't rate is their instructor's actual knowledge.

This section, then, offers the best ways to use student ratings when evaluating the teaching of candidates for tenure and promotion. It focuses on two aspects of student ratings:

## I. Reliable data

## II. Instructional context

### Reliable data:

- Consider the number and percentage of students who provide data. The larger the N, and the greater the percentage of students who provide data, the more reliable the data. Course data from 7-10 students are far more meaningful in a class of 25 than of 100.
- Analyze data from at least five courses to ensure inter-class reliability.
- Think in terms of general categories (“Excellent,” “Very Good,” etc.) A difference of less than 0.3 is not statistically significant. We recommend that faculty members, tenure and promotion committees, and departments value student ratings in light of self-assessment and peer review: taken together, these three areas offer meaningful data and analysis for judgment.

### Instructional context:

- There is evidence that student ratings are affected by students’ reasons for enrolling in a class, expected grade relative to other courses, and class size. Therefore, UW’s course evaluation IASystem computes Adjusted Medians for the first four (global) items and the combined mean of the four items.
- There is evidence that other factors affect student ratings, including the faculty member’s gender, race, and ethnicity; online vs. face-to-face courses; and online vs. paper evaluations. At present, these factors are not accounted for in IASystem’s Adjusted Medians. OEA is currently considering them. In the meantime, we strongly recommend that departmental and college-level tenure and promotion committees bear in mind that gender, race, ethnicity, and country of origin inflect student ratings.
- There is evidence that faculty members who pilot teaching innovations may initially encounter student resistance, because student expectations for how the course should be taught have been stymied, particularly regarding any change in roles of faculty member and student. This resistance can lead to students feeling less positive about their experience in the course, and, as a result, faculty members might see student ratings decrease.

We strongly recommend that departmental and college-level tenure and promotion committees bear in mind that (1) students, like other humans, do not embrace change immediately; and (2) the first time any course or innovation is offered yields data that leads to improvement the next time. (We also encourage tenure and promotion candidates to explain pilots and innovations in their teaching statement or philosophy.)

- The faculty member’s self-assessment. Reviewing the instructor’s interpretation of the student ratings data, along with their discussion of innovations and pilot projects, and teaching reflection, teaching statement, or teaching portfolio is a robust best practice.
- The course learning goals, content, and discipline. What constitutes effective teaching varies from discipline to discipline – depending on course learning goals and content. It’s important for college-level tenure and promotion committees to interpret student ratings data within a disciplinary perspective.

## Conclusion

To paraphrase the late Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Tip O'Neill of Massachusetts ("all politics is local"), all assessment is local, inflected by disciplinary, college, and institutional cultures and values. One size fits none. To evaluate teaching in a way that reflects research-based best practice and the UW's innovation imperative, we recommend that tenure and promotion committees

- consider self-assessment as a source of reliable data
- seek evidence of thoughtful, ongoing departmental peer review practice that provides constructive information about a candidate's teaching
- judge student ratings in light of instructional context and what constitutes reliable data
- use self-assessment, peer review, and student ratings data together to evaluate teaching

## References

(<http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/assessing-and-improving-teaching/>)

- Berk, R.A. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1): 48-62.
- Berk, R.A. (2006). *Thirteen strategies to measure college teaching*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Recommendations for use of student ratings of instructors in merit and promotion decisions. (n.d.). Retrieved April 1, 2015, from <http://www.washington.edu/oea/resources/recommendations.html> (Passed by the University of Washington Faculty Council on Instructional Quality (FCIQ) and approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Spring Quarter, 2003.)
- Berk, R. A. (2009). Using the 360° multisource feedback model to evaluate teaching and professionalism. *Medical Teacher*, Vol. 31(12), 1073-1080.
- Berk, R.A., Naumann, P.L., & Appling, S.E. (2004). Beyond student ratings: Peer observation of classroom and clinical teaching. *International Journal of Nursing Education and Scholarship*, 1(1). Retrieved from [http://www.ronberk.com/articles/2004\\_beyond.pdf](http://www.ronberk.com/articles/2004_beyond.pdf)
- Beyer, C. H., Taylor, E. and Gillmore, G.M. (2013). *Inside the undergraduate teaching experience: The University of Washington's growth in faculty teaching study*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Bowden, D. (2004). Small group instructional diagnosis: A method for enhancing writing instruction. *Council of Writing Program Administrators*, 28: 115-135.
- Brent, R., & Felder, R.M. (2004). A protocol for peer review of teaching. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2004 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition. Retrieved from [http://uwf.edu/CAS/partners/documents/Peer\\_Review\\_Protocol\\_ASEE04.pdf](http://uwf.edu/CAS/partners/documents/Peer_Review_Protocol_ASEE04.pdf)
- Center for Instructional Development and Research, University of Washington (1998). *Developing a teaching portfolio*. *Teaching and Learning Bulletin* 1(1).
- Center for Instructional Development and Research, University of Washington (2003). *Writing a teaching statement*. *Teaching and Learning Bulletin* 7(2).
- Diamond, M. R. (2004). The usefulness of structured mid-term feedback as a catalyst for change in higher education classes. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5(3): 217-231.

Finelli, C. J., Ott, M., Gottfried, A. C., Hershock, C., O'Heal, C., & Kaplan, M. (2008). Utilizing instructional consultations to enhance the teaching performance of engineering Faculty. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 97(4): 397-412.

Gosling, D. (2014). Collaborative peer-supported review of teaching. In J. Sachs & M. Parsell (Eds.), *Peer review of learning and teaching in higher education*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Gosling, D., O'Connor, K.M. (2009 August). A new approach to peer review of teaching. Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) Paper 124. Retrieved at <http://www.seda.ac.uk/papers>

Iqbal, I. (July 01, 2013). Academics' resistance to summative peer review of teaching: Questionable rewards and the importance of student evaluations. *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 18(5), 557-569.

Kalish, A. (2015). Evaluation of teaching: Recommendations for developing an effective, reliable, and humane policy.

Lowell, N. (2015). Using student ratings of instruction to inform merit, promotion and tenure decisions. Office of Educational Assessment (n.d.). Using IASystem to make decisions. Retrieved April 1, 2015, from [http://www.washington.edu/oea/services/course\\_eval/decisionmaking.html](http://www.washington.edu/oea/services/course_eval/decisionmaking.html)

Seldin, P. (2004). *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions*, 3rd ed. Bolton, MA: Anker.

University of Washington College of Engineering (n.d.). Promotion and tenure toolkit. Retrieved from: <http://www.engr.washington.edu/mycoe/faculty/pt-toolkit.html>

Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching (2015). Teaching statements. Teaching and learning - inquiry, experimentation, reflection. Retrieved from: <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/teaching-statements/>

Warwick University Learning and Development Centre (2012). Self evaluation. Retrieved from: <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/services/ldc/resource/evaluation/tools/self>

## Appendixes

### **Appendix A: Guiding questions for end-of-term course summaries**

Guiding questions for these reflections include:

- What did I do improve, update, or innovate in this course?
- What went well this term? What do I think supported student learning?
- What assignments, readings, etc. will I keep the next time I teach this class?
- What resources do I need to support my teaching?

### **Appendix B: Sample faculty self-evaluation of teaching form**

<http://www.coe.fsu.edu/content/download/50739/352379/file/Self-Evaluation-of-Faculty-Performance.pdf>.

### **Appendix C: Collecting midterm feedback from students**

Midterm feedback allows instructors to check in with students with enough time to tweak their teaching before the end of the quarter. Effective methods may include gathering written feedback through an anonymous survey or WebQ, or a whole class interview process, such as Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID) (see Bowden [2004], Diamond [2004], and Finelli [2008]). See the CTL's [Gathering Student Feedback](#) web page for more information.

Formative assessment--such as the collection of midterm student feedback to provide an instructor with data on the impact of his or her teaching--differs in purpose and audience from evaluative assessment of the kind performed by a tenure and promotion review. For one thing, it's voluntary. However, formative assessment might usefully become part of a tenure and promotion review in one way: a faculty member could describe the formative practices s/he chooses to employ without including the data from those practices.

#### **Appendix D: Examples of peer review protocols and forms**

Best practices for forming review committees and for peer reviewers:

Ohio State University, Office of University Senate (2015), Peer Review of Teaching:  
<http://senate.osu.edu/PeerEvalTeach.html>

Protocols and examples, pages 12-22:

Central Michigan University, Office of the Provost (2013), A Review and Recommendations for Evaluations  
[https://www.cmich.edu/office\\_provost/facit/Documents/Teaching%20and%20Instructional%20Design/Documenting%20and%20Evaluating%20Teaching%20Excellence%20-%20CMU%20-%2020130108.pdf](https://www.cmich.edu/office_provost/facit/Documents/Teaching%20and%20Instructional%20Design/Documenting%20and%20Evaluating%20Teaching%20Excellence%20-%20CMU%20-%2020130108.pdf)

Templates for peer review rubrics:

Brent, R., Felder, R.M. (2004 June), A Protocol for Peer Review of Teaching. *2004 Annual ASEE Conference Proceedings*, ASEE. [http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/ASEE04\(Peer-Review\).pdf](http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/ASEE04(Peer-Review).pdf) .

University of California, Berkeley (2015), Peer Review / <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/peer-review-course-instruction>