The Evans School has a long history of high quality education supported by a collaborative teaching and learning environment. Peer teaching evaluation has provided faculty with critical insight and feedback to improve our teaching and has facilitated sharing of curriculum and teaching practices. This policy outlines the process for peer teaching evaluation.

The UW faculty code (24-57) and UW academic Human Resources policy requires collegial evaluation of teaching every year for Assistant Professors and lecturers and at least every three years for Associate Professors and Professors. [Policies attached.] These evaluations may also form part of the record for reappointment or promotion, though a fuller assessment of all teaching and student evaluations is required in those cases.

**Process of evaluation:**

1. Faculty members needing a peer evaluation will choose a course and ask an Evans School tenure-track or senior lecturer faculty member to be their peer evaluator. The course must be a credit bearing course taught within the Evans School.

2. The teacher and evaluator will agree on materials to be reviewed, at least one specific class session to be observed, and a time to meet to discuss the assessment after the observation and review of materials. They may also decide to meet prior to class observation to review materials and course purposes. The teacher may want to convey a set of questions or focus points for the evaluation.

3. Following the review, the evaluator submits a copy of the Evans Peer Teaching evaluation form to the associate dean and the teacher.
Faculty Code (24-57)

Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24–32, Subsection C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the instructional title of senior lecturer or principal lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

Faculty Code, Section 24-57
http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#Sec2457

Academic Human Resources Policy on Promotion and Tenure:

“Collegial evaluation of teaching. Collegial evaluation of teaching must be conducted every year for Assistant Professors and at least every three years for Associate Professors and Professors. The School/College/Campus also requires collegial evaluations for the promotion of Lecturers, Artists, and other instructional titles. Collegial evaluations serve two purposes. One is to produce positive benefits for the individual faculty member and for the unit by identifying the individual's particular teaching contributions, by sharing teaching knowledge among colleagues, and by the improvement of teaching. The second is to provide material for evaluation in merit, reappointment, and promotion/tenure reviews. While student ratings provide useful data on success in communicating with a class, collegial evaluations allow a focus on course content as perceived by peers and can describe the unique expertise, types of instruction, courses, or other activities which the individual contributes to the unit's curriculum or teaching program as a whole. Self-evaluation by the individual faculty member is encouraged as a helpful component in this process. The diversity of College/School/Campus programs makes it difficult to specify any particular method of collegial evaluation. A unit, however, should use the same method(s) for all evaluations so that uniform standards are applied. The chair/program director should not have sole responsibility for conducting the evaluation, and evaluators need not all be senior faculty. Active participation by the individual being evaluated is encouraged. Appropriate methods might include collegial review of one or more of the following: teaching materials, student evaluations, classroom performance, and student performance. The last may be particularly appropriate in the studio and performing arts. A useful reference is the booklet “Evaluating Teaching,” available from the Center for Instructional Development and Research. For promotion and tenure recommendations, there should be a thoughtful report from a faculty committee. In no case, however, is it sufficient simply to note that the faculty member is a “good” teacher or to provide materials or data without analysis. The method(s) of collegial evaluation, the names of the evaluators, and the results must be reported.”

(http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/faculty/promotion_tenure.html)
Evans School Peer Teaching Review

Faculty member: 

Course Reviewed (number, title):

Date of Class observation(s): 

Date met with teacher for feedback:

Materials Reviewed (answer Y/N):

Y/N Syllabus
Y/N Web Page
Y/N Class Assignments, Exams, Student Work

Before Class – Consider the Following Aspects of the Class

1. Is the course content up-to-date, relevant and challenging?
2. Does course content engage a range of diversity issues?
3. Are course materials and/or web site of high quality?
4. Are the course objectives clearly articulated on the syllabus and appropriate?
5. Do assignments contribute to class learning and goals?
6. Are the evaluation strategies (tests, grading) clear and appropriate?

Key Strengths

Questions/Suggestions
In Class Review – Consider the Following Aspects of the Class

1. Are the session objectives clear and well articulated?
2. For class discussion – is it well designed, time efficient and productive?
3. Does the instructor encourage interest, engagement and a wide range of participation?
4. For lecture - are the concepts presented in a clear, effective and organized manner?
5. Was the use of examples and illustrations effective?
6. Was the instructor receptive to questions? Were answers to student questions clear?

Key Strengths

Questions/Suggestions