

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

Memo No. 1

Revised September 2003

COLLEGIAL (PEER) REVIEW OF TEACHING

Collegial review of teaching is mandated by the University Handbook (<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/handbook/Volume2.html> Section 24-57) and the College of Arts and Sciences (reference <http://www.artsci.washington.edu/services/Personnel/TeachingEvaluations.htm>).

This review has two purposes:

1. To benefit the individual and the program by enhancing teaching skills
2. To provide information for merit, reappointment, and promotion reviews to both the School and the College.

These reviews are not intended as critiques of teaching style or content, but as constructive assessments of teaching methods and a chance to share ideas and information with faculty colleagues.

Administrative Guidelines:

- Collegial evaluations must be performed every three years for associate and full professors, and every year for assistant professors and other ranks.
- Collegial evaluators may be of any rank and program.
- Faculty are encouraged to participate actively in the peer review process per the spirit of the Faculty Code.
- Written summaries of the evaluation should be submitted to the Executive Director by the end of the quarter in which the review is conducted, with copy to the faculty member being evaluated.

Evaluation Guidelines:

Collegial review includes all of the following:

- Review of course materials submitted to the reviewer
- Classroom observation
- Evaluation of student performance if appropriate
- Conference with the faculty member under review
- Written report

Some questions may be helpful in performing the collegial review:

- Are the course goals and desired outcomes clearly defined?
- Are the course's scope and structure appropriate to those goals?
- Does the creative or written work produced in the class meet the desired outcomes?
- Is technology used effectively (if relevant)?
- Are the evaluation strategies (tests, grading) clear and conducive to the course goals?
- Do the classroom environment and structure promote student learning?

During your conference you may want to ask the following questions:

- What do you feel is working best in this class? What would you like to improve?
- What are your biggest challenges in teaching this course?
- What feedback would you like from me, now that I've attended and reviewed the class?

The written review should document the reviewer's evaluation process as well as the conclusions, and should give the faculty under review a chance to participate in and/or respond to the review process.

The University Handbook requires that departmental recommendations for merit salary increase, promotion, tenure and reappointment include annual documentation of teaching effectiveness, accomplished by conducting official student teaching evaluations every year. It is recommended that all non-tenured members of the faculty conduct more than one student teaching evaluation per year.

Any faculty member subject to a promotion, tenure or renewal decision will be evaluated as outlined in the School of Drama's Administrative Policy Memo #5.

PM8101/REV9-2003

Administrative Policy Memo No. 1, first established 10/88.

Subsequent revisions:

Executive Committee approval: 9/16/2003

Faculty Approval: 9/19/2003