MERIT REVIEW MATERIALS: COLLEGIAL EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

According to the College, collegial evaluations serve two purposes:

- 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
- To provide material for evaluation in merit, reappointment, and promotion/tenure reviews

Faculty must periodically arrange for collegial evaluations of their teaching. The frequency depends on rank: every year for Assistant Professors and Assistant Teaching Professors and at least every three years for Associate Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, Full Professors, and Full Teaching Professors.

All collegial evaluations should be submitted to Karla Tofte electronically in .DOC, .DOCX, .PDF, or .RTF format, and ideally they should be written **on departmental letterhead**. Please arrange to have your evaluator submit a letter by May 20th. If an evaluator will not be able to submit a letter by this date—for example, because you have arranged for a teaching observation to take place later in Spring quarter—please inform Karla before May 1st when a letter will be forthcoming and who will be providing it.

Collegial letters should be written by peers, that is, full-time faculty, preferably ones from UW, ideally ones from the Department. **Evaluators can be any rank**, teaching professor or tenure-track. You may not have a student write and submit a collegial evaluation, but statements by students can be included within a collegial evaluation, if an evaluator so chooses.

Collegial evaluation reports can take many forms and proceed in many ways, but, unless there is a compelling reason not to do so (e.g., an individual only taught abroad in a given year under another unit's auspices), a report should concentrate on one class taught under an ENGL designation (or cross-listed or withered with ENGL).

The College also recommends that a collegial review include "one or more of the following: teaching materials, student evaluations, classroom performance, and student performance." While a classroom teaching observation is not, strictly speaking, required—for instance, one can, *faute de mieux*, write a review based on syllabi and other documentation of teaching effectiveness—at least one classroom visit is nonetheless highly recommended.

Finally, the College encourages the active involvement of the individual being reviewed in the evaluation process. For this reason, **collegial evaluations are not confidential documents**. Reviewees have access to them, and if an evaluator does not provide a reviewee with a copy, they can request one from the Main Office.

The Center for Teaching and Learning recommends that a collegial evaluation proceed in the following manner:

- MEET TO CLARIFY GOALS. The reviewee describes the course and may share course materials (such as syllabi and course websites) to provide context for the observation. What elements of the course help students learn? What are the challenges? What kind of feedback will the faculty member find most useful?

- AGREE ON A PROTOCOL FOR TEACHING OBSERVATION. Decide how many times will the reviewer observe and for what period of time, and discuss your teaching goals, the type of feedback that would be most useful and what aspects of your teaching you would like the reviewer to focus on; lastly, communicate what you hope to gain from the experience and any purposes, in addition to feedback on pedagogy.
- FOLLOW UP WITH A CONVERSATION. The observer describes what they saw and speaks, if possible, to the faculty member's specific questions. The conversation focuses on observed effective practice, open-ended questions, and the faculty member's goals.
- COLLABORATE ON WRITING A SUMMARY REPORT. Describe the conversation, which may include observable strengths of the class session and related materials as well as what could be improved or refined, why, and how.

Before beginning the above process, evaluators should consult the Center for Teaching and Learning's "Guide to Best Practice for Evaluating Teaching," with particular attention to the sections "Peer Review: Advice for Review and Promotion" and "Peer Review: Further Reading."