

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs**  
**Faculty Council on Women in Academia**

April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2016  
12:30pm – 2pm  
Gerberding 26

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. Approval of the minutes from March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016
  3. Vote on joint-council structural changes
  4. Subcommittee updates / review of reports, materials or resolutions
    - Review of Sexual Assault Resolution
    - Review of Equity, Inclusion Accessibility training for Tenure and Promotion committees Resolution
    - Review of Equity Preamble for new salary policy
    - Review of BLM metrics and responsibilities (attached)
  5. Presentation from Allen on upcoming launch of Office of Faculty Advancement hiring workshops and materials
  6. Discuss guide for Best Practices in Evaluating Teaching for Tenure & Promotion (Beth Kalikoff)
  7. Good of the order
  8. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

Chapman called the meeting to order at 12:34 p.m.

She thanked Shaffer and Devine for attending the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting to present the approved FCMA/FCWA Class C resolution on Living Wages. The resolution was approved by the SEC and was forwarded to the faculty senate.

**2) Approval of the minutes from March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

The minutes from March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016 were approved as written.

**3) Vote on joint-council structural changes**

Chapman explained the SEC in the last month asked if FCMA/FCWA members would recommend any changes to the joint-council organization and meeting structure. She noted the councils held discussion in the last meeting and decided to remain separate councils, though also decided to continue meeting jointly (in monthly meetings) to do business and reflect/vote on the work of subcommittees.

Discussion ensued. Members considered changes to the joint-council structure. Some expressed differences of opinion in elongating a single monthly meeting, or implementing two bi-weekly normal and special meetings at a 1.5 hour duration.

There was an informal vote on elongating the amount of time the councils meets each month. A majority of members were in favor of elongating one monthly meeting for subcommittee meetings to take place at the end of normal business.

After continued discussion, a formal recommendation was stated concerning the joint FCMA/FCWA organizational and meeting structure: Details of the recommendation are as follows:

- ❖ Title: “Sojourner Truth Jointly Meeting Faculty Council for Racial-Ethnic Equity and Faculty Council for Gender Equity.”
- ❖ Chairing: meetings are to be held jointly and co-chaired.
- ❖ Meeting time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. (2.5 hours). The last 45 minutes of the meeting will be dedicated to work within subcommittees, and no official business will be carried out during this time.

More discussion manifested an additional recommendation that two new faculty councils should be created - one to address LGBTQ issues and another addressing disability - as the current faculty council structure does not adequately support issues facing these communities.

It was noted members Chen and Campbell would work on drafting the written recommendation of the joint-council to be sent to the SEC, predicated on a vote of council members on the specific recommendations. Proposed names for the new councils were “Faculty Council on LGBTQ Equity,” and “Faculty Council on Disability Justice.”

A motion was made to approve the above council recommendation, as well as the recommendation for two new faculty councils. The vote was approved by majority vote.

Chen and Campbell noted they would update the joint-council on progress of the written recommendation in the next meeting.

#### **4) Subcommittee updates / review of reports, materials or resolutions**

##### *Review of Sexual Assault Resolution*

Chapman noted the Class C resolution on Sexual Assault is being revised to bring it in line with updates from the time it was approved by the joint-council in the last academic year’s spring meeting (2014-2015). Chen stated he would forward the current draft of the resolution on to the appropriate official in the ASUW, who would be put in touch with the subcommittee working on it.

##### *Review of Equity, Inclusion Accessibility training for Tenure and Promotion committees resolution*

It was noted the subcommittee had not met since the last meeting and would like to table their update until they have had a chance to meet.

*Review of Equity Preamble for new salary policy (Exhibit 1)*

Shaffer explained the proposed changes to the salary policy on behalf of the FCMA/FCWA included locating all the places where the word “equality” was used in the document, and substituting that term with “equity and transparency.”

There was some discussion and an explanation given on what occurred in the last faculty senate meeting, wherein the proposed faculty salary policy was voted down with the desire that a few issues be corrected within the code language and the proposal be returned to go through the Class A legislation consideration process before the end of the academic year (2015-2016).

Chapman explained the joint-council may vote to approve the Equity Preamble, which was recently revised, and the document will be forwarded to the SEC for consideration (Exhibit 1). There was some discussion of the document. Chapman explained a vote for approval of the document by FCMA/FCWA will signify the councils’ desire that the preamble be incorporated into the Class A legislation on the Faculty Salary Policy when or if it is approved.

There was a motion to forward the Equity Preamble to the Senate Executive Committee. The motion was approved by a majority vote.

*Review of BLM metrics and responsibilities*

Lo noted the subcommittee drafted metrics for the approved Class C resolution on Black Lives Matter and would like feedback to be offered by members. Chapman suggested the process for gleaning feedback be conducted online through a shared document, which was agreed to. It was requested that the research on policing/police review presented to the faculty senate as part of the BLM resolution be forwarded to the subcommittee along with a related letter that was recently forwarded to President Cauce, which was agreed to.

Lo noted the subcommittee has taken the previously FCMA/FCWA-reviewed “Law School Diversity Plan” and begun using that document to develop a diversity plan template that may be applied universally around the university.

**5) Presentation from Allen on upcoming launch of Office of Faculty Advancement hiring workshops and materials**

Allen (president’s designee) gave a brief update on the workings of the Office of Faculty Advancement. He explained that In February, the office rolled out a new handbook on best practices for faculty searches, while meanwhile the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity (OMAD) has issued a staff diversity hiring tool kit, which are both available online.

He noted the faculty recruitment initiative is underway with over \$200,000 dedicated to the effort. The fund is designed to help recruit new hires that advance the diversity profile of the university. He noted six new African-American faculty members will be starting at the UW in fall 2016, with several other Asian and Latino hires currently within the recruitment process. Allen spoke to the complexity and often drawn-out nature of the process for recruiting new faculty hires, especially while several institutions (many private) compete to recruit the same faculty member. He gave some examples of recent nuanced/difficult recruiting situations.

He noted he is working to secure more central funding for retention and hiring - mentioning that his own expectation is these efforts will be successful, and funds may be allotted within departments for retention.

#### **6) Discuss guide for Best Practices in Evaluating Teaching for Tenure & Promotion (Beth Kalikoff)**

Kalikoff (Director, Center for Teaching and Learning) noted she is present to gather feedback on the draft "Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices" (Exhibit 2). She explained her hope is that the finalized version of the document will be voted on and approved by FCMA/FCWA (along with several other faculty councils and committees), before being disseminated and posted on the Center for Teaching and Learning's (CTL) and the Provost's websites. She noted before this happens, she is seeking feedback on the guide. The initiative originated as a directive from then-Provost Cauce, to ensure that UW faculty teaching evaluations are based in contemporary, evidence-based best practices.

Kalikoff reminded the joint-council that there are three sections to the guide: student evaluations, peer evaluations, and self-assessment. She welcomed feedback. Comments received from council members are as follows:

- ❖ There was a recommendation that "self-assessment" be further highlighted within the guide, promoting its usefulness.
- ❖ There was a recommendation that numbers not be attached to section or subsection titles.
- ❖ A question arose on if biases between faculty in the same department are addressed in the guide. A reply was given. The issue is addressed, and a related recommendation is that departmental faculty discuss and decide on peer review methods for use in that department.
- ❖ A question arose on if the UW Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) (responsible for gathering and collating student evaluations) accounts for inherent student biases during averaging and presentation of data. Kalikoff explained the OEA does account for certain biases, such as the fact that students routinely evaluate harder courses with lowered ratings, though she noted there is no such adjustment for women or underrepresented minority faculty, of which research shows are also often awarded lowered ratings.
- ❖ A question arose on if faculty are able to administer their own course evaluations to students (to be used exclusively by that faculty member). The answer was yes, and it was noted the OEA provides a list of common questions faculty often desire to include in these evaluations.

Kalikoff suggested the council scan the document after more changes are made, and consider endorsing it with a formal vote. She thanked members for their feedback.

## 7) Good of the order

Babigumira noted in the Department of Global Health there was an allegation of racial profiling against a UW police officer. He noted the accusation has heightened tensions within the department. It was explained after question that the UW Police are not a unit beneath the Seattle Police Department.

## 8) Adjourn

Chapman adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

---

*Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst*

**Present:**                      **Faculty:** Tessa Evans-Campbell, Rachel Chapman (chair), Michelle Shaffer, Whasun Chung, Joseph Babigumira,  
**Ex-officio reps:** Katie Woods, Francesca Lo, Patricia Devine, Mitchell Chen  
**President's designees:** Chad Allen  
**Guests:** Beth Kalikoff

**Absent:**                      **Faculty:** James Carothers, Jim Gregory, Delphine Yung, Sadaf Bhutta, Michael Fialkow, Sarah Prager, Bonnie Duran, Geethapriya Thamarasu  
**Ex-officio reps:** Elloise Kim, Ada Onyewuenyi, Maureen Nolan, Jill McKinstry  
**President's designees:** Sue Camber

### Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCMA FCWA Equity Preamble to Salary Policy.doc

Exhibit 2 – fcmafcpwa\_Jan 20 2016\_teachingevaluationguide\_ctl.doc

**Joined Faculty Council on Minority Affairs and Faculty Council on Women in Academia**  
**Proposed Equity Preamble for the New Salary Policy**

April 4, 2016

People are the most valuable asset of an educational institution, and salary is a key way in which institutions demonstrate the value they place on individual employees. Salary equity is imperative at the University of Washington not only for reasons of fairness, or because it improves morale, protects the University's investment in human capital, and has a positive impact on productivity, but also because it is the law. \*

We use the term equity intentionally. Equity and equality are both strategies we can use in an effort to produce fairness, excellence and quality of life. Equity is giving everyone what they need to be successful. Equality is treating everyone the same. Equality aims to promote fairness, but it can only work if everyone starts from the same place and needs the same resources. But not everyone starts at the same place, and not everyone has the same needs. Equity actively moves everyone closer to success via "leveling the playing field" by **giving everyone what they need to be successful and boundless.** \*\*

By improving fairness, morale and productivity, salary equity is, thus, an important contributor to faculty commitment to the university and students, and a driving force in the university's ability to recruit and retain faculty members of high quality. Salary equity concerns include external market comparisons with peer institutions. To compete for the best faculty, the University must be competitive with its peers. To retain the best faculty requires a similarly competitive approach. Salary equity also addresses internal equity issues regarding factors such as gender, race, work- life balance needs, especially for faculty raising families and academic discipline. It does so by actively upending and avoiding reproduction of internal salary hierarchies that have accumulated under the present salary policy. \*\*\*

In order to accomplish these critical objectives, the faculty must have confidence that their continuing and productive contributions to the goals of their units and to the University's missions of teaching, research, and service will be rewarded equitably throughout their careers. This policy is designed to provide for a predictable and equitable continuing salary progression for meritorious faculty. It does so by promoting principles of equity in every aspect of its vision, scope and implementation by building in and insisting upon practices of transparency and consistent application into all phases of review and evaluation. To achieve this goal, wherever it is deployed, the term "meritorious" as criteria for evaluation, raises and promotion must be transparently defined, and consistently applied in ways that at a minimum do not reproduce hierarchies based on institutional bias, but at best build pay and promotion equity.

\*University of Minnesota

[http://www.academic.umn.edu/wfc/documents/WFC-Salary-Equity-Study\\_2010.pdf](http://www.academic.umn.edu/wfc/documents/WFC-Salary-Equity-Study_2010.pdf)

People are the most valuable asset of an educational institution, and salary is a key way in which institutions demonstrate the value they place on individual employees. Salary equity is important at the University of Minnesota not only for reasons of fairness, or because it improves morale, protects the University's investment in human capital, and has a positive impact on recruiting, retention and productivity, but also because it is the law.

\*\*Amy Sun. 2014. Equality Is Not Enough: What the Classroom Has Taught Me About Justice. Everyday Feminist Magazine. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2014/09/equality-is-not-enough/>. Downloaded 03/30/16.

\*\*\*Southern Illinois University

[http://www.siue.edu/ugov/faculty/welfarecouncil/faculty\\_salary\\_equity\\_committee\\_operating\\_papers.shtml](http://www.siue.edu/ugov/faculty/welfarecouncil/faculty_salary_equity_committee_operating_papers.shtml)

Salary equity is an important contributor to faculty morale, faculty commitment to the university and students, and the university's ability to recruit and retain faculty members of high quality. Salary equity concerns include both external market comparisons with peer institutions and internal equity issues with regards to factors such as gender, race, and academic discipline.

<p>Rough Draft 1/20/16 FCMA/FCWA</p>
--

## 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

Last year, various faculty groups expressed concerns to then-Provost Ana Mari Cauce on how we evaluate the teaching of colleagues going up for tenure and promotion. 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 1, 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 sometimes 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%20D](https://www.cmich.edu/office_provost/facit/Documents/Teaching%20and%20Instructional%20D)

[esign/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>