**Thank you for consenting to do a peer evaluation of your colleague’s teaching effectiveness.**

**The University of Washington** requires that collegial evaluation of teaching be conducted ***every year*** for Instructors and Assistant Professors and at least ***every three years*** for Associate Professors and Professors. Collegial evaluations are also required for promotion of Lecturers and other instructional titles. For ways to maximize the benefits of peer review, see the CIDR description at:

<http://depts.washington.edu/cidrweb/Bulletin/ClassroomObservation.html>

The **School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences** is attempting to regularize and standardize teaching evaluations. To that end, their faculty mentors will review Assistant Professors annually. All other faculty will be reviewed every three years, with roughly a third of the qualifying faculty reviewed each year, by a member of the Curriculum Committee. Assignments will be random draws, and annual scheduling will be handled by the Chair of the Curriculum Committee in consultation with the Director.

After the in-class evaluation is complete, forward a copy to the reviewee for review and comment. The reviewee is invited to respond to the review, should he/she feel any points need to be elaborated on or explained. Both faculty members should sign this completed document (review and response). A follow-up meeting can be scheduled if either reviewer or reviewee feels this would be valuable.

The final signed evaluation should be sent to the Director with a copy to the reviewee no later than one month following the in-class visit. Teaching evaluations will be included in the faculty member’s file, will be available for review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as by all faculty during any promotion action. Evaluations will form one element of the promotion package, and will be forwarded to the College Council and ultimately to the Provost’s Office.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR REVIEWERS**

* Contact your reviewee early in the quarter to talk over what class session to attend; DON’T wait until the last week of the quarter.
* In addition to attending a full lecture, consider attending part of a laboratory or discussion section, or a TA meeting (for courses with several TAs, like Marine Biology or Water and Society), in order to get a more complete picture of the course and how the faculty has arranged it.
* Spend some time and effort writing your evaluation, so that it can be used by the reviewee to make changes.
* Meet with your reviewee after the fact, to go over your impressions while they are still fresh.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR REVIEWEES**

* Provide your reviewer with the following materials *a priori*: course syllabus and course web site access.
* Select 2-3 different dates that a reviewer might attend.
* Talk beforehand about areas in which you think you might like to improve, and those where you are searching for additional techniques or approaches. Prime your reviewer to be as helpful to you as possible.

The purpose of the attached form is to provide guidelines for the evaluator to use during the classroom visit and to suggest topics that should be discussed in the written evaluation. Any or all of the criteria listed may be used for the evaluation. The use of the scale is optional and intended to help the evaluator note particular areas of strength as well as areas for improvement.

|  |
| --- |
| **EVALUATION INFORMATION** |
| **Faculty Reviewee**:  **Rank**: |
| **Course Observed**: |
| **Date Observed**: |
| **Faculty Reviewer**:  **Rank**: |
|  |
| **CONTENT** |
| ***Main ideas are clear, specific, and accurate*** |
| ***Main ideas tied to previous and upcoming class topics*** |
| ***Lecture incorporates required readings*** |
| ***Incorporation of primary research material*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS** |
| ***Effective speaking skills (eye contact, clear vocal delivery, rate appropriate)*** |
| ***Visual aids/handouts clear*** |
| ***Effective use of in-class technology (e.g. computers, clickers)*** |
| ***In-class activities promote active learning*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **INTERACTION & ENGAGEMENT** |
| ***Effective at encouraging student participation/questions*** |
| ***The majority of students are engaged*** |
| ***Incorporates student responses into the lecture*** |
| ***Intellectual challenge appropriate for course level (100, 200. 300, 400)*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **NOTES** |
| **What were the instructor’s strengths as demonstrated in this classroom observation?** |
|  |
| **What suggestions do you have for improvement of this instructor’s pedagogical style?** |

|  |
| --- |
| **DEBRIEFING** |
| **Date of Debriefing** |
|  |
| **Additional comments from debriefing session between observer and observed faculty?** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SIGNATURES** | |
| **Faculty Reviewer** | **Date** |
|  | |
| **Faculty Reviewee** | **Date** |