College of Arts and Sciences

Policy and Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

May 28, 2026

This document shall serve as guidance for the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for faculty and administrators in the College of Arts and Sciences. Specifically, policies and procedures for creating, maintenance, and use of Teaching Portfolios, the use of selected items from Teaching Portfolios in annual faculty evaluation, and Peer Review of teaching, including policy, procedure and rubrics for Peer Review are discussed. Most items will be uploaded to, and reports generated from, the Watermark Faculty Success software planform, which is abbreviated "WFS" here.

I. The Teaching Portfolio.

A. Review of the Teaching Portfolio. Section 5.2.1 of the University-level Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness policy mandates that all full-time faculty construct a teaching portfolio. The full Teaching Portfolio will be reviewed at certain times based on suggestions in the University-level policy, summarized as follows:

> 1. Probationary faculty (Tenure Track Faculty who do not yet have Tenure) shall begin constructing their portfolios immediately upon joining the faculty and update it regularly through the probationary period. Full portfolios will be reviewed by appropriate administrators and committees as part of the mid-probationary review in year 3 and Tenure review in year 6 (or in the appropriate year for faculty given credit for prior service).
>
> 2. Non-tenure-track faculty shall begin constructing their portfolios immediately upon joining the faculty and update it regularly. Full portfolios will be reviewed by the faculty member's Department Chair in year 3 and appropriate administrators and committees as part of any Promotion reviews.
>
> 3. Tenured faculty members will continue to update their Teaching Portfolios annually. Full portfolios will be reviewed by appropriate administrators and committees as part of any Promotion reviews.

B. Construction of the Teaching Portfolio. The Teaching Portfolio will be constructed as a report generated in Watermark Faculty Success (WFS). Individual faculty are responsible for entering appropriate data into WFS so that the Portfolio will be properly constructed. The Portfolio will consist of three sections: Self Review, Peer Review, and Student Review. The College will provide a template for construction of the Portfolio describing which WFS sections should be used for various items. When retrieving a Teaching Portfolio from WFS, the last five years should be included, unless the faculty member was a member of the faculty for less than five years.

1. Self Review. The Self Review section of the Portfolio will consist of the following sections:

a. A Teaching Philosophy and Self-Evaluation statement. This statement mirrors the Teaching Self-Evaluation used in Promotion reviews. This document should describe the faculty member's approach to their teaching responsibilities, and include descriptions of improvement, use of feedback, and use of evidence-based teaching practices. This should be seen as a document that evolves over the course of a career
b. Annual teaching self-reflections. These should be short descriptions of teaching highlights from the past year, with particular attention to new course developments or course improvements.
c. Teaching assignments. This is a list of teaching assignments for the Portfolio date window, generated automatically in WFS. Faculty must upload the relevant Student Perceptions of Instruction report for each section.
d. Sample Course Syllabi. Faculty should upload to WFS course syllabi for selected courses, so that the Portfolio includes a set of syllabi (at least two, but possibly up to five or six) representative of the faculty member's instructional activities. For courses taught repeatedly during the Portfolio window, only one representative syllabus is needed.
e. Other Teaching Artifacts. Faculty should upload to WFS up to three artifacts each year. These could include items such as sample assignments or assessments, new class activities that were developed, or examples of outstanding student work that demonstrate instructional effectiveness.
f. Teaching Professional Development and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Faculty should include documentation of participation in any professional development activities related to teaching, and any deliverables (papers, presentations, classroom activities, etc.) developed that focus on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

2. Peer Review. The Peer Review section of the Portfolio will be populated after each peer review is conducted.

a. For each Peer Review conducted, two files will be uploaded. These are the Peer Review report generated by the Peer Reviewer, and the Instructor reflection/response to the Peer Review.

3. Student Review. The Student Review section of the Portfolio will consist of the following sections:

a. A summary of student evaluations, using charts and graphs. This mirrors the document currently required for mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion applications. This should be seen as a document that evolves over the course of a career. (Note:

Individual Student Perception of Instruction files do not need to be included here, as they are already reported as part of the course listing in the Self Evaluation section).
b. Results from structured student feedback or evaluation activities, such as SGIF or similar student feedback mechanisms, if any have been completed. These are optional.
c. Unsolicited student feedback. This includes unsolicited student comments, "Thank-a-Teacher" notes, or other similar items, if any has been received. These are optional.

C. Use of Teaching Portfolio items in Annual Reviews. Selected items from Teaching Portfolios should be used by Chairs in Annual Faculty Evaluations. These items will be included in annual Faculty Activity Reports which are extracted from WFS. Faculty are responsible for addition relevant information to WFS so that Faculty Activity Reports will contain the required materials.

In addition to Student Perceptions of Instruction, the following portfolio elements should be used by Chairs when performing annual faculty evaluations:

1. Annual teaching reflections, which should summarize for that year course development, use of evidence-based practices, and efforts to increase student success
2. Representative course syllabi for that year
3. Representative course artifacts for that year

When placed in the appropriate WFS sections, these items will appear in annual Faculty Activity Reports.

II. Peer Review of Teaching

A. Timing of Peer Reviews. Peer Review of Teaching is mandated by the University policy at certain points in a faculty member's career. These include, for all faculty, a Peer Review in Year 2 and again in Year 4, with subsequent reviews prior to submission of an application for Promotion. Specifically:

1. The 2nd year peer review should, unless significant issues prevent it, be conducted in the Fall semester. This review is included in the Teaching Portfolio that is reviewed as part of the mid-probationary review (for tenure-track faculty) or 3rd year annual review (for non-tenure-track faculty). Department chairs should include the 2nd year Peer Review in their annual review of probationary faculty.

2. The 4th year peer review should, unless significant issues prevent it, be conducted in the Spring semester. This review is included in the Teaching Portfolio that is reviewed as part of the tenure and promotion review (for tenure-track faculty) or promotion review (for assistant professors of instruction applying for associate professor of instruction) which occurs in year 6. Department chairs should include the 4th year Peer Review in their annual review of probationary faculty.

3. For faculty hired with 2 or 3 years of credit for prior service, a Peer Review will be conducted near the midpoint of the probationary period. For faculty hired with 1 year of service credit, two reviews are required in years 2 and 4.

4. For promotion reviews not considered in points 1 and 2 above, a Peer Review of Teaching should be scheduled in the Spring semester of the year prior to applying for promotion, unless significant issues prevent it. This includes faculty applying for promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor, associate professors (both tenure-track and instructional professorial track) applying for Full Professors, and Assistant Professors of Instruction applying for Associate Professor of Instruction in Year 7 or later. These reviews may be used in promotion applications submitted the following academic year, or the year after that. After a gap of two or more years, a new peer review will be required.

5. Prior to the start of the academic year, a list of faculty to be peer reviewed will be generated as follows:

a. By July 15, the College will send a list of faculty members who require a peer review in the upcoming academic year to the Department Chairs.

b. Also by July 15, other faculty requiring a peer review for promotion in the upcoming academic year should notify their department chair. (Note: This is to allow a determination of the number of reviews that need to be done that year so the college peer review of teaching committee can be adequately staffed. **Faculty considering promotion need to request a review over a year before their promotion application is submitted.**)

c. By September 1, Department Chairs forward to the Dean a list of all faculty in their departments requiring Peer Review in the upcoming academic year.

B. The Peer Review Committee and Assignment of Peer Reviewers. The College will, annually, constitute a peer review committee who will be trained to conduct the peer review and write peer review reports. The committee will be constituted using the guidelines below.

1. In September, the Dean will identify and constitute a Peer Review committee and committee chair, which will consist of no less than one committee member for every three candidates being reviewed. Committee members should expect to do no more than three reviews in a given year.

2. Committee members and faculty being reviewed will be from different Departments, but matched based on Departmental meta-major as follows:

a. *Natural Sciences and Mathematics*: Biology; Chemistry; Earth Sciences; Marine Sciences; Mathematics & Statistics; Physics

b. *Social Sciences*: Communications; Political Science & Criminal Justice; Psychology; Sociology, Anthropology & Social Work

c. *Humanities*: English; History; Modern and Classical Languages; Philosophy

d. *Fine and Performing Arts*: Art & Art History; Music; Theatre & Dance

If a faculty member wishes to be paired with a reviewer from a different metamajor, that request needs to be made to their Department Chair prior to August 15 so that the College committee can be appropriately staffed.

3. The committee chair will convene a committee meeting by the start of October.

4. Training, to be coordinated with and provided by the ILC, will take place before the start of reviews and will cover both the observation process and writing effective peer review reports.

5. The committee chair will pair reviewers with faculty members to be reviewed, based on meta-major. Prior to being assigned, the committee chair will inform the faculty being reviewed of the identity of their peer reviewer. Faculty may request a different reviewer if they feel the reviewer may not be objective. Once review assignments are finalized, the committee chair will inform the committee members of their review assignments.

C. The Class Observation and Reports. The peer reviewer and reviewee will meet to discuss the logistics of the peer review and conduct the review using the following guidelines.

1. The observer will contact the faculty member to be observed; they will either meet in person or correspond remotely to discuss the peer review process. This discussion should include:

    a. The choice of observation course, day, and time. For observation of online courses, the reviewer is to be added to the course Canvas site as an Observer for a 7-day window.

    b. A review of the process.

    c. A discussion of the class period's subject matter.

    d. Completion of the Pre-Visit Discussion Form (included in the Rubrics section, below).

2. In-class observations should be completed no later than three weeks before the end of term.

3. The observer and faculty member will hold a post-observation meeting no later than one week after the observation to discuss the observation and outline the contents of the peer review report. The Post-Visit Discussion Form (included in the Rubrics section, below) will be completed during this meeting.

4. The observer will provide the faculty member and the faculty member's Department Chair a copy of the peer review report no later than two weeks after the post-observation meeting. The letter should contain Pre- and Post- visit Discussion forms, along with the observer's narrative statement.

5. The faculty member will provide a response to the observation letter within one week after having received the observation letter. A copy of their response should be sent to their Department Chair.

6. The faculty member is responsible for uploading the Peer Review Report and their response to WFS. (Note: The pre- and post- visit discussion forms and rubric are not uploaded to WFS; they are used to guide the review process and writing of the reviewer report).

7. A second classroom visit may be scheduled if (a) the original visit is significantly interrupted, or (b) at the instructor's request, based on issues that occurred during the class. This should be arranged no more than one day after the initial classroom visit. A third visit should only be arranged in extraordinary circumstances, and only with approval of the Dean.

D. Peer reviews, including pre- and post- visit meetings, will be conducted using specific rubrics provided by the College. Different rubrics are provided for in-person and online instruction and are flexible for a wide variety of course types. The Review rubrics consist of certain required dimensions, which must be addressed in the review, and optional or faculty-defined dimensions, at least one of which must be selected for use by the faculty member being reviewed. The rubrics require qualitative or narrative assessment of each element; they do not include a numeric scale.