

Faculty of Science
Summative Assessment of Teaching Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
July 2012

The Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) and Dean of Science requests that each candidate's file includes a summative assessment of the teaching dossier or portfolio and other appropriate evidence of performance as a university teacher and educator. Please note that individual letters summarizing the classroom visits by peer reviewers are no longer accepted by themselves; rather, a summary of these reports must be included within the body of the summative assessment or as a separate peer teaching report. The peer evaluations should consist of a minimum of three peers preferably four who have each attended at least two lectures or other teaching activity. The teaching report or summary must be an assessment of the most current teaching term possible. Typically, the Associate Head of Faculty Affairs, the chair of the Promotion/Tenure committee or the Teaching Evaluation committee with the input of the peer reviewers writes this assessment. The assessment should include the following sections (descriptions are provided in italics) and is normally 2-3 pages in length.

1. Description of the procedure:

Describe the nature of the review process in terms of who conducted the review, when and how the review took place and what material the reviewers evaluated.

2. Teaching load:

Include a quantitative summary of the amount of teaching performed by the candidate and how the amount of teaching compares to the expected norms of the Department. If the amount of teaching in one or more particular areas does not meet the expected standards, an explanation should be included.

3. Student evaluations:

A quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of the candidate's student evaluations is to be included.

Summary Table of Student Evaluations:

The template provided below should be used to present a summary with evaluations in teaching performance. The period covered should be since the candidate's appointment or last promotion. Please do not include the "bubble charts" as the table below takes the place of these. In addition, do not include the responses to the Faculty of Science Module (Questions 8-12).

Begin Table Template -->

=====

The instructor was evaluated in the following courses using the Course Evaluation Teaching Questionnaire in which students rate instructors on the following attributes on scale of 1-5, and also provide written comments.

1. The instructor made it clear what students were expected to learn.
2. The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively
3. The instructor helped inspire interest in learning the subject matter
4. Overall, evaluation of student learning (through exams, essays, presentations etc.) was fair.

5. The instructor showed concern for student learning.
6. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.

The average score (+/- standard deviation) for each of these attributes (Q1 to Q6 columns) are given below. Also provided is the Q6 average (+/- standard deviation) across all sections of the course taught in the previous three years and the number of such sections (Q6 Section Average). The overall Q6 average (+/- standard deviation) for courses taught at that level in the program (i.e. 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th year or graduate level) is provided (Q6 Program Average).

Course	Session	Responses (Enrolled)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q6 Section Average (# sections)	Q6 Program Average (# courses)
BIOL 201	2012 W	45 (60)	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/-0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3	4.2 +/- 0.3 (10)	4.2 +/- 0.3 (32)

<--End Table Template

Student Comments:

The candidate has the right to add student comments to the file providing they were obtained through formal procedures. If the student comments are added, it must be a balanced and comprehensive set (rather than a selection by the candidate).

Assessment of Student Evaluations

A qualitative assessment of the candidate's student evaluations will be included, and a description of how these evaluations compare to the expected norms in the Department. If the candidate's student evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the expected standards, a comment or explanatory statement should be included.

4. Peer evaluations:

The summative peer evaluation should be from the most current teaching term possible.

*A summary of qualitative peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels needs to be included as well as a statement regarding how these assessments compare to the expected standards of the Department. **As an alternative, it is recommended that a separate peer evaluation of teaching report be attached and the overall summary stated in this section.** Please see the Faculty of Science Peer Review of Teaching guidelines.*

Overall, this section or an attached peer teaching report should summarize observations from the classroom visits (including strengths and weaknesses), student interviews (if carried out), and supporting teaching materials such as the teaching dossier. If the candidate's peer evaluations in one or more particular areas do not meet the normally expected standard, an explanation should be included.

5. Graduate (Undergraduate Research) Supervision:

A statement regarding the candidate's performance as a graduate student supervisor in terms of the student's degree completion, time to completion, publications with students, research awards, and subsequent professional success of trainees. This section can also include supervision of undergraduate research such as B.Sc. directed research and Honours theses. For Instructors and Senior Instructors, professional mentoring of TAs could be included along with membership on thesis committees.

Some departments choose the option of including confidential interviews with current or previous graduate students of the faculty member being evaluated. The promotion and tenure committee or the Department Head will the confidential interview to determine the quality of instruction and support being provided such as accessibility, feedback on work, career support and any concerns. In the case of appointment to Senior Instructor or Professor of Teaching, if laboratory instruction is the primary responsibility, the committee could interview the TAs involved in the lab.

6. Other teaching or educational activities:

A description of any other major teaching or educational activities performed by the candidate, along with statements supported by summarized evidence regarding the candidate's effectiveness and the importance of these activities may be included. In addition, such activities as curriculum development, program or course direction, development of instructional materials (textbooks, course packages) or websites, and successful grant applications for course development can be identified, as well as examples of leadership in course/instructional or curriculum development. Outreach and/or courses taught outside of UBC should be listed including the institutions and the impact. This section could also include advising activities including undergraduates, graduates and other instructors.

7. Awards:

A list and brief description of any teaching and mentorship awards or other recognition of teaching excellence the candidate has received.

8. Professional Development:

A list and brief description of any special efforts undertaken to improve teaching performance through UBC (such as TAG, CTLT) or outside programs, such as participation in teaching conferences or workshops.

9. Other evidence:

Include a summary of any other evidence that bears upon the effectiveness or quality of the candidate's teaching. Examples might include: leadership in teaching initiatives within UBC and outside of UBC, national professional accreditation of a training program the candidate directs; recognition by a scholarly society of the candidate's educational contributions to the field; conference presentations; or publications on the scholarship of teaching.

10. Overall summary:

Provide an overall summary of the candidate's performance as a university teacher and educator and describe how this compares to the expected norm for the Department.