



Strategies to Value Effective Teaching

Teaching Assessment Working Group

Final Report

August 9, 2019

Table of Contents

- I. Executive Summary..... 3
- II. Introduction 5
- III. Background 7
 - Assessment and Evaluation 7
 - Recent SFU Reports 7
 - Current Situation at SFU 8
- IV. Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching 11
 - Summary 11
 - Kaplan Decision (2018) 11
 - Recommendations 11
 - Goals addressed 13
- V. Use of Teaching Assessment Methods Beyond SET 14
 - Guidance for faculty members 15
 - Guidance for tenure and promotion committees 15
 - General comment on teaching assessment..... 15
 - Goals addressed 16
- VI. Improving the Recognition of Teaching..... 17
 - Recommendations 17
 - Goals addressed 18
- VII. Training and Support for Faculty Members and TPCs 19
 - Goals addressed 19
- VIII. Recommendations for Changes to Policy and Administration 20



	Summary	20
	Changes that Academic Units Can Make	20
	Actions for Deans	22
	Actions for the VPA / AVPLT	23
	Institutional Support	24
	Resources	24
	Changes to the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement	25
	Reporting and Review	25
	Goals addressed	26
IX.	Conclusions	27
X.	Bibliography	28
XI.	Appendices.....	31
	Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations	31
	Appendix B: TAWG Terms of Reference	38
	Appendix C: Goals for improving how we assess and value teaching	41
	Appendix D: Definitions	42
	Appendix E: Guidance for use of teaching assessment methods by faculty members	44
	Appendix F: Guidance for use of teaching assessment methods by academic units	48
	Appendix G: Recommendations for workshops for faculty members	49
	Appendix H: Examples / templates.....	51

I. Executive Summary

The Teaching Assessment Working Group (TAWG) was established in August 2017 to encourage an active conversation amongst faculty at SFU about how we assess and value teaching and to recommend ways to review teaching practice that are consistent, flexible and robust, and that are useful and useable to faculty, chairs, tenure and promotion committees (TPCs) and deans. In this report, TAWG proposes several recommendations in five main categories:

1. Use of student evaluations of teaching (SET)
2. Use of teaching assessment methods beyond SET
3. Improving the recognition of teaching
4. Training and support for faculty members and TPCs
5. Recommendations for changes to policy and administration

Evaluating teaching effectiveness is a key goal of both the biennial review and tenure/promotion processes. While it is generally accepted that an effective teacher promotes and enables learning, it is difficult to measure teaching effectiveness because it is difficult to measure learning. While Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) are the most commonly used form of assessment, SET in itself is not a measure of student learning. It is better to think of SET as a tool for understanding the student experience. We recommend that **faculty use SET as a tool to inform pedagogy**, to find out what students believe is working in their classes and what isn't, to discover how a new format or method was received. We recommend that **TPCs and Deans not use SET for the biennial review process**, as there is too much potential for bias. TPCs may use SET results in evaluating tenure/promotion applications as **one form of evidence** demonstrating how students experience the applicant's teaching, particularly changes in that experience over time. We also see a potential role for **Chairs and Directors to use SET as one part of a broader set of indicators to identify outliers, to inform teaching assignments and as part of a collective assessment of a program** to help identify changes to improve student learning and experience.

The use of teaching assessment methods beyond SET has recently been studied by a group reporting to the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning. One major finding of the group's final report (SETCWG, 2017) is that TPCs rely heavily upon student evaluations and are not comfortable with other assessment methods. TAWG supports the recommendations of this report, which include the **development of a more robust assessment of teaching based on five principles**: that assessments of teaching should use **multiple methods** and **multiple sources** gathered over **multiple points in time**, all of which should be **viewed holistically** (without focusing on a single method or source) and **used in alignment with individual instructors' career paths**. The report includes a comprehensive discussion of methods that are consistent with these principles. In our report, we propose guidelines for faculty and TPCs for use of these methods. TAWG recommends that **each Academic Unit define a teaching assessment framework based on Faculty Member Guidelines (Appendix E) and the TPC Guidelines (Appendix F) for use within the Unit** and that **TPC members be encouraged to participate in training on how to assess teaching**. These tools have been drafted in terms of three sources of data: self-reflection, students, and peers.

To increase the recognition of teaching, we recommend that we **expand and enhance teaching awards at SFU**, as well as **improve the recognition and celebration of teaching award winners**. We also



recommend that the University **explore non-competitive criteria-based mechanisms to recognize teaching effectiveness** and **highlight the importance of teaching** within the University's mandate.

Faculty members will require guidance in preparing documentation for teaching assessment. As part of its mandate, **TAWG has worked to develop a series of workshops to introduce faculty members to different methods of assessing teaching**. The workshops start with an overview of teaching assessment methods and practices, and continue with workshops focusing on use of student feedback, peer feedback, and self-assessment and reflection. We **recommend that workshops on assessing and valuing teaching be provided for TPC members by the Associate Vice President, Learning and Teaching (AVPLT), working in concert with Faculty Relations, SFUFA and the Centre for Educational Excellence (CEE)** (formerly Teaching and Learning Centre).

To ensure that teaching is valued, it should be assessed comprehensively, without focus on a single source or method, evaluated as an ongoing process of inquiry, experimentation and reflection, and it should be recognized, both through salary review and promotion, and through public recognition. We recommend that **Academic Units review their tenure/promotion criteria related to teaching** for clarity and consistency and that they **define a teaching assessment framework for their unit to use to evaluate teaching**. We recommend that Academic Units be encouraged to **assign step awards based on both teaching and research** and to **make sure that contributions to teaching impact the step award**. **Deans should make sure that departmental criteria for teaching assessment are multi-faceted and comprehensive** and that **biennial review (BR) and tenure/promotion (TP) cases provide sufficient evidence for effective teaching**. The Vice-President Academic should **encourage TPCs to attach more significance to teaching at BR and TP and should explore shifting from a summative to a formative system of assessment to encourage positive change**.

The report concludes with some suggestions for ways to review implementation of these recommendations and their impact.

The full list of recommendations is provided in Appendix A. We hope that these recommendations will be useful and useable and will help build a culture where teaching is valued.

II. Introduction

The Teaching Assessment Working Group was established by Vice President, Academic and Provost Peter Keller in August 2017 to encourage an active conversation amongst faculty at SFU about how we assess and value teaching and to recommend ways to review teaching practice that are consistent, flexible and robust, and that are useful and useable to faculty, chairs, tenure and promotion committees (TPCs) and deans. The TAWG Terms of Reference are attached as Appendix B. The group included representation from all faculties, from the SFU Faculty Association (SFUFA), the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL), and Faculty Relations, and included both teaching and research faculty who were at various levels of their careers.

We met with Dean's Advisory Councils in all eight faculties as well as several additional groups to identify concerns and to invite feedback. We also reviewed several recent SFU reports related to these issues:

- Task Force on Teaching and Learning: Final Report (TFTL, 2010),
- Teaching and Course Evaluation Project: Final Report (TCEP, 2013), and
- Developing a Teaching Assessment Framework for Simon Fraser University: Final Report of the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Working Group (SETCWG, 2018),

as well as a recent thesis examining the role of teaching evaluation in tenure and promotion policies in Canada (Gravestock, 2011). Following the release of a draft of this report, TAWG hosted a session at the Teaching and Learning Centre's (TLC's) 17th Symposium on Teaching and Learning to gather feedback and further recommendations from the community.

Building a culture where teaching is valued is central to SFU's Mission Statement,

"To be the leading engaged university defined by its dynamic integration of innovative education, cutting-edge research, and far-reaching community engagement,"

as an **innovative education** requires that faculty members be engaged in their teaching, and that they have access to the support and encouragement they need to be able to create and implement innovations.

However, various concerns about the climate for teaching and the availability of teaching support have been raised in our consultations:

- Faculty are reluctant to try new things because they feel this may negatively impact their teaching assessments and hence their evaluations during biennial reviews and promotion;
- We heard from many faculty members that they do not feel their teaching is valued, but concerns were particularly strong amongst teaching faculty who felt that their contributions were ignored in the biennial review process;
- Teaching excellence is not broadly recognized, rewarded, celebrated or communicated;
- TPCs are not comfortable using methods of teaching assessment other than formal surveys of student evaluations of teaching;
- There is a lack of alignment between departmental tenure and promotion (TP) criteria and TP review practice; and
- After at least ten years of discussion and reports, some progress has been made (e.g. creation of the Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC), introduction of university-wide student evaluation



system, establishment of a new AVPA Learning and Teaching, introduction of Faculty Teaching Fellows) but more can be done to ensure that effective teaching is a core value of the institution.

Based on these concerns, we developed goals in three main areas, for (1) faculty members, (2) academic units, and (3) the University, that we believe will improve the way we value and assess teaching; these goals can be found in Appendix C. The goals were distributed to the community in early 2018 for consideration by academic units and faculties as they drafted their 2019-2024 Academic Plans (TAWG, 2018a). Since then, TAWG has used these goals to develop a set of strategies and recommendations to value teaching practice and to facilitate consistency, flexibility and robustness of reviews of teaching practice of use to all stakeholders.

Our recommendations to address the above goals fall into five main categories:

1. Use of student evaluations of teaching (SET)
2. Use of teaching assessment methods beyond SET
3. Improving the recognition of teaching
4. Training and support for faculty members and TPCs
5. Recommendations for changes to policy and administration

The recommendations in each category, with some background and discussion and a list of the goals addressed, are presented in this report. A summary is provided in Appendix A. We hope that these recommendations will be useful and useable and will help build a culture where teaching is valued.

III. Background

Assessment and Evaluation

A key precept of any assessment system is that it be designed with a specific outcome in mind—that is, what is it that the assessment is supposed to examine and how will the data be used? In the current context, assessment of teaching, results might be used by the instructor to adjust the course structure, content, or pedagogical approach to formatively improve student outcomes. This would be the typical practice within a *formative* assessment system. In planning their teaching, instructors would look at assessment data as providing information for their use within their practice and the primary purpose would be to get data, typically in a timely and ongoing manner, that allows them to fully understand the outcomes of their planning, instruction, and student learning activities and adjust their teaching as needed. Formative assessment is typically a core component of any continuous improvement system.

Assessment data might also be used in a *summative* manner for evaluation—that is to evaluate the outcomes of a system at a set point in time. Summative evaluations are typically designed to determine the value of a program, course, or experience and frequently have higher stakes associated with them as a result. Again, in the current context, assessment data could be used to determine the “value” (e.g. evaluation) of a faculty member’s teaching at key points in time (the end of a course, during biennial review, for renewal, for tenure or for promotion). When data is used to evaluate something in a summative manner, the goal is descriptive and the results are not as readily available for formative use. For example, the results of our biennial assessments summarize two years of teaching data and are provided in the middle of the semester following submission of the review documents, meaning any changes an instructor might make would be in response to data 2½ to three years old by the time changes could be implemented. Summative assessments are frequently used for periodic review of specific performance outcomes.

While contract renewal, tenure and promotion are focused on individual achievement, biennial assessment in the current context of limited salary steps introduces competitive stimuli. In effect, the biennial assessment system shifts the focus from a descriptive criterion assessment (what is the effectiveness of each individual’s teaching and does it meet defined effectiveness criteria) to a normalized system (how can we differentiate between participants to allocate limited rewards, irrespective of an independent measure of quality).

These three features—formative, summative, and competitive evaluation—are core parts of many evaluation systems, including our own. In considering how best to assess teaching, it is critical that the influence of the entire evaluation system be considered, and not just the particular definitions of effective teaching or specific measures that may be available.

Recent SFU Reports

Three recent SFU reports provide background related to issues of teaching assessment, as well as recommendations that are relevant to faculty members, tenure and promotion committees (TPCs), and the University: the Task Force on Teaching and Learning (TFTL) report “TFTL: Recommendations Report” (TFTL, 2010), the Teaching and Course Evaluation Project (TCEP) report “Student Evaluation of Teaching and Courses” (TCEP, 2013), and the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Courses Working Group (SETCWG) report “Developing a Teaching Assessment Framework for SFU” (SETCWG, 2017). Each of

these reports includes a comprehensive survey of the literature and consideration of the situation at SFU. A few highlights will be presented here; please see these reports for further details.

The goal of the TFTL was to develop recommendations to enhance teaching and learning support at SFU. The group studied the teaching and learning environment at SFU and recommended establishment of a coordinated teaching and learning support system. Of particular interest to academic units, they recommended development of a coherent system to evaluate teaching and learning effectiveness¹ that includes multiple inputs as well as ability to recognize teaching workload, and encouraged more ways to recognize and value teaching, including awards, special recognitions and incentives.

The TCEP was asked to develop recommendations for a new system of student evaluation of teaching and courses, with an emphasis on improving the teaching and learning environment, ensuring efficient methods of data collection, storage and protection of privacy, and adoption of guidelines for best practices in the use of evaluation data. The report was based on earlier work by the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) and the TFTL. The report presents many recommendations related to the ethical and appropriate use of SET data, but also emphasizes that SET should not be the sole source of data for decision making around teaching performance, suggesting that peer evaluation and/or teaching dossiers provide supplemental information.

The SETCWG was tasked with determining which SFU policies govern the evaluation of instructors and courses, and identifying areas where SFU practices and policies require revision or additions. The report reviews both the relevant academic literature and SFU policies, and summarizes interviews with SFU TPC Chairs, teaching fellows, and teaching award recipients. The report contains a number of recommendations, but also highlights limitations and recommendations for future work. It contains a proposed framework for teaching assessment and an inventory of 73 methods of teaching assessment. The framework is based on five principles:

1. Use multiple methods – several pieces of data and evidence should be collected using various methods,
2. Use multiple sources – to increase validity, teaching assessment methods from various sources should be gathered,
3. Gather teaching assessment methods over multiple points in time - this will increase reliability,
4. View teaching assessment methods holistically – without focusing on one particular piece of data or evidence, and
5. A teaching assessment should align with an instructor's career path – one single prescribed, weighted evaluation should not be used for all instructors.

Current Situation at SFU

Teaching assessment methods used at SFU

The SFUFA/SFU Collective agreement (SFUFA/SFU 2014) clearly states that “teaching is of fundamental importance” and that matters that should be taken into account when evaluating teaching include mastery of the subjects being taught, generation of enthusiasm in students, maintenance of appropriate academic standards, dedicated involvement within one's field(s), openness to innovation, graduate

¹ Teaching effectiveness, and other terms used to describe teaching and teaching assessment, are defined in Appendix D.

supervision, and development of academic programs. In addition, it states that consideration should be given to the ability and willingness of a faculty member to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction, and to the provision of services to students over and above formal teaching, particularly where the service is of a time-consuming nature. It states that teaching effectiveness should be evaluated through a combination of methods, including student questionnaires, observations of faculty colleagues, teaching portfolios, and the calibre of supervised dissertations and theses.

The SETCWG report summarizes the current state (as of 2016) of teaching assessment methods at SFU. The SETCWG studied what was written in departmental tenure and promotion criteria, and surveyed chairs to find out what actually happened in the TP review process. Table 1 summarizes the results and compares methods that were included in TP criteria to those actually used in the review process. This table includes methods included in TP criteria by > 50% of the departments (for further detail see SETCWG report, Tables 32 and 33):

Table 1: Summary of use of teaching assessment methods in TP criteria and TP review practice (SETCWG report, Tables 32 and 33). Use of some methods is required, while use of others is either recommended or optional.

Method	TP Criteria	TP Practice		
	Frequency of use in departmental TP criteria	Frequency of use in TP review - required	Frequency of use by in TP review – recommended	Frequency of use in TP review – optional
Teaching Assessment Data				
SET	95%	100%	-	-
Teaching dossiers	86%	53%	17%	3%
Classroom observations	51%	3%	3%	3%
Teaching philosophy statements	49%	63%	10%	10%
Teaching Assessment Evidence – Pedagogical Contributions				
Curriculum/courses design and development	92%	20%	3%	3%
Graduate supervision or committee service	92%	7%	0%	0%
Teaching activity (list of courses, level and breadth)	89%	17%	0%	3%
Supervision of experiential learning courses	73%	-	-	-
Teaching materials	54%	37%	10%	3%
Teaching Assessment Evidence – Pedagogical Growth				
Use of innovative techniques	70%	30%	3%	17%
Professional development	51%	17%	3%	10%

There are obvious discrepancies between policy (TP criteria) and practice (frequency of use), with most forms of assessment being used less than stipulated. The exception is the observation that student evaluations of teaching (SET) are used universally.

Views of SFU faculty members on teaching assessment



In the fall of 2018, the TAWG surveyed all faculty members at SFU to find out how they reflect on their teaching, what evidence they feel would be useful in evaluating their teaching, and how they feel their teaching is valued. 340 faculty members responded to the survey, or 30% of faculty at SFU.

A report on the survey has been prepared (TAWG, 2019). Most of the questions were multiple choice questions, but some had open-ended answers. The results of the multiple choice questions are represented as tables and/or graphs. The open-ended answers were analyzed by Ms. Vanja Zdjelar, MA candidate in Criminology. Her work is summarized in the TAWG report, but her complete report, which describes the methodology in detail and compares the response of tenure vs teaching track and of tenured vs untenured faculty, is also available (Zdjelar, 2019).

From the survey, it is clear that many faculty are reflective, thoughtful teachers who care deeply about their teaching. Participants report that student feedback, both informal (e.g. conversations with students outside of class, surveys they conduct during class, and alumni feedback) and formal (teaching evaluations including SFU's online system SETC), is very important. It helps them determine whether their course went well, whether or not they should make changes, and informs the changes that they make. In general, participants feel that their TPCs rely too heavily on formal teaching evaluations including SETC, and would like to see TPCs use a broader range of assessment methods. Overall, participants are not very satisfied with the way their teaching is assessed; on a scale of 1 (not satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), they ranked their satisfaction at 2.64. They are most satisfied with how their teaching is valued by their students (3.81), followed by their academic unit (2.97). They are least satisfied by how their teaching is valued by SFU (2.67). About 30% of respondents to Question 16 (Overall, how satisfied are you with how your teaching is valued) responded that they felt that their teaching was not valued. However, many others wrote that they personally value their teaching and achieve great satisfaction from this aspect of their work.

IV. Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching

Summary

Evaluating teaching effectiveness is a key goal of both the biennial review and tenure/promotion processes. While it is generally accepted that an effective teacher promotes and enables learning, it is difficult to measure teaching effectiveness because it is difficult to measure learning. While student evaluations of teaching (SET) are the most commonly used form of assessment, SET in itself is not a measure of student learning. It is better to think of SET as a tool for understanding the student experience. The use of SET allows students to have a voice in their education. SET can also be very useful for identifying outliers – either teachers who are struggling or teachers who are exceptional.

Kaplan Decision (2018)

Contention between the Ryerson Faculty Association and Ryerson University about the use of SET for the purpose of evaluation of a faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher was sent to an arbitration hearing presided over by William Kaplan, a Canadian lawyer, mediator and arbitrator. His decision (Kaplan, 2018) provides a useful summary of the benefits and difficulties with use of SET:

- SETs have value because they capture the student experience
- SETs are easy to administer
- Numerous factors – including personal characteristics, response rates, and course characteristics – skew the results
- Averages establish nothing relevant or useful about teaching effectiveness, and should not be compared across course formats, levels, topics, or disciplines
- If SETs must be presented, they should be presented as a frequency distribution with response rates and as a source of information about the student experience, and not as a measure of teaching effectiveness
- Deans, Chairs and TPCs should be educated in the inherent and systematic biases in SETs
- The best way to assess teaching is through use of a teaching dossier and in-class peer assessment

In his deliberations, Mr. Kaplan heard expert testimony from Professors Phillip Stark and Richard Freishtat (Stark and Freishtat, 2014). Professor Stark (UC Berkeley) visited SFU in April, 2018 to give a public presentation and to discuss use of SET with TAWG and other interested parties (Stark, 2018). In his lecture, Professor Stark gave a very comprehensive overview of bias issues related to use of SET and made several suggestions as to how SET should be used. Links to Mr. Kaplan's decision, Prof. Stark's presentation and paper, and other references can be found in the Bibliography – please see these references for further details.

Recommendations

All users of SET data should understand the risks involved in using data that research has shown may systematically disadvantage some faculty members and groups of faculty for reasons that are unrelated to their teaching. SET data should be used with caution, and never as the only indicator regarding faculty teaching.



Use of SET by Role

By Faculty Members

Faculty should:

- Use this as a tool to inform pedagogy rather than assess teaching
- Utilize the four questions that are available to them in SETC to find out what is working, and what isn't, in their classes, how a new format of assignments or new material was received, etc., with the idea of using the responses as a basis for reflection of their teaching
- Use the opportunity to add contextual information as a way to reflect on their teaching
- Use mid-semester (informal) surveys for formative questions and end of semester survey for summative questions
- Consult with experts such as their faculty's Educational Consultant on how to word questions – in particular on how to ask questions that focus on the student experience

By TPCs

Because of the different purposes of biennial reviews (competitive) and tenure/promotion decisions (summative), we are recommending using SET in different ways in the two processes:

- TPCs should not use SET results for biennial review, because there are questions of validity and too much potential for bias.
- TPCs may use SET results in evaluating tenure/promotion applications as **one form** of evidence demonstrating how students experience the applicant's teaching, particularly changes in that experience over time.

By Chairs and Directors

- Use this as a tool to inform pedagogy rather than assess teaching
- Use SET results as one indicator among multiple indicators to inform teaching assignments
- Use SET results to flag outliers for further investigation – faculty who receive consistently exceptional responses may be considered for awards; faculty who receive consistently negative responses may be provided with support to improve their teaching practice
- Use SET results as one part of a broader program of collective assessment of a program to help identify changes to improve student learning and experience

SETC Design

- Preamble:
 - o Use the preamble on the SETC questionnaire to educate students on the importance of SET, how it is used, and how to make useful comments
- Contextual component:
 - o Make the purpose of the instructor-related context section clearer. This could be used as an opportunity for the faculty member to reflect on their teaching – what they tried, what worked, what didn't. This section is currently presented as a way to influence how the results are evaluated, which is not the same thing.
- Questions:
 - o Students are asked to respond to a SET survey for each class they are taking at a time when they are already busy and stressed.

- Reduce the number of questions. The current version consists of 23 questions – 10 would be more reasonable, e.g. 3 institution questions, 3 department questions and 4 instructor questions.
 - Make sure that questions provide answers to things the institution/ department/instructor are really interested in and can only find out in this way (e.g. make sure that the information is not provided by the annual student satisfaction survey)
 - To reduce survey fatigue consider shifting to sampling strategy for gathering responses rather than a census approach.
- Revise any judgment-based questions on SETC questionnaires (Stark and Freishtat, 2014). Questions should be rewritten to focus on the student's experience e.g.
 - I could understand the instructor's explanations (instead of The course instructor explained concepts clearly)
 - I understood what was expected of me (instead of The course instructor explained grading criteria clearly)
- Questions should focus on issues that affect learning and the learning experience e.g.
 - I feel this course is too much work
 - I cannot read the instructor's handwriting
 - I feel I learned a lot in this class
- Presentation of Responses
 - Reorganize the presentation to condense the information
 - Do not present averages, present frequency distributions with response rates
 - Do not rank or compare across faculty, course formats, levels, topics or disciplines
 - Provide instructors with more raw data so that they can explore, for example, cross-tabulations on pairs of questions in order to better understand the student experience in their class, while ensuring confidentiality of students is maintained

Goals addressed

- The capacity to understand and evaluate teaching is present in all steps of the process
- TPCs have the tools and knowledge to value effective teaching

V. Use of Teaching Assessment Methods Beyond SET

Article 28.5 of the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement (SFUFA/SFU, 2014) states that “Teaching effectiveness should be measured or assessed through a combination of methods, including student questionnaires, the observations of faculty colleagues, teaching portfolios, and the calibre of supervised dissertations and theses.”

The final report of the SETCWG summarizes assessment policies and practices currently implemented at SFU and recommends potential improvements (SETCWG, 2017). It includes a discussion of best practices identified in a literature review, relevant SFU policies used in tenure and promotion processes, results of interviews with chairs of SFU Tenure and Promotion Committees and with select SFU award-winning instructors, a summary of teaching assessment practices and policies used at other Canadian institutions, and a teaching assessment framework that outlines guiding principles and provides an inventory of assessment methods for use by academic units in developing their teaching assessment policies and practices.

One major finding of the report was that, despite SFU policies such as Article 28.5 of the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement and unit TP criteria that recommend using multiple methods of assessment, interviews with TPC Chairs in 2016 indicated that TPCs rely heavily upon student evaluations (100%). Only 9% of TPC Chairs reported utilizing classroom observations despite this method being mentioned in 51% of the TP criteria. While teaching philosophy statements and/or portfolios were frequently submitted (83% and 73% respectively), TPC Chairs noted that there was uncertainty about how they should be assessed, leading once again to a greater reliance on student evaluations.

Decreasing the reliance of TPCs on student evaluations is also recommended by a recent arbitration decision involving teaching assessment at Ryerson University (Kaplan, 2018). Arbitrator William Kaplan declared that where “assessing teaching effectiveness is concerned – especially in the context of tenure and promotion – [student evaluations of teaching] are imperfect at best and downright biased and unreliable at worst”.

In recommending the development of a more robust assessment of teaching, the SETCWG outlined five principles: assessments of teaching should use **multiple methods** and **multiple sources** that are **gathered over multiple points in time**, all of which should be **viewed holistically** (without focusing on a single method or source) and **used in alignment with individual instructors' career paths**.

Based on these principles, the report includes a Teaching Assessment Inventory, which identifies 73 methods of assessment that are generated from different sources: the instructor, students, peers and administrators, alumni, and from course data (SETCWG 2017, Tables 34-37, pp. 63-66).

In order to help assist faculty members in presenting and TPCs in identifying and assessing **multiple methods and sources**, the Teaching Assessment Working Group has reorganized the SETCWG’s 73 methods into two tables that focus on methods and sources, one to provide guidance for faculty members (Appendix E), and one to provide guidance for TPCs (Appendix F). These documents are meant to be used as a starting point as academic units work to define the teaching assessment framework that will be used for biennial review and tenure and promotion decisions in their unit.

In addition, feedback from faculty members at the 2019 Symposium on Teaching and Learning suggests a simpler approach. Many teaching assessment methods can be described as being either student, peer, or self-assessments. Faculty member feedback suggested that Academic Units use student focus groups

(in addition to formal SET surveys for student feedback), that they include peer observation for formative assessment, and that a self-reflection piece of 2-3 pages might follow one of the following formats:

- (a) 3 most significant achievements
- (b) What did you do? What did you learn? What will you do next year?
- (c) What did you try? What worked? How did things improve?

SFU and the CEE may wish to further investigate these and other approaches to understanding teaching at SFU.

Guidance for faculty members

TAWG has summarized the 73 methods described in the SETCWG Report (SETCWG, 2017, Tables 34-37, pp. 63-66) in a single table (Appendix E) to help guide faculty members as they work to demonstrate their effectiveness as a teacher for biennial review or tenure/promotion processes. The table summarizes the 73 methods into four main sections: documentation, reflection on current goals and past practice, student outcomes and observations, and reflection on future goals. The format is designed to encourage reflection and follows the guiding principles of a teaching dossier. Departments may also use Appendix E to generate discussion about the aspects of teaching they can assess and value, and the ways in which they might operationalize those values through evaluation. All of the documentation listed is provided/assembled by the faculty member, unless otherwise noted. Please note that this table presents an inclusive list; what a faculty member actually includes will depend on department requirements.

Guidance for tenure and promotion committees

In order to best assist TPCs in identifying **multiple methods and sources**, the Teaching Assessment Working Group has reorganized the SETCWG's 73 methods (SETCWG, 2017, Tables 34-37, pp. 63-66) into a single table that focuses on methods and sources (Appendix F). The table focusses on three groups of assessment methods: documentation of teaching and related activities, reflections on teaching, and outcomes and observations. While Appendix E is designed to help faculty members make their case, we hope that the approach outlined in Appendix F will help academic units in their evaluation of their colleagues teaching. Please note that the list of assessment methods is an inclusive list; what a TPC uses will depend on department requirements.

Assessing teaching is difficult and how TPCs assess their colleagues' teaching – either for promotion or biennial review – will have an impact on faculty careers. The Associate Vice President, Learning and Teaching should work with Faculty Relations, SFUFA, and the Teaching & Learning Centre to provide advice and workshops for TPCs on how to assess teaching beyond student evaluations. Ultimately, adjudication of teaching effectiveness should be based on a preponderance of evidence across all of the data sources presented.

General comment on teaching assessment

Teaching assessment at SFU contains all three of the components described in Section III; formative, summative and competitive evaluation. In particular, biennial assessment in the current context of limited salary steps introduces competitive stimuli. In such a competitive, incentivized system

substantial research shows that participants tend to change their behaviours to increase the likelihood that they will be able to obtain the rewards (or avoid the sanctions). In effect, the higher the stakes within the system, the more likely it becomes that the system will be corrupted as participants attempt to manipulate the data to ensure their place in the distribution and obtain the rewards. When rewards are allocated competitively, this pits members of the system against each other and further breaks down both the system and the community.

To mitigate the negative effects of competitive, high-stakes evaluation systems, research suggests that data be gleaned from a wide variety of sources and across multiple time points (to limit the ability of participants to manipulate outcomes), or that separate systems for evaluation be used. For example, creating a formative system where data is provided exclusively to improve teaching eliminates the incentives that tend to encourage manipulation. Reducing competition within the system also reduces the incentives for manipulation, as does creation of a categorical (noncompetitive) evaluation system.

While the bulk of our work focuses on the methods for gathering and using data, attention to the larger incentive system is also important and we recommend that SFU and SFUFA should work collaboratively on further examining SFU's current incentive system in light of the unintended impacts the system may have on accurately determining faculty performance.

Goals addressed

- Faculty members feel they are part of a culture where teaching is valued
- TPCs have the tools and knowledge to value effective teaching
- Multiple teaching assessment methods are integrated into the work of TPCs
- The capacity to understand teaching and evaluate it well is present in all steps in the process
- A general framework for methods of teaching assessment has been adopted, which can be used to inform the work of academic units

VI. Improving the Recognition of Teaching

As part of the completion of our mandate, we would like to recommend a number of strategies to celebrate teaching excellence.

The primary mechanism for teaching recognition at SFU is through teaching awards. This document focusses on this mechanism, but also includes some ideas for non-competitive, criteria-based recognition.

Recommendations

1. Expand and enhance teaching awards at SFU

The University recognizes teaching excellence through the University Excellence in Teaching Awards, awarded annually to up to three faculty members. In addition, some Faculties offer awards to their faculty members. Making sure that there is a diversity and hierarchy of awards available will make it easier to nominate excellent teachers for national and international awards. We recommend that:

- The variety of teaching awards at the University level be increased;
 - awards could be made in different areas such as excellence in TA development, instructional technology innovation, course development, experiential learning, risk taking, etc. in order to highlight different aspects of teaching excellence,
 - awards could target different stages of an academic career (early, mid, late), and
 - awards could target different instructor groups (faculty members, sessional instructors, TAs, TMs).

For example, the [University of Calgary](#) offers awards celebrating teaching excellence in 13 different categories, including diverse learning contexts, individual and team awards, curriculum design and educational leadership.

- The award guidelines be reviewed and revised as the criteria are vague and not in line with current standards, in particular, we should ensure that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. For example, applications for [University of Calgary](#) teaching awards require a teaching dossier that includes information from the nominee, from peers, and from students.
- Faculties that do not currently have a teaching award be encouraged to develop one. This will both recognize teaching at the Faculty level and makes sure that the Faculty's excellent teachers are known and can be nominated for University awards.

2. Expand and enhance recognition and celebration of teaching award winners

- For example, the visibility of teaching award winners could be increased through dinners and/or receptions, such as the FASS Cormack Teaching Award Reception and Symposium, or by posting photos and bios in prominent places.
- Highlight teaching successes and innovation in University and Faculty newsletters, web pages, etc.
- Award winners could be encouraged to open their classrooms, or could be seconded to provide professional development for their colleagues.
- Chairs should be encouraged to celebrate teaching, for example by awarding extra merit steps to award winners.

3. Expand and enhance support for nominees and nominators

The process of identifying teaching excellence begins at the level of the academic unit. TPCs should be encouraged to identify faculty-level nominations during biennial review or tenure/promotion processes. Subsequently, winners of faculty-level awards should be nominated for university awards, and university award winners should be nominated for national awards. At each level, award winners should be counselled on what they should do to prepare for the next level of award. Each academic unit should be encouraged to nominate a member for faculty-level awards, and each Faculty should ensure that a member of the faculty is nominated for university-level awards.

A central support model should be developed for nominations for national and international awards. This could include appointment of an awards facilitator to make sure that candidates are identified and encouraged. A nomination for a national award would then include collaboration between nominator, nominee, nominee’s academic unit, CEE, and the office of the AVPLT.

4. Awards are one way to recognize excellent teaching. Other teaching recognition mechanisms are available at SFU and should be continued and enhanced:

- Appointment of Faculty Teaching Fellows
- Awarding steps in biennial review associated with teaching effectiveness
- Recognition of teaching achievements in biennial review and tenure/promotion letters
- Recognition of teaching innovations in CEE newsletters
- Recognition of teaching innovation on the main SFU website and in SFU News

5. Finally, TAWG recognizes that there are many faculty engaged in highly effective teaching at SFU and that not all quality teaching can be adequately recognized through competitive awards. As a result, we recommend that the University explore non-competitive criteria-based mechanisms to value and recognize the importance of teaching to the University’s mandate. These could include

- Encouraging TPCs to attach more importance to teaching at all stages of a faculty member’s career: hiring, biennial review, tenure and promotion
- Encouraging TPCs to recognize teaching outside the formal classroom – for example supervision of graduate students, field courses, and special topics courses
- Encourage certification of professional development experiences
- Explore development of a multi-tiered teaching fellowship program.

Goals addressed

- Faculty feel that they are part of a culture where teaching is valued
- Outstanding teaching is celebrated
- Academic units identify and promote their best teachers for faculty, university, national and international teaching awards

VII. Training and Support for Faculty Members and TPCs

Faculty members and TPCs should feel comfortable with a range of teaching assessment methods. Faculty members will require guidance in preparing documentation for teaching assessment. TPC members should become comfortable using the evidence from multiple, new teaching assessment methods. As a result, significant training and support will be required.

Daria Ahrensmeier and Sarah Turner from CEE, working in collaboration with TAWG, have developed a series of workshops that will introduce faculty members to different methods of teaching assessment. The workshops start with an overview of teaching assessment methods and practices, and continue with workshops focusing on use of student feedback, peer feedback, and self-assessment and reflection. For details, see Appendix G.

These workshops should be part of a series of workshops for early, mid and late career faculty that provide professional development and support to faculty teaching at different stages of their careers. The workshops will help faculty members prepare material for more accurate assessment of their teaching and will help them be reflective and responsive teachers. TPCs should recognize participation in these types of professional development as an indicator of faculty commitment to effective teaching in the teaching review process.

Workshops for TPC members should be provided by the Associate Vice President, Learning and Teaching, working in concert with the Faculty Relations, SFUFA and the CEE. These workshops should include information on how to use different teaching assessment methods, how to evaluate teaching-related data, and on the inherent and systematic biases of SET. Some training could be made available online. These workshops should help TPCs work more efficiently and effectively.

Both faculty members and TPC members will need time to engage in training, to prepare for, and to perform a more comprehensive teaching assessment. Institutional support is required to minimize the impact on workload. We have included a few suggestions on how to minimize the impact on workload in the next section, Section VIII.

Goals addressed

- Faculty members are reflective and responsive teachers
- Faculty members adapt their teaching to changing environments
- Faculty members are comfortable taking risks and are rewarded for experimenting with their teaching practices
- TPCs have the tools and knowledge to value effective teaching
- Multiple teaching assessment methods are integrated into the work of TPCs
- The capacity to understand teaching and evaluate it well is present in all steps in the process

VIII. Recommendations for Changes to Policy and Administration

Summary

To ensure that teaching is valued, it should be assessed comprehensively, without focus on a single source or method, evaluated as an ongoing process of inquiry, experimentation and reflection, and it should be rewarded, both through salary and promotion and through public recognition.

Faculty want to hear a consistent message from chairs and other administrators that teaching is valued – teaching needs to impact hiring and promotion, faculty should have access to training that supports their needs and interests, faculty should be encouraged to try new things, and faculty who are having difficulty should have access to support.

While summative assessment is appropriate at the stages of tenure and promotion, where a decision is being made on whether a candidate has been performing at the level expected, this is not necessary for biennial review where the emphasis is on comparing the progress of different department members. SFU should consider increasing the opportunities for formative assessment, where feedback is designed to promote growth and improvement of performance.

Changes that Academic Units Can Make

Based on recent SFU reports and discussions with various stakeholders, TAWG would like to recommend a number of changes that academic units can make in how they assess and value teaching. These changes will demonstrate that teaching is valued, will provide more support to faculty in their teaching, and will ensure that their efforts are assessed in a fair, unbiased manner. Each department can choose practices that are best suited for their discipline.

Practices that demonstrate that teaching is valued:

- Ask candidates to give a teaching presentation as part of the hiring process
- Ensure that the hiring practice for teaching faculty is as rigorous and thoughtful as the practice of hiring research faculty in order to identify candidates of the highest calibre
- Implement a formal mentorship program to support new faculty as they start teaching (Teaching Fellows and/or CEE Educational Consultants to help)
 - Encourage formative assessment before tenure and promotion, i.e. year 3 for Assistant Professor or Lecturer, as this is a particularly important time in a faculty member's professional development
 - Provide formative assessment on promotion to Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer – what can they work on as they prepare for promotion to Professor or University Lecturer? (This will probably have to occur after the promotion decision)
- Encourage award-winning teachers to open their classrooms to new instructors
- Ensure that representation of teaching faculty on TPCs reflects the ratio of teaching to research faculty in the Academic Unit (this may require changes to the Collective Agreement)
- Use the biennial review process to
 - identify faculty members to recommend for teaching awards, or other recognition
 - recognize teaching innovations
 - recognize educational leadership projects

- Assign step awards based on both teaching and research; make sure that contributions to teaching impact the step award

Suggestions of methods from academic units at SFU that have been effective in promoting a culture where teaching is valued in their unit

- Set aside time at every department or school meeting to discuss teaching issues, e.g. through issues raised by the curriculum committees, or through sharing by faculty members of new ideas they have tried or come across
- Encourage formation of a Teaching Circle, a small group of faculty members who meet on a regular basis to discuss teaching and learning concerns, in your department

Practices that improve assessment of teaching:

Academic units should review their unit's tenure/promotion criteria related to teaching. Academic units assess teaching as part of the tenure and promotion process, and as part of the biennial review process. To inform both faculty members and the TPC, it is important that the department criteria related to teaching be clear and applied consistently.

All departmental TP criteria are now published on the Faculty Relations webpage (www.sfu.ca/faculty-relations). Some define criteria related to teaching more clearly than others – we have included what we believe to be a couple of good examples of clear criteria in Appendix H.

During our consultations, faculty members raised concerns about several issues related to existing criteria. When reviewing departmental TP criteria, please ensure that the following issues are clarified:

- Departmental TP criteria *are in addition* to the University criteria; this may not be obvious to new faculty members, for example.
- Is graduate supervision – including senior supervisor, member of supervisory committees, and internal/external reviewer – considered part of research or teaching and how is it evaluated?
- How will professional development activities, including professional development that leads to certification, be recorded and recognized?
- How will the supervision of student projects or group work, interdisciplinary teaching, and community-engaged teaching be recorded and recognized?
- How will risk-taking and experimentation with teaching practice be rewarded and recognized?
- What criteria will be used to differentiate between satisfactory, successful, excellent, and outstanding teaching? These are words used to describe expectations for different ranks in the Collective Agreement, but they are not currently defined there – for examples, please see the definitions that TAWG has been using, summarized in Appendix D.

Each unit should define the teaching assessment framework that will be used to evaluate teaching – including details of the tools and processes to be used, and an example of each. See recommendations for use of SET and methods of assessment beyond SET in Sections IV and V, respectively, for details. Each unit should define a version of the guidelines for faculty members (Appendix E) and guidelines for TPCs (Appendix F) for use in the unit. Using these tools will ensure that best practices in teaching assessment are being followed, as described in the SETCWG report:

- Use multiple methods – a diversity of data and evidence should be collected using various methods (observations, interviews, surveys, etc.).

- Use multiple sources – to increase validity, teaching assessment methods from various sources should be gathered (students, colleagues, self, etc.).
- Gather teaching assessment methods over multiple points in time - this will increase reliability.
- View teaching assessment methods holistically – without focusing on one particular piece of data or evidence.
- Align the teaching assessment with an instructor’s career path – one single prescribed, weighted evaluation should not be used for all instructors.

Many units do not differentiate the evidence used in biennial assessment and at tenure and promotion. We recommend that academic units specify the evidence used in the biennial assessment in the unit’s TP criteria and that this should focus on evidence of teaching effectiveness specific to the short-term process of biennial assessment. This could include measures of both classroom teaching and external efforts to strengthen teaching, including participation in professional development.

Finally, TPC members will need to be encouraged to participate in training on how to assess teaching (see Section VII Training and Support).

Suggestions for ways to manage workload

- Focus on doing the most thorough reviews at year 3 at the time of contract renewal and/or in the year before promotion
- Consider doing salary reviews every three years after promotion to Full Professor or University Lecturer, or perhaps throughout one’s entire career (would need to be part of the Collective Agreement)
- Provide training to TPC members on how to evaluate teaching-related data to help them work more efficiently
- Provide rubrics for evaluation
- Provide exemplars of high-quality teaching and portfolios

Actions for Deans

We recommend that Deans review departmental criteria for teaching carefully to ensure that teaching assessment is multi-faceted and comprehensive. They should encourage cross-disciplinary review and sharing of TP criteria and ensure that Academic Units realize that TP criteria are now available online. During the review process, they should encourage TPC Chairs to ensure that contributions to teaching impact the step award. They should send biennial review (BR) and tenure/promotion (TP) cases back if there is not sufficient evidence for effective teaching.

We recommend that Deans ensure that their Faculty has teaching awards, that the award guidelines are clear, and that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. They should encourage all of their Academic Units to submit teaching award nominations and celebrate their award winners. See TAWG’s recommendations on teaching recognition (Section VI) for further information.

Teaching Fellows were introduced following the TFTL Report (TFTL 2010). They are meant to provide support for continued improvement in teaching within the faculty as well as bring attention to issues related to teaching. They provide the opportunity for cross-faculty exchange of teaching innovations and

issues. Deans should make sure that they have a full complement of Teaching Fellows and that their roles are clear.

Actions for the VPA / AVPLT

We recommend that senior leadership take the following actions to demonstrate support for a culture where teaching is valued:

- Review recommendations from previous reports to make sure that progress has been made. For example, the TFTL Report (TFTL, 2010) recommended that SFU develop and implement a phased institutional plan to raise awareness of the broad range of SFU teaching and learning successes, services and support for teaching and learning and to ensure that they are recognized, used, and celebrated at all three campuses in an appropriate manner and that we establish and communicate a vision statement and principles to provide direction and common purpose around teaching and learning at SFU. It would be great to see a mission statement where teaching plays a more prominent role!
- Enable the development of additional methods of assessing teaching. For example, faculty are interested in the opportunities afforded by peer evaluation. Other institutions have developed peer evaluation systems, but to implement such a program at SFU will require leadership and commitment.
- Explore shifting from a summative to a formative system that encourages positive change. In a competitive incentivized system substantial research shows that participants tend to change their behaviour to increase the likelihood that they will be able to obtain the rewards (or avoid the sanctions). In effect, the higher the stakes within the system, the more likely it becomes that the system will be corrupted as participants attempt to manipulate the data to ensure their place in the distribution and to obtain the rewards. When rewards are allocated competitively, this pits members of the system against each other and further breaks down both the system and the community. SFU and SFUFA should work collaboratively on further examining SFU's current incentive system in light of the unintended impacts the system may have on accurately determining faculty performance.
- Review the award guidelines for the University Awards to make sure that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. Consider increasing the variety of awards available. Celebrate award winners. See TAWG's recommendations on teaching recognition (Section VI) for further information.
- Initiate a review of departmental criteria for tenure and promotion that includes a focus on teaching criteria and teaching assessment. Review the revised criteria carefully to make sure that teaching assessment is multi-faceted and comprehensive.
- Ask the Deans to have TPCs attach more importance to teaching at the time of biennial reviews and promotion and ask them to turn back biennial review and promotion cases that do not indicate that teaching has been assessed comprehensively.
- Extend the orientation period for new faculty in order to give new faculty time to prepare for teaching, and encourage the establishment of a year-long series of workshops addressing instructional issues facing new faculty.

Institutional Support

The CV system is in the process of being redesigned. The new version should collect more teaching-related information to support faculty in reflection on their teaching and to help them prepare teaching material for BR and TP. The new CV system could provide a template for a teaching dossier. It should also make it easier to incorporate existing data to avoid manual data entry. We recommend that a design committee be established that includes both teaching and research faculty. For examples of information that should be included, please see Appendices E and F.

Examples of best practice should be collected and made available to the SFU community in one location. Appendix H includes some examples that TAWG has collected. For example, the CEE could be tasked with maintaining and updating resources related to teaching assessment on a regular basis, making them available to the SFU community through the CEE website. The following should be included:

- Best examples of departmental TP Criteria related to teaching assessment
- Examples of instructions sent to faculty preparing documentation for biennial review
- Information on how to conduct an informal student survey, with an example
- Information on how to conduct a student focus group, with an example
- Information on how to conduct peer assessment
- Information on how to prepare a teaching philosophy statement
- An example of a short teaching dossier that could be used to present material for teaching assessment for biennial review

Other recommendations:

- Encourage a scholarly approach to teaching
- Support development of a peer assessment program
- Highlight teaching successes and innovation in University and Faculty newsletters, web pages, etc.
- Provide opportunities to present teaching innovations at yearly sharing events
- Provide institutional support for faculty who wish to apply for external funding for teaching-related research
- Provide funding to attend conferences related to teaching

Resources

Using SET as a proxy measure for teaching effectiveness is fast and easy, but the opportunities for bias are high. A culture where teaching is valued, where faculty members are reflective and responsive teachers, where they adapt their teaching to changing environments, and where they are comfortable taking risks asks more of faculty members. TPC members and Chairs will require training in types of teaching assessment methods and in how to evaluate teaching submissions. Resources for professional development for faculty members and training for TPC members are required to support a community of teaching.

- Resources are required for: Collection of additional teaching assessment data, e.g. peer or expert observation, video analysis, surveys of alumni, student input beyond SETC such as focus groups or exit surveys
- Faculty members require support and professional development

- TPCs require support, e.g. training in evaluating teaching submissions and peer assessment and on the inherent and systematic biases of SET
- Develop ways to manage TPC workload – we have heard that there is not enough time to do a good job. Could TPC members be relieved from other service obligations? Could the workload of Chairs/Directors be reduced? We have made a couple of suggestions in the section “Changes that Academic Units Can Make”
- The CEE requires resources to provide
 - Workshops for faculty – assessment of teaching; see proposal for workshops on teaching assessment, outlined in Appendix G, consisting of four modules: 1. Overview, 2. Student Feedback, 3. Peer Feedback, 4. Self-reflection
 - Workshops for faculty – general; CEE should offer a coordinated series of workshops aimed at early-, mid- and late-career faculty members
 - Resources to develop a peer assessment program
 - Support for teaching assessment activities
 - Support for teaching awards and teaching award submissions
 - Resources to develop a teaching development certificate
 - Educational consultants with disciplinary knowledge
 - Support for SETC – the SETC managing group is under-staffed and under-supported
 - Development of support for faculty and academic units creating SET questions that avoid bias; with support of the EDI office
 - Consider seconding faculty to work and learn in the CEE and then return to Faculties with added capacity
- Institute for Studies in Teaching and Learning in the Disciplines (ISTLD)
 - Continue to support faculty-led inquiry

Changes to the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement

As part of its work, TAWG has made a number of recommendations for consideration in the next round of negotiations of the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement. These include adding a new section describing steps for academic units to use to develop criteria for evaluation of teaching that are in addition to the university criteria, including recognition of the scholarship of teaching and learning as a form of scholarship, and working towards harmonization of criteria for teaching and research faculty in order to reduce differences and distinctions. For further detail, please see the TAWG submission (TAWG, 2018b).

Reporting and Review

Developing a culture where teaching is valued and rewarded falls within the mandate of the AVPLT. We suggest the AVPLT consider enlisting the support of Senate, through the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning, and the Centre for Educational Excellence, and other local structures already in place to support teaching and learning, for example the Beedie Teaching and Learning Group.

A general review of the impacts of the project should be initiated within five years – ideally to inform the next Academic Planning cycle. We recommend that repeats of the two surveys – the survey of TPCs conducted by the SETCWG and the survey of faculty members conducted by TAWG – be used as measures of change of culture. Given the discontent with the way merit steps are assigned during biennial reviews expressed by teaching faculty, we recommend that a comparison be made of the merit

steps awarded to teaching and research faculty across the university and any differences justified or corrected. Progress on the recommendations made in recent reports related to teaching assessment (TAWG, SETCWG, TCEP, TFTL) should also be reviewed.

Finally, these recommendations will need to be revised as the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement evolves.

Goals addressed

- Faculty members are aware of teaching expectations for their rank and position
- Faculty members are reflective and responsive teachers, they adapt their teaching to changing environments, and they are comfortable taking risks and are rewarded for experimenting with their teaching practices
- Faculty members feel they are part of a culture where teaching is valued
- Expectations for different ranks for teaching and research faculty are clear
- Teaching is valued at hiring and promotion
- Multiple teaching assessment methods are integrated into the work of TPCs
- TP criteria reflect best practice and current teaching research, and are used to inform tenure and promotion decisions
- TP criteria, practice and assessment are aligned
- SFU has articulated a vision statement and principles to provide direction and common purpose around teaching and learning
- There is a clear definition of expectations for both teaching effectiveness and teaching excellence, and the standards expected for different ranks for teaching and research faculty
- A general framework for methods of teaching assessment has been adopted, which can be used to inform the work of academic units
- There is a program of professional development and support that is clearly aligned with this evaluation framework
- The University has established a support system to provide formative feedback and instructional development to all interested faculty
- There is a program of support and/or training for all those involved in the review process
- The expectations, evaluation framework, and support mechanisms are regularly reviewed
- Institutional policies regarding teaching and learning are regularly examined and revised
- Appropriate resources, including the CEE, are tasked with supporting the advancement of teaching and learning throughout the university

IX. Conclusions

The Teaching Assessment Working Group met for a period of twenty months from September 2017 to April 2019. During that time, members reviewed recent SFU reports related to assessment of teaching, invited several experts to present to the community, met with various groups within the community, and discussed ways to build a culture where teaching is valued.

Teaching is a multifaceted activity and we must consider a comprehensive approach to understanding and valuing teaching. This includes using multiple methods to assess teaching. We support the SETCWG recommendations that, to assess teaching, multiple methods, multiple sources, and multiple points in time should be applied. We recommend that academic units focus on formative assessment of teaching for new assistant professors and lecturers during the early part of the faculty member's career. We recommend that academic units perform a comprehensive, summative assessment at the time of promotion to associate professor or senior lecturer and at the time of promotion to full professor or university lecturer. These processes will require additional expertise and work on the part of faculty and TPCs and should be supported by training – through workshops and on-line material – for faculty and TPC members.

To ensure that teaching is valued, faculty members need to hear a consistent message from chairs and other administrators that this is indeed the case – teaching needs to impact hiring and promotion and faculty should have access to training that supports their needs and interests. Addressing these issues requires the attention of faculty members, their Chairs and Directors, and their Deans. Finally, excellent teaching should be rewarded through salary increases, at promotion, and through public recognition.

X. Bibliography

Faculty of Education (2018) [Criteria for Tenure and Promotion: Research and Teaching Faculty.](#)

Farr, M. (2018) **Arbitration Decision on Student Evaluations of Teaching Applauded by Faculty.** *University Affairs*, Aug. 28 2018.

Summary of the arbitration decision made by arbitrator William Kaplan in the case between the Ryerson Faculty Association and Ryerson University over the use of student evaluations of teaching in tenure and promotion decisions.

<https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/arbitration-decision-on-student-evaluations-of-teaching-applauded-by-faculty/>

Gravestock, P. S. (2011). **Does Teaching Matter? The Role of Teaching Evaluation in Tenure Policies at Selected Canadian Universities,** Pamela S. Gravestock, PhD Thesis, University of Toronto, 2011.

This includes a review and analysis of tenure policies from 46 universities across Canada and compares them to best practice as described in the literature on evaluation of teaching. It includes a detailed summary of policies from five institutions that most thoroughly reflect the recommendations from the literature.

https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/31764/6/Gravestock_Pamela_S_201111_PhD_thesis.pdf

Kaplan, W. (2018) **IN THE MATTER OF AN INTEREST ARBITRATION BETWEEN: Ryerson University and the Ryerson Faculty Association (Faculty Course Surveys and Related Issues).**

The text of the decision made by William Kaplan, arbitrator.

<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onla/doc/2018/2018canlii58446/2018canlii58446.html>

OCUFA (2018) **Significant arbitration decision on use of student questionnaires for teaching evaluation.** Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations.

OCUFA summary of the arbitration decision made by arbitrator William Kaplan in the case between the Ryerson Faculty Association and Ryerson University over the use of student evaluations of teaching in tenure and promotion decisions. <https://ocufa.on.ca/blog-posts/significant-arbitration-decision-on-use-of-student-questionnaires-for-teaching-evaluation/>

SETCWG (2017) **Developing a Teaching Assessment Framework for Simon Fraser University: Final Report of the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Working Group.**

The SETCWG was tasked with determining which SFU policies govern the evaluation of instructors and courses, and identify areas where SFU practices and policies require revision or additions. The report reviews the relevant academic literature, SFU policies, and summarizes interviews with SFU TPC Chairs, teaching fellows, and teaching award recipients. The report contains a number of recommendations, but also highlights limitations and recommendations for future work. It also contains a proposed framework for teaching assessment and an inventory of 73 methods of teaching assessment.

<http://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/faculty-recognition/Documents/SETCwg2Report.pdf>

SFUFA/SFU (2014) **Simon Fraser University Faculty Association and Simon Fraser University Collective Agreement, 2014-2019, SFU, 2014.**



The 2014-2019 Collective Agreement between Faculty and the University.

<https://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/faculty-relations/collective-agreement/CA.pdf>

Stark, P. B. (2018) Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness.

The lecture that Prof. Stark presented at SFU April 26, 2018 can be viewed here:

www.stat.berkeley.edu/~stark/Seminars/setSFU18.htm

Stark, P. B. and Freishtat, R. (2014) An evaluation of course evaluations. *ScienceOpen Research*.

Student ratings of teaching have been used, studied, and debated for almost a century. This article examines student ratings of teaching from a statistical perspective. The common practice of relying on averages of student teaching evaluation scores as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness for promotion and tenure decisions should be abandoned for substantive and statistical reasons: There is strong evidence that student responses to questions of “effectiveness” do not measure teaching effectiveness. Response rates and response variability matter. And comparing averages of categorical responses, even if the categories are represented by numbers, makes little sense. Student ratings of teaching are valuable when they ask the right questions, report response rates and score distributions, and are balanced by a variety of other sources and methods to evaluate

teaching. https://www.scienceopen.com/document_file/ad8a9ac9-8c60-432a-ba20-4402a2a38df4/ScienceOpen/1826_XE9106672292100478299.pdf

TAWG (2018a) Teaching Assessment Working Group: Valuing Teaching and the 5-year Academic Plan.

Goals to improve how we assess and value teaching at SFU. These goals were developed by TAWG to contribute to the 2019-2024 Academic Plan. <http://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/faculty-recognition/Documents/TAWG%20teaching-related%20considerations%20for%20the%205-year%20planning%20process.pdf>

TAWG (2018b) Teaching Assessment Working Group: Recommendations for the Collective Agreement.

Proposed changes to the collective agreement between the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association and the University. These changes were developed by TAWG to clarify the expectations for teaching effectiveness and teaching excellence, and the standards expected for different ranks for teaching and research faculty.

TAWG (2019) Teaching Assessment Working Group: Report on Faculty Survey (2018).

This report presents of a survey of faculty members delivered in the fall of 2018. Faculty members were asked to comment on how they reflect on their teaching, on what evidence they feel would be useful in evaluating their teaching, and how they feel their teaching is valued.

<https://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/faculty-recognition/Documents/TAWG%20-%20Faculty%20Survey%20-%20Report.pdf>

TCEP (2013) Teaching and Course Evaluation Project: Final Report.

The TCEP was asked to develop recommendations for a new system of student evaluation of teaching and courses, with an emphasis on improving the teaching and learning environment, ensuring efficient methods of data collection, storage and protection of privacy, and adoption of guidelines for best practices in the use of evaluation data. The report was based on earlier work by the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) and the TFTL. The report presents many recommendations



related to the ethical and appropriate use of SET data, but also emphasizes that SET should not be the sole source of data for decision making around teaching performance, suggesting that peer evaluation and/or teaching dossiers provide supplemental information.

<http://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/faculty-recognition/Documents/2013%20Final%20Report%20of%20the%20Teaching%20and%20Course%20Evaluation%20Project.pdf>

TFTL (2010) Task Force on Teaching and Learning: Final Report.

The goal of the TFTL was to develop recommendations to enhance teaching and learning support at SFU. The group studied the teaching and learning environment at SFU and recommended establishment of a coordinated teaching and learning support system. Of particular interest to academic units, they recommended development of a coherent system to evaluate teaching and learning effectiveness that includes multiple inputs as well as ability to recognize teaching workload, and encouraged more ways to recognize and value teaching, including awards, special recognitions and incentives.

<https://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/faculty-recognition/Documents/2010%20Recommendations%20Report%20of%20the%20Task%20Force%20on%20Teaching%20and%20Learning.pdf>

Zdjelar (2019) The Teaching Assessment Working Group (TAWG) Survey 2018 Results.

Qualitative analysis of the written responses from the TAWG survey.

XI. Appendices

Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations

Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching

<p>General Statement on the Use of SET data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All users of SET data should understand the risks involved in using data that research has shown may systematically disadvantage some faculty members and groups of faculty for reasons that are unrelated to their teaching. SET data should be used with caution, and never as the only indicator regarding faculty teaching.
<p>Use of SET by Faculty Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use this as a tool to inform pedagogy rather than assess teaching - Utilize the four questions that are available in SETC to find out what is working, and what isn't, in their classes, how a new format of assignments or new material was received, etc., with the idea of using the responses as a basis for their reflection of their teaching - Use the opportunity to add contextual information as a way to reflect on their teaching - Use mid-semester (informal) surveys for formative questions and end of semester survey for summative questions - Consult with experts such as their faculty's Educational Consultant on how to word questions – in particular on how to ask questions that focus on the student experience
<p>Use of SET by TPCs</p> <p>Because of the different purposes of biennial reviews (competitive) and tenure/promotion decisions (summative), we are recommending using SET in different ways in the two processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPCs should not use SET results for biennial review, because there are questions of validity and too much potential for bias. - TPCs may use SET results in evaluating tenure/promotion applications as one form of evidence demonstrating how students experience the applicant's teaching, particularly changes in that experience over time.
<p>Use of SET by Chairs and Directors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use this as a tool to inform pedagogy rather than assess teaching - Use SET results as one indicator among multiple indicators to inform teaching assignments - Use SET results to flag outliers for further investigation – faculty who receive consistently exceptional responses may be considered for awards; faculty who receive consistently negative response may be provided with support to improve their teaching practice - Use SET results as one part of a broader program of collective assessment of a program to help identify changes to improve student learning and experience
<p>SETC Design</p> <p>Preamble:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use the preamble on the SETC questionnaire to educate students on the importance of SET, how it is used, and how to make useful comments <p>Contextual component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make the purpose of the instructor-related context section clearer. This could be used as an opportunity for the faculty member to reflect on their teaching – what they tried, what

worked, what didn't. This section is currently presented as a way to influence how the results are evaluated, which is not the same thing.

Questions:

- Students are asked to respond to a SET survey for each class they are taking at a time when they are already busy and stressed.
 - o Reduce the number of questions. The current version consists of 23 questions – 10 would be more reasonable, e.g. 3 institution questions, 3 department questions and 4 instructor questions.
 - o Make sure that questions provide answers to things the institution/department/instructor are really interested in and can only find out in this way (e.g. make sure that the information is not provided by the annual student satisfaction survey)
- Revise any judgment-based questions on SETC questionnaires. Questions should be rewritten to focus on the student's experience e.g.
 - o I could understand the instructor's explanations (instead of The course instructor explained concepts clearly)
 - o I understood what was expected of me (instead of The course instructor explained grading criteria clearly)
- Questions should focus on issues that affect learning and the learning experience e.g.
 - o I feel this course is too much work
 - o I cannot read the instructor's handwriting
 - o I feel I had taken the right pre-requisites to prepare for this course

Presentation of SETC Responses

- Reorganize presentation to condense the information
- Do not present averages, present frequency distributions with response rates
- Do not rank or compare across faculty, course formats, levels, topics or disciplines
- Provide instructors with more raw data so that they can explore, for example, cross-tabulations on pairs of questions in order to better understand the student experience in their class, while ensuring confidentiality of students is maintained
-

Use of Teaching Assessment Methods Beyond SET

General

Follow the five principles outlined in the SETCWG Report (SETCWG, 2018)

1. Use multiple methods – several pieces of data and evidence should be collected using various methods.
2. Use multiple sources – to increase validity, Teaching Assessment Methods from various sources should be gathered.
3. Gather Teaching Assessment Methods over multiple points in time - this will increase reliability.
4. View Teaching Assessment Methods holistically – without focusing on one particular piece of data or evidence.
5. A teaching assessment should align with an instructor's career path – one single prescribed, weighted evaluation should not be used for all instructors.

Academic Units

Work to develop guidelines for faculty members and for TPC members on which assessment methods should be used for biennial review and tenure and promotion decisions. Tables in Appendices E and F are included for guidance.

SFU and SFUFA

Work collaboratively on further examining SFU’s current incentive system in light of the unintended impacts the system may have on accurately determining faculty performance.

Improving the Recognition of Teaching

Expand and enhance teaching awards at SFU

- Increase the variety of teaching awards at the University level
 - awards could be made in different areas such as excellence in TA development, instructional technology innovation, course development, experiential learning, risk taking, etc. in order to highlight different aspects of teaching excellence,
 - awards could target different stages of an academic career (early, mid, late), and
 - awards could target different instructor groups (faculty members, sessional instructors, TAs, TMs). For example, the [University of Calgary](#) offers awards celebrating teaching excellence in 13 different categories, including diverse learning contexts, individual and team awards, curriculum design and educational leadership.
- Review and revise the award guidelines as the criteria are vague and not in line with current standards, in particular, we should ensure that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. For example, applications for [University of Calgary](#) teaching awards require a teaching dossier that includes information from the nominee, from peers, and from students.
- Encourage faculties that do not currently have a teaching award to develop one. This will both recognize teaching at the Faculty level and makes sure that the Faculty’s excellent teachers are known and can be nominated for University awards.

Expand and enhance recognition and celebration of teaching award winners

- For example, the visibility of teaching award winners could be increased through dinners and/or receptions, or by posting photos and bios in prominent places, such as the FASS Cormack Teaching Award Reception and Symposium.
- Highlight teaching successes and innovation in University and Faculty newsletters, web pages, etc.
- Award winners could be encouraged to open their classrooms, or could be seconded to provide professional development for their colleagues.
- Chairs should be encouraged to celebrate teaching, for example by awarding extra merit steps to award winners

Expand and enhance support for nominees and nominators

TPCs should be encouraged to identify faculty-level nominations during biennial review or tenure/promotion process, winners of faculty-level awards should be nominated for university awards, and university award winners should be nominated for national awards.

- At each level, award winners should be counselled on what they should do to prepare for the next level of award.

- Each academic unit should be encouraged to nominate a member for faculty-level awards, and each faculty should ensure that a member of the faculty is nominated for university-level awards.
- A central support model should be developed for nominations for national and international awards.

Continue and enhance other teaching recognition mechanisms at SFU

- Appointment of Faculty Teaching Fellows
- Awarding steps in biennial review associated with teaching effectiveness
- Recognition of teaching achievements in biennial review and tenure/promotion letters
- Recognition of teaching innovations in CEE newsletters
- Recognition of teaching innovation on the main SFU website and in SFU News

Explore non-competitive criteria-based mechanisms to value and recognize the importance of teaching to the University’s mandate

These could include

- Encouraging TPCs to attach more importance to teaching at all stages of a faculty member’s career: hiring, biennial review, tenure and promotion
- Encouraging TPCs to recognize teaching outside the formal classroom – for example supervision of graduate students, field courses, and special topics courses
- Encouraging certification of professional development experiences
- Explore development of a multi-tiered teaching fellowship program.

Training and Support for Faculty and TPCs

- The CEE should offer workshops for faculty members on teaching assessment methods. We have proposed a series of four workshops (Appendix G): an overview of teaching assessment methods and practices, use of student feedback, use of peer feedback, and use of self-assessment and reflection.
- These should be part of a series of workshops for early, mid and late career faculty that provide professional development and support to faculty teaching at different stages of their careers
- Workshops for TPC members should be provided by the Associate Vice President, Learning and Teaching, working in concert with the Faculty Relations, SFUFA and the CEE. These workshops should include information on how to use different teaching assessment methods and on the inherent and systematic biases of SET.

Recommendations for Changes to Policy and Administration

Changes that Academic Units Can Make

Practices that demonstrate that teaching is valued:

- Ask candidates to give a teaching presentation as part of the hiring process
- Ensure that the hiring practice for teaching faculty is as rigorous and thoughtful as the practice of hiring research faculty in order to identify candidates of the highest calibre
- Implement a formal mentorship program to support new faculty as they start teaching (Teaching Fellows and/or CEE Educational Consultants to help)

- Encourage formative assessment before tenure and promotion, i.e. year 3 for Assistant Professor or Lecturer, as this is a particularly important time in a faculty member's professional development
- Provide formative assessment on promotion to Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer – what can they work on as they prepare for promotion to Professor or University Lecturer? (This will probably have to occur after the promotion decision)
- Encourage award-winning teachers to open their classrooms to new instructors
- Ensure that representation of teaching faculty on TPCs reflects the ratio of teaching to research faculty in the Academic Unit (this may require changes to the Collective Agreement)
- Use the biennial review process to
 - identify faculty members to recommend for teaching awards, or other recognition
 - recognize teaching innovations
 - recognize educational leadership projects
- Assign step awards based on both teaching and research; make sure that contributions to teaching impact the step award
- Set aside time at every department or school meeting to discuss teaching issues, e.g. through issues raised by the curriculum committees, or through sharing by faculty members of new ideas they have tried or come across
- Encourage formation of a Teaching Circle in your department (e.g. Biology)

Practices that improve assessment of teaching:

- Academic units should review their unit's tenure/promotion criteria related to teaching.
- Clarify that all departmental criteria are in addition to the university criteria
- Clarify how your academic unit views graduate supervision – including senior supervisor, member of supervisory committees, and internal/external reviewer
- Recognize and value professional development, including professional development that leads to certification, and recognize supervision of student projects or group work, interdisciplinary teaching, and community-engaged teaching
- Recognize and reward risk taking and experimentation with teaching practices
- Clarify what your academic unit means by satisfactory, successful, excellent, and outstanding teaching
- Include information about the evidence used in the biennial review process in the unit's TP criteria and focus on evidence of teaching effectiveness specific to the short-term process of biennial assessment
- Define the teaching assessment framework that will be used to evaluate teaching – including details of the tools and processes to be used, and an example of each (See Appendix E and F)
- Encourage TPC members to participate in training on how to assess teaching (see Section VII Training and Support)

Suggestions of ways to manage workload

- Focus on doing the most thorough reviews at year 3 at the time of contract renewal and/or in the year before promotion
- Consider doing salary reviews every three years after promotion to Full Professor or University Lecturer, or perhaps throughout one's entire career (would need to be part of the Collective Agreement)

- Provide training to TPC members on how to evaluate teaching-related data to help them work more efficiently
- Provide rubrics for evaluation
- Provide exemplars of high-quality teaching and portfolios

Actions for Deans

- Review departmental criteria for teaching carefully to ensure that teaching assessment is multi-faceted and comprehensive. During the review process, encourage TPC Chairs to make sure that contributions to teaching impact the step award. Send biennial review (BR) and tenure/promotion (TP) cases back if there is not sufficient evidence for effective teaching.
- Encourage cross-disciplinary review and sharing of departmental TP criteria and make sure that Academic Units realize that departmental TP criteria are now available online.
- Ensure that your Faculty has teaching awards, that the award guidelines are clear, and that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. Be sure to encourage all of your Academic Units to submit teaching award nominations. Celebrate award winners.
- Make sure that you have a full complement of Teaching Fellows and that their roles are clear.

Actions for the VPA/AVPLT

- Review recommendations from previous reports (TFTL, 2010; TCEP, 2013; SETCWG, 2018) to make sure that progress has been made
- Enable the development of additional methods of assessing teaching, for example peer evaluation
- Explore shifting from a summative to a formative system that encourages positive change
- Review the award guidelines for the University Awards to make sure that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. Consider increasing the variety of awards available. Celebrate award winners.
- Initiate a review of departmental criteria for tenure and promotion that is designed to focus on teaching criteria and teaching assessment. Review the revised criteria carefully to make sure that teaching assessment is multi-faceted and comprehensive.
- Ask the Deans to encourage TPCs to attach more importance to teaching at the time of biennial reviews and promotion and ask them to turn back biennial review and promotion cases that do not indicate that teaching has been assessed comprehensively.
- Extend the orientation period for new faculty and encourage the establishment of a year-long series of workshops addressing issues facing new faculty.

Institutional Support

- Make sure that the new CV System can collect more teaching-related information to support faculty in their reflection on their teaching and help them prepare teaching material for BR and TP
- Collect and make available examples of best practice
- Encourage a scholarly approach to teaching
- Support development of a peer assessment program

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight teaching successes and innovation in University and Faculty newsletters, web pages, etc. • Provide opportunities to present teaching innovations at yearly sharing events • Provide institutional support for faculty who wish to apply for external funding for teaching-related research • Provide funding to attend conferences related to teaching
<p>Resources</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources are required for: Collection of additional teaching assessment data, e.g. peer or expert observation, video analysis, surveys of alumni, student input beyond SETC such as focus groups or exit surveys • Faculty members require support and professional development – this requires support of the CEE and the ISTLD • TPCs require support, e.g. training in evaluating teaching submissions and peer assessment • Develop ways to manage TPC workload– we have heard that there is not enough time to do a good job. Could TPC members be relieved from other service obligations? Could the workload of Chairs/Directors be reduced? We have made a couple of suggestions in the section “Changes that Academic Units Can Make” • Provide the resources the CEE needs to present workshops, teaching assessment activities (including peer assessment and SET), educational consultants with disciplinary knowledge • Continue support for faculty-led inquiry
<p>Reporting and Review</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recommend that the AVPLT enlist the support of Senate, through the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning, the Centre for Educational Excellence, and other local structures already in place to support teaching and learning, • Compare how merit steps are awarded to teaching and research faculty to make sure that there are no discrepancies • Initiate a review of the impacts of the project within five years. Repeat the two surveys – the survey of TPCs conducted by the SETCWG and the survey of faculty members conducted by TAWG – to measure change of culture • Revise these recommendations as the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement evolves



Appendix B: TAWG Terms of Reference

Teaching Assessment Working Group *Strategies to Value Effective Teaching*

Terms of Reference

Preamble

Some 54 Tenure and Promotion Committees (TPC's) exist across SFU each charged with reviewing faculty performance and providing recommendations. Each TPC develops review criteria consistent with their Faculty and disciplinary needs.

Faculty members are evaluated and promoted based on their performance in three areas as set out in the SFU-Faculty Collective Agreement, Section 28.5. These areas are Research, Teaching, and Service. Although the distribution of these areas is not mentioned in the collective agreement it is generally considered to be 40% Research, 40% Teaching and 20% Service for research faculty and 80% Teaching, 20% Service for teaching faculty (these percentages may vary depending on expectations).

In general, the metrics used to evaluate the research component are well known, consistent, and relatively straightforward to apply. The evaluation of teaching practice and related metrics are not as well known across disciplines and, in practice, may not be as consistent or as straightforward to apply. It is the belief of this working group that TPC's are committed to valuing teaching by fairly evaluating all components of a faculty members' teaching practice but may lack a consistent set of evaluation tools to choose from. It will be beneficial to all to review best practices locally, at other institutions, and as identified in the literature and to share these with the SFU academic community.

Purpose of Working Group

The charge of this working group is to provide a set of strategies to value teaching practice and recommendations to facilitate consistency, flexibility, and robustness of reviews of teaching practice that are **useful and usable** by Faculty, Chairs, Tenure and Promotion Committees (TPCs), and Deans.

Scope

The working group should identify current practice and issues of concern by considering the following:

1. Review of current Departmental TP Criteria to determine the types and ways in which teaching practice are being evaluated,
2. Review of current University Criteria,

3. The experiences of TPC Chairs and Deans,
4. The experiences of a sample of faculty members who have been reviewed,
5. The experiences of other groups e.g. SFUFA, SCUTL, Faculty Relations.

The working group should explore alternatives to current practice by considering, for example, the following:

1. Best practices at SFU including the types and range of strategies being used,
2. Best practices at other institutions in Canada including the types and range of strategies being used,
3. Recent literature relevant to faculty teaching reviews.

The working group will work to advance awareness of alternatives by considering, for example, the following:

1. Workshops for faculty with experts,
2. Promotion of discussions at department meetings,
3. Development of a website of resources

The working group will write a report summarizing their findings and develop a set of recommendations for different stakeholders regarding:

1. Strategies to celebrate teaching excellence,
2. A broad and flexible set of teaching competencies,
3. Methods for formative and summative evaluation of teaching,
4. Support for faculty including submission templates,
5. Clarification of Departmental and general University criteria,
6. Strategies to increase efficacy, fairness and efficiency,
7. Strategies to promote sustainability of the initiative.

Committee Members

Barbara Frisken (Chair) (PHYS)	Faculty of Science
Brad Johnson (Director, TLC)	Teaching and Learning Centre
Natalia Gajdamaschko (EDUC)	Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) 2017-2018
Panayiotis Pappas (LING)	Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) 2018-2019
Russell Day (PSYC)	SFU Faculty Association (SFUFA)
Jennifer Spear (HIST)	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Diana Cukierman (CMPT)	Faculty of Applied Sciences
Neil Abramson	Beedie School of Business (2017-2018)
Daniel Ahadi (CMNS)	Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology
Dan Laitsch (EDUC)	Faculty of Education
Andrew Perkins (GEOG)	Faculty of Environment



Diego Silva	Faculty of Health Sciences
Richard Lockhart (STATS)	Faculty of Science
Doug Thorpe-Dorward	Faculty Relations (Ex-Officio) (2017-2018)

Appendix C: Goals for improving how we assess and value teaching

TAWG developed goals in three main areas, for faculty members, academic units, and the University, that we believe will improve the way we value and assess teaching. These goals were distributed to the community in early 2018 for consideration as academic units and faculties drafted their 2019-2024 Academic Plans. TAWG also used these goals to develop the strategies and recommendations to build a culture at SFU where teaching is valued that are outlined in this report. The goals addressed by recommendations in each of the five categories are summarized at the end of the appropriate section.

The goals are that:

1. Faculty members are reflective practitioners within a community of teaching
 - They are aware of teaching expectations for their rank and position
 - They are reflective and responsive teachers
 - They adapt their teaching to changing environments
 - They are comfortable taking risks and are rewarded for experimenting with their teaching practices
 - They feel they are part of a culture where teaching is valued
 - Outstanding teaching is celebrated
2. Academic units value and reward teaching as one of the primary academic responsibilities
 - Expectations for different ranks for teaching and research faculty are clear
 - Teaching is valued at hiring and promotion
 - TPCs have the tools and knowledge to value effective teaching
 - Multiple teaching assessment methods are integrated into the work of TPCs
 - Departmental TP criteria reflect best practice and current teaching research, and are used to inform tenure and promotion decisions; criteria, practice and assessment are aligned
 - Academic units identify and promote their best teachers for faculty, university, national, and international teaching awards
3. The University provides support to faculty members and academic units for the design, development, delivery, and evaluation of effective teaching
 - SFU has articulated a vision statement and principles to provide direction and common purpose around teaching and learning
 - The capacity to understand teaching and evaluate it well is present in all steps in the process
 - There is a clear definition of expectations for both teaching effectiveness and teaching excellence, and the standards expected for different ranks for teaching and research faculty
 - A general framework for methods of teaching assessment has been adopted, which can be used to inform the work of academic units
 - There is a program of professional development and support that is clearly aligned with this evaluation framework
 - The University has established a support system to provide formative feedback and instructional development to all interested faculty
 - There is a program of support and/or training for all those involved in the review process
 - The expectations, evaluation framework, and support mechanisms are regularly reviewed
 - Institutional policies regarding teaching and learning are regularly examined and revised
 - Appropriate resources, including the TLC, are tasked with supporting the advancement of teaching and learning throughout the university

Appendix D: Definitions

There are a number of terms used to describe teaching and assessment. In this report, we used the definitions below; departments may use these as a starting point as they work to define terms that are relevant to their discipline and context.

Formative Assessment – ongoing feedback that is designed and used to promote growth or improvement in the person’s performance²

Summative Assessment – an evaluation designed to present conclusions about the merit or worth of a person’s performance²

Effective Teaching

Section 28.5 of the 2014-2019 SFU/SFUFA Collective Agreement states:

“Success as a teacher is of fundamental importance for evaluating the performance of a faculty member. Matters which should be taken into consideration in evaluating teaching include **mastery of the subject, generation of enthusiasm in students, maintenance of appropriate academic standards, dedicated involvement within one's field(s), openness to innovation, graduate supervision, and development of academic programs.**”

This is consistent with accepted definitions of effective teaching in the field. For example, Gravestock (2011, p 54) states

“In general, it is agreed that an effective teacher should be:

- Organized and prepared for class;
- Knowledgeable about and demonstrate a strong interest in the subject matter;
- Able to motivate students;
- Fair and reasonable in their evaluation of student work;
- Able to assist with and encourage student learning;
- Able to encourage discussion;
- Dynamic and energetic in the classroom and possess effective presentation skills; and,
- Interested in their students learning.”

For more information, Gravestock references a more complete definition published by Queen’s University in 1995, which is reproduced in Gravestock’s thesis (Gravestock, 2011, Appendix G, p 347).

Scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) – “The systematic study of teaching and/or learning and the public sharing and review of such work through presentations, performance, or publications.”

McKinney, p39. From <https://www.stlthe.ca/sotl/what-is-sotl/>

Discipline Based Education Research (DBER) – “DBER combines knowledge of teaching and learning with deep knowledge of discipline-specific science content. It describes the discipline-specific difficulties learners face and the specialized intellectual and instructional resources that can facilitate student understanding.” National Research Council. 2012. *Discipline-Based Education Research: Understanding and Improving Learning in Undergraduate Science and Engineering*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/13362>.

² Gullickson, A.R., Howard, B.B. (2009). *The Personnel Evaluation Standards: How to assess systems for evaluating educators* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.



Active research – research in teaching and learning in one’s own classroom

Scholarly teaching – teaching informed by research /scholarship of teaching and learning (UBC Collective Agreement)

Excellent teaching and outstanding teaching – These two terms are used to describe teaching expectations for promotion at SFU but are not defined in the SFUFA/SFU Collective agreement. They are generally used to describe teaching that exceeds expectations for effective teaching. Excellent teaching is sometimes described as being a combination of effective and scholarly teaching. In general, each academic unit will need to define these terms in the context of disciplinary norms in order to make it clear what is expected for promotion to senior academic positions within the academic unit. The Criteria for Promotion recently approved by the Faculty of Education in December 2018 (Faculty of Education, 2018) provide a comprehensive example.

Innovative teaching – introducing or applying practices that are new to them or to their classroom

Educational leadership

Educational leadership is the process of influencing colleagues, students, and SFU administration to improve student learning. It includes leadership in the exploration of instructional strategies and student learning; mentorship of colleagues; and the creation, development, and/or implementation of policies, initiatives, and programs within the University to enhance student learning and teaching practice.

Two other terms are used to define teaching – quality teaching and successful teaching – but we believe that these are captured in the terms above and have avoided using them.

Appendix E: Guidance for use of teaching assessment methods by faculty members

This table was created by Daria Ahrensmeier to help faculty members systematically collect information and document the scope, effectiveness and progression of their teaching. It is meant for personal reflection and professional development, but can also be used for biennial review and/or tenure/promotion processes. Departments may also use the table to generate discussion about the aspects of teaching they can assess and value, and the ways in which they might operationalize the assessment. The table reorganizes the 73 teaching assessment methods described in the SETCWG Report (SETCWG, 2017, Chapter 5) from a user’s point of view. The format encourages reflection and follows the guiding principles and structure of a teaching dossier. All of the documentation listed is provided/assembled by the faculty member, unless otherwise noted. Please note that this list shows a wide variety of options; what a faculty member actually includes will depend on their own interests or department requirements. Faculty and departments should refer to the details in the SETCWG report when considering these items, and are encouraged to request help and further information from the CEE (Centre for Educational Excellence). Departments should also consider Appendix F: Guidelines for use of teaching assessment methods by academic units as a scaffold for evaluation of teaching for biennial review, tenure and promotion.

	What – The kind of information that may be collected and documented	How – Examples for Details, specific materials and data that may be included	Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching
Documentation of Teaching and Related Activities	Courses taught	Number, type, level of courses; student population; specific responsibilities; description of student activities; teaching strategies and innovation	Breadth and depth of experience; use of evidence-based, research-informed practices; adaptability to audience
	Course materials	Syllabus, course plan; sample lecture, sample assignment, midterm, final; grading rubrics	Alignment of Educational Goals, assessment, and teaching practice; use of evidence-based, research-informed practices; meaningful/authentic assessment
	Course (re)design; curriculum (re)design	New vs old course materials (see details above); new vs old program including curriculum map, Program Level Educational Goals	Consideration of Student needs and/or feedback; alignment of Educational Goals, assessment, and teaching practice; use of evidence-based, research-informed practices

	What – The kind of information that may be collected and documented	How – Examples for Details, specific materials and data that may be included	Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching
	TA training and/or supervision	TA training materials	Awareness of student needs, demands and issues the TAs may face
	Graduate student supervision	Number of students; student careers, student awards	Awareness of graduate student needs and methods to support their success
	Active participation in teaching circles or communities of practice	Presentations, reports	Interest in new developments, literature, and continuous improvement including sharing experiences
	Educational Leadership	Mentoring other instructors; creation of course materials for broader use; writing/editing textbook; creating community of practice; editor for a SOTL/DBER journal	Impact beyond one’s own classroom, on the larger teaching community
	Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) and/or Discipline Based Education Research (DBER)	Grants, projects, reports, presentations, publications	Impact on the larger teaching community through scholarly work.
	Professional development activities related to teaching	Documentation of participation in workshops etc; artifacts created; certificates; journals or books read	Interest in continuous improvement, learning about new developments and research; adherence to professional standards in a field
	Teaching-related administrative work	Committee work, program development participation	Support of teaching community; interest in program improvement to address changing needs

	What – The kind of information that may be collected and documented	How – Examples for Details, specific materials and data that may be included	Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching
Reflection on Current and Past Practices	Reflections on Teaching	Teaching Philosophy Statement; Teaching Dossier; Reflection on own teaching in relation to SoTL or DBER literature, Teaching Perspectives Inventory etc.	Views on how teaching and learning works, values and how they are realized; seeking out and responding to feedback; reflection for continuous improvement; changes based on reflection
	Reflections on Educational Leadership	Educational Leadership Dossier	Views on how educational leadership works, values and how they are realized; seeking out and responding to feedback; reflection for continuous improvement
	Other teaching-related Publications	Blogs, videos, opinion pieces	Impact on the larger teaching community through communicating reflection, news, and opinions.
Outcomes and Observations	Course data	Grade distributions; attendance, retention	Consistency with department practice; student engagement
	Educational goals	Mapping of educational goals to course work and related grades or other assessment	Degree of achievement of educational goals through the course
	Student outcomes	Student work samples; concept inventory (pre-/post-test) results	Illustration of student learning via examples or validated, reliable tests.
	Student feedback	SETC; student focus groups, interviews (provided by CEE); instructor-developed surveys; in-class feedback; alumni feedback; testimonials	Student perception of the course, their learning, and the instructor’s teaching
	TA feedback	TA focus groups, interviews, exit survey (all provided by CEE)	TAs’ perception of the course, the instructor’s

	What – The kind of information that may be collected and documented	How – Examples for Details, specific materials and data that may be included	Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching
			teaching and the students’ learning
	Peer feedback	Classroom observation with or without standardized protocol (provided by peers; training by CEE available)	Student engagement and interaction; use of suitable, effective methods
	Expert feedback	Classroom observation with or without standardized protocol (provided by CEE or, e.g., university lecturers)	Student engagement and interaction; use of suitable, effective, evidence-based, research-informed methods
	Teaching awards	Awards, nominations	Demonstration of particular dedication to teaching, innovation etc
Reflections on Future Goals	Reflections on future development as an instructor	Teaching philosophy statement; Teaching dossier; reflection on development options based on feedback and observations, inspired by literature or interactions with community	Seeking out opportunities for professional growth as instructor, reflecting on and using feedback; planned changes based on outcomes and observations
	Plans for future teaching (innovation), course development, SoTL, DBER, etc	Teaching philosophy statement; Teaching dossier; ideas inspired by feedback and observations, community, student/department needs and/or literature	Seeking opportunities for professional growth as instructor to further teaching in the department and address the (changing) student needs

Appendix F: Guidance for use of teaching assessment methods by academic units

This table organizes the SETCWG’s 73 methods for assessment of teaching (SETCWG, 2017, Tables 34 and 35, pp. 63-66) into a single table organized by methods and sources. The table focusses on three groups of assessment methods: documentation of teaching and related activities, reflections on teaching, and outcomes and observations. While Appendix E is designed to help faculty members record and document their teaching, we hope that this approach will help academic units in choosing their sources for evaluation of their colleagues’ teaching. A \$ indicates methods that would need to be financially supported. Faculty and departments should refer to the full SETCWG report in considering any of these items and contact the Centre for Educational Excellence (CEE) for support.

Method	Self	Current & Former Students	Peer/Administrator
Documentation of Teaching & Related Activities	Courses taught Course (re)design Course materials Graduate student supervision T.A. training/supervision Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SoTL) and/or Discipline Based Education Research (DBER) Professional development activities Educational leadership	Student work	Review of course materials Review of SoTL/DBER
Reflections on Teaching: 1) Current & Past Practices 2) Future Goals	Teaching philosophy (why do you do what you do in the classroom?) Narrative reflection on teaching activities & practices	Faculty-developed surveys	Pre- & post-observation meetings
Outcomes & Observations	Video analysis \$ Teaching awards	Number/calibre of students supervised Student awards & distinctions Course data (grades, attendance, retention) Student feedback T.A. feedback Focus groups \$ Current & former student testimonials Alumni surveys \$	Peer observation \$ Expert (CEE, University Lecturers) observation \$ Video analysis \$ Review of course materials

Appendix G: Recommendations for workshops for faculty members

This Appendix describes four workshops designed to introduce faculty members to different methods of teaching assessment. The workshops were designed by Daria Ahrensmeier and Sarah Turner from TLC in collaboration with TAWG and were piloted at the Symposium for Teaching and Learning on May 15 and 16, 2019, at SFU's downtown campus.

Design overview and considerations

- Workshops should illustrate that instructors' professional development and the reflection on and presentation of their development and achievements are complementary processes.
- Correspondingly, the workshops should provide guidance on how to implement the various teaching assessment methods, how to analyze the resulting data, and how to present the results, including reflection. They should also illustrate pros and cons of each method and their limitations.
- The workshops should offer face-to-face options as well as online materials for self-study/review, including exemplars for instructors at various ranks/career stages and from various disciplines.
- The sessions should be short (typically no more than 2 hours), with each session focused on one topic.
- For the workshops to be efficient, departments should be strongly encouraged to discuss their view of effective teaching so that instructors can use that view as a guideline.
- It is important that these sessions are both supported from the bottom up, i.e. including faculty voices in the creation and development of each module, and top down. It is recommended that there be clear support of these initiatives by the VPA, AVPTL and directors and chairs.

Draft Timeline (2019/2020)

- Design sessions, supplementary material, outreach strategy: Jan – April
- Book space, promote sessions, plan evaluation: February and March
- Pilot newly developed sessions at the Teaching and Learning Centre's Symposium: May
- Revise and refine, using feedback from participants and consultations with stake holders: June - August
- Begin offerings and create supplementary/online materials: September – April

Module 1: Teaching Assessment – An Overview

While there are multiple options for teaching assessment beyond student course evaluations, not many of them are currently being used at SFU. The goal of this workshop is to provide an overview of these options, how they can be implemented, their pros and cons, and the type, breadth and depth of information they can provide, including their limitations. We will also address how instructors can use the results for continuous improvement of their teaching, where they can find support for implementation and analysis, and what a TPC will likely be looking for in their assessment.

Faculty members should expect an initial increase in workload when implementing these methods, but the workshops will illustrate the benefits that make up for it: a combination of multiple methods (e.g. surveys, observations, reflection) and data sources (students, peers, self) at several points in time is not



only suggested in SFU policies, it is also widely seen as a more nuanced, fair and realistic approach that allows for interpretation within the context of an individual instructor's career path.

Module 2, with Kiran Bisra: Student Feedback on Teaching

Collecting meaningful, relevant and timely student feedback on teaching can lead to improvements and further development of an instructor's teaching practice. Methods of collecting this feedback are varied, and include student course evaluations (including SETC instructor-selected questions), mid-term instructor-designed surveys (distributed early enough to make adjustments), and student focus groups (conducted by an educational consultant, TA's or Peers), or class observations by trained undergraduate students.

Participants will learn how to identify key aspects of the learning experience they would like feedback about, how to use survey question design principles to craft questions about those aspects, distill and analyze survey results, and how to use this data to improve their students' learning experience.

Module 3: Peer Feedback – Approaches to Design

Teaching assessment by peers provides a complementary angle to student assessment and can contribute to a more holistic picture of an instructor's practice. While formative peer assessment has recently become more popular at SFU and elsewhere, many questions regarding the process still remain. This session examines the goals and scope of peer observation as well as models, options and guidelines for performing and for receiving peer feedback.

Participants will evaluate the benefits and limitations of these models and discuss how to document and extract information, as well as how to present findings. Faculty members who have implemented peer assessment processes will share their own experiences highlighting the various ways they have made the workload both sustainable and manageable. Special attention will be paid to the various ways these experiences have informed instructors' practice and creative models for sharing and showcasing the learning from peer feedback.

Module 4: Teaching Philosophy Statements and Dossiers

The commonly used format for documenting an instructor's teaching effectiveness, progress, and self-reflection is the teaching dossier, which includes the teaching philosophy statement.

In this workshop, participants will get started on preparing their own dossier and philosophy by reviewing the typical structure and content of teaching dossiers, and comparing several examples from a variety of disciplines and career stages. They will start to create their Philosophy of Teaching statement, discuss approaches for documenting teaching activities and effectiveness as well as reflections, and engage in peer review of the results. They will also learn what to look for when assessing another instructor's teaching dossier, and where to find support.

Follow-Up session: Drop-in session for participants to receive feedback on their teaching dossier drafts



Appendix H: Examples / templates

1. TP Criteria related to teaching assessment
 - a. [Department of History](#)
 - b. [Faculty of Education](#)
2. Informal course survey of students, not led by instructor
 - a. Student focus group – SETCWG Appendix D7
 - b. Small group instructional diagnosis – SETCWG Appendix D8
3. Informal course survey of students, led by instructor
 - a. Student Feedback TAE – SETCWG Appendix D6
 - b. Muddiest point – SETCWG Appendix D9
 - c. One minute paper – SETCWG Appendix D9
4. Peer assessment - <http://ctl.ok.ubc.ca/teaching-development/classroom-practices/peer-review/>