

***Report of the AUNBT and UNB
Joint Committee for the Assessment of Teaching
Competence***

July 12, 2007

Committee Members:

AUNBT Representatives

Regena Farnsworth (Co-chair)
Philip J. Backman
Robert J. McKellar
Charlene F. Mayes

UNB Representatives

Pierre Zundel (Co-chair)
Gwendolyn Davies
Robert A. MacKinnon
Sharon J. Rich

The University of New Brunswick's (UNB) mission statement states that UNB Strives "to be known for its excellence in teaching by providing students with the highest possible quality instruction." A key component of our approach to achieving this mission is to assess the quality of the teaching that goes on at all levels of the University. For this reason, University of New Brunswick (UNB) and the Association of University of New Brunswick Teachers (AUNBT) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding the assessment of teaching competence, as part of the 2005-2009 collective agreement (see Appendix I). The Joint Committee's mandate was to seek to identify and agree upon means of enhancing the quality of the documentary evidence related to academic competence in the dissemination of knowledge. In addition, the Joint Committee was mandated to consult broadly to arrive at recommendations for:

- *Mechanisms(if any) that may be adopted to improve the assessment of faculty members' teaching competence as part of the overall assessment of academic competence in the dissemination of knowledge; and*
- *Changes (if any) to the Collective Agreement provisions governing the assessment of teaching competence as part of the overall assessment of academic competence in the dissemination of knowledge.*

Accordingly, the committee's recommendations (see Section IV) will help UNB educators better evaluate the quality of their own instruction, while also providing a means to enhance the documentary evidence related to the assessment of teaching competence for the purpose of promotion or tenure. Additionally, they will increase the support available to faculty members for preparation and analysis of such evidence, and to assessment committees and senior administrators responsible for its evaluation.

Since early fall 2006, after its formation, and the appointment of co-chairs and Committee members by both parties, the Joint Committee on the Assessment of Teaching Competence has met bi-monthly . This has permitted discussions of how effective teaching may be measured, the types of information that may be collected and used for assessing teaching and learning, and the practices in place at UNB, and at other post-secondary institutions, for assessing teaching and learning.

Individuals, groups, and researchers with an interest in, and knowledge of, teaching assessment practices were identified for consultation. Individual members of the Joint Committee and subcommittee groups undertook the task of identifying individuals and groups for consultation, and of completing specific aspects of teaching assessment research (see Section III). The Committee endeavoured to consult as widely as possible across UNB, and elsewhere, and to research and collect information on current teaching assessment practices, especially among the 13 universities which currently serve as UNB's comparison group.

Some groups were consulted because they had particular responsibilities in the assessment process (e.g., faculty members, deans, senior administrators). Some UNB groups had particular expertise to share with the Committee [e.g., the Saint John Vice President's Excellence in Teaching Committee (VPETC), the Fredericton Center for Enhanced Teaching and Learning (CETL)]. Other groups were consulted because they had particular interests in teaching competence (e.g., the Graduate Student Associations on both campuses). We also consulted with external experts such as Dr. Michael Piva of the Canadian Association of University teachers and Dr. Trevor Holmes of the Guelph University Teaching Support Services. In this phase of our consultations we were seeking information and advice about issues associated with the current documentary basis for the assessment of teaching competence and advice about best practices. Appendix II lists the groups and individuals consulted.

The primary issues discussed during these consultations included:

1. The assessment of teaching competence in general and the underlying philosophical/educational frameworks for such assessment;
2. The existing collective agreements and legal frameworks in place at UNB and at other universities;
3. The identification of literature on the assessment of teaching competence; and
4. The assessment of teaching and supervision at the graduate level.

This section outlines some of the key ideas that underlie our recommendations. It is not intended as an exhaustive review of the literature on the assessment of teaching. Rather it provides a brief summary of some of the background information that informed our discussion of the issues related to the assessment of teaching competence and ultimately our recommendations. We have structured this section as follows. We begin with some of the basic ideas related to the assessment of scholarship and of teaching in particular. We then describe the reasoning behind the use of teaching dossiers and the rationale for the various items that make them up. We then outline our ideas on the assessment of graduate teaching. Our hope is to provide the ideas underlying our recommendations in roughly the same order as they are presented in Section IV.

As noted in the previous section of this report, consultations with numerous individuals and groups formed a broad based and solid foundation for our recommendations. Additionally, a number of publications were particularly valuable sources of information regarding the types of evidence that may be considered for the effective assessment of teaching. In particular, the committee relied heavily on two CAUT publications, the current “Policy on the Use of Anonymous Student Questionnaires in the Evaluation of Teaching” (approved by the CAUT Council in November 2006) and a CAUT booklet “Teaching Dossier,” (2007). Links to electronic copies of these CAUT documents are included in our references. Books that were particularly helpful included: *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System* (Arreola, 2000), *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990), *Scholarship Assessed* (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997) and *What the best college teachers do* (Bain, 2004). The committee also reviewed the policies on assessment of teaching at other universities (see Appendix III), including all of those in our comparison group of universities, as listed in Article 36B.07 of our Collective Agreement (see Appendix IV). Following is a brief summary of key ideas gleaned from these and other sources.

Ernest Boyer (1990) challenged the Academy in his book *Scholarship Reconsidered* to think about scholarship more broadly than as ‘research’ alone. He argued that scholarships of application and of teaching were equally important forms of scholarship. In *Scholarship Assessed*, Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997) presented a conceptual model for assessment of the different scholarships identified by Boyer and argued that all good scholarly work includes clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. They indicated that these should be the basis for the assessment of all forms of scholarship, including teaching. Our committee found this framework helpful as we thought about the kinds of documentary evidence that should be used for the assessment of teaching competence. For example, we considered what types of documentation could be presented to indicate that a professor had clear goals in mind when creating and/or teaching a course, and that appropriate methods were selected and used to achieve those goals.

Furthermore, in *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System* (2000) Arreola asserts that the assessment of teaching competence depends of several key factors, including:

1. Clearly defining what the model of good teaching is;

2. Identifying the information (criteria) needed to compare actual teaching performance to the model;
3. Gathering required breadth and depth of information about faculty performance most efficiently and from the most reliable sources to make judgments about criteria; and
4. Systematically using the information gathered to arrive at informed, consistent judgments of faculty performance.

While the committee supports the use of a systematic approach of this type, we are not recommending that a particular model of effective teaching be used by all faculty members. Instead, we believe that explicitly defining a model of good teaching is the purview of individual faculty members, who best understand the context in which they teach, as well as their teaching objectives and their students. Nonetheless, the factors identified by Arreola were compatible with Boyer (1990) and Glassick et al. (1997), and are supported by the information that we gathered in our consultations with VPETC, CETL, and CAUT. All of these sources concur that a broad base of information needs to be evaluated in order to conduct a fair and accurate assessment of teaching competence. Indeed, there was substantial consensus in our consultations and in the literature that the assessment of teaching competence needed to be systematically informed by a range of different types of information.

Although our collective agreement *permits* the submission and consideration of a broad range of information during the assessment process (see Articles 25D and 25E of the 2005-09 Collective Agreement), it does not require it. The only item consistently available for most candidates is the aggregated results of Senate approved student opinion surveys (SOS). Because these surveys are often the only assessment tool common to most candidates under review, the SOS is frequently overused by assessment committees. The SOS provides valuable information about certain issues (for example course delivery and potential for student engagement). However, it does not provide quality information about other key issues such as the currency of the course content (Arreola, 2000, p. xxiii; CAUT, 2007, p.6). Bain (2004) provides the following analysis:

For some issues, student ratings offer strong evidence; for others, only the syllabus, examples of student work, or the critique of a colleague might do. Any good process should rely on appropriate sources of data, which are then *compiled* and *interpreted*... (pp. 167-168).

Furthermore, CAUT (2006, ¶ 2) states, “Procedures for the evaluation of teaching should take into account all relevant sources of information about teaching. Anonymous student ratings should never be the primary measure of teaching performance.” Additionally, CAUT (2007) reports that, “Teaching is at a disadvantage in the evaluation process” (p. 5) and that it is more difficult to demonstrate competence in teaching than in research largely because of the types of evidence typically used for evaluation. For instance, the CV typically is limited to listing courses taught and students supervised, which does not address the quality of teaching. Yet, the themes identified in Glassick et al. (1997) and the factors associated with assessing teaching competence identified in Arreola (2000) require a broad range of information to be properly addressed in the assessment process. Thus, our committee concluded that the documentary evidence used for the assessment of teaching competence at UNB needs to include a wider range of materials than is currently required.

Teaching Dossier

The experts and literature we consulted were consistent in recommending a Teaching Dossier as the best source of information for the assessment of teaching competence. According to CAUT (2007, p. 2), “A teaching dossier is a summary of an academic’s major teaching accomplishments and strengths. It is to an academic’s teaching what lists of publications, grants, and academic honours are to research.” The same publication goes on to say,

By providing both data and context a teaching dossier helps prevent vital discretionary decisions from becoming arbitrary and capricious. . . . Well-designed and appropriately used institutional evaluation procedures should be augmented by a carefully prepared teaching dossier in which the academic staff member puts “their best foot forward” (CAUT, 2007, p. 8).

As a result of our consultations and review of the relevant literature, we believe that a teaching dossier that systematically provides evidence and conclusions about a faculty member’s teaching performance should be a requirement in the assessment process at UNB. A review of assessment practices at other universities (See Appendices III & IV) revealed that among Canadian Universities teaching dossiers are required at several, including, but not limited to Concordia, McGill, McMaster, Memorial, Ryerson, University of Guelph, University of Toronto, University of Victoria, University of Western Ontario, and Wilfred Laurier. Among our group of 13 comparison universities, four require teaching dossiers (McMaster, Memorial, Queens, and University of Victoria) and a total of six permit their submission.

A teaching dossier at UNB would complement the use of student opinion surveys. The dossier, viewed in a general sense, offers faculty the opportunity to document pro-actively the evolution of their teaching, and thus eliminates the situation that can arise when their teaching is singularly evaluated by the students. The dossier provides a much needed mechanism for faculty to explain to others their motives, methods, and goals.

We further believe that a teaching dossier needs to provide certain kinds of information that address the key themes in the assessment of scholarly work. To serve as a valuable tool, the dossier should be compiled to make the best possible case for teaching effectiveness (CAUT, 2007). CAUT (p.16 - 19) provides a list of possible items to include in the dossier, and we refer the reader to that publication for the full range of options. Additionally, for ease of reference we have provided a list of possible items excerpted from the CAUT Teaching Dossier guidelines in Appendix V. The following paragraphs outline the reasoning behind our recommendations for each of the particular components we recommend be included as required elements in teaching dossiers at UNB.

One important part of a teaching dossier is the statement of teaching philosophy, educational objectives, and context. The teaching philosophy outlines the scholar’s own ideas of what is worth knowing in their discipline, how students learn, and what the faculty member’s values are in the educational endeavour. This philosophy is an evolving document that informs educational practices, assessment and development. As we described above, clarity of objectives is a key quality of strong scholarship (Glassick et al., 1997). Objectives in terms of student learning

describe the intent behind the faculty member's work as a teacher and are fundamental to assessment of teaching competence (Bain, 2004). These objectives need to be framed within the educational context that describes the students taught (for example, age, preparation, disciplinary major), class size, when the courses occur within the program and so on (Arreola, 2000; CAUT, 2007). Together these components help faculty members explain the reasons behind their pedagogical choices and their professional development activities.

Additionally, appropriate preparation was cited by Glassick et al. (1997) as one of the key components of effective scholarship. Information about a faculty member's activities related to teaching is important in assessing their preparation for the teaching task. CAUT (2007) also identify "Teaching responsibilities and practices" as a key component of a dossier. They help assess the degree of effort invested and the scale of the teaching endeavour with which the faculty member is associated. This is also identified by Arreola (2000) as a key piece of information provided by faculty members to help assessors understand the nature of their teaching work.

The ultimate aim in competent teaching is to cause students to learn. Glassick et al. (1997) comment that "Any act of scholarship must also be judged by the significance of its results." The amount, quality and consistency of student learning are therefore potentially important forms of evidence of competence in teaching. CAUT (2007, p. 17) identifies "products of good teaching" as one of the key components of teaching dossiers and lists a number of items that can be used in this category, including test scores, examples of lab work, essays and other assignments. They also list other forms of evidence such as students signing up for more than one [elective] course with the instructor, requests from peers for assistance with their teaching or course development and evidence of successful graduate supervision. ■

We believe that a record of what teachers do to assess and improve their teaching is a powerful indicator of their current and future competence in teaching and a predictor of their long-term success. According to Bain (2004), the 'best college teachers' shared in common a tendency to carry out formal self-assessment about their ability to help students learn and to modify their practices on this basis. Inclusion of "reflective critique" is also identified by Glassick et al. (2007) as a critical component of effective scholarship. The CAUT identifies "Evaluating and Improving One's Teaching" as an important component of a dossier. Candid and evidence-based self-assessment and subsequent improvements is one of the key ways in which the scholarly value associated with the pursuit of growth and learning is actualized in faculty teaching.

Teaching awards and other formal recognition for effective teaching are an important indicator of teaching competence. Highly competitive, formally peer-adjudicated regional and national awards such as, the Atlantic Association of Universities Educational Leadership Award and the 3M National Teaching Fellow awards, constitute peer judgments of the quality of a faculty member's teaching.

Graduate Student Supervision and Teaching

Our consultations with graduate students, faculty, and administrators indicated that one area that needs special attention in the assessment process is graduate student supervision, teaching, and mentoring. There are particular challenges with the assessment of faculty in this area since graduate class sizes are often so small that formal anonymous student surveys are not practical. In addition, much of this teaching occurs in the process of research supervision. The power relationship between students and their research supervisors can create barriers to candid assessment of effectiveness. Nevertheless, graduate teaching, thesis supervision, and mentoring are important components of many faculty members' work and needs to be addressed (CAUT, 2007):

Teaching: Faculty members assembling the graduate teaching section of their teaching dossiers will essentially be working with the same kind of criteria as they have with their senior undergraduate teaching, in particular measuring their success in organizing and animating seminar classes and in directing students to the latest research in their field. Various graduate-specific measures that may also inform the graduate teaching dossier include: evidence that class enrolment has subsequently translated into one or more students working with the faculty member as thesis supervisor; enrolment of students in a second graduate class offered by a graduate professor; QA and accreditation reviews that flag the appropriateness and research relevance of a given graduate course; and student evaluations that are done in graduate courses in many Graduate Academic Units.

Supervision: A number of documents exist that can help graduate faculty members define their roles as graduate supervisors. Several of these are available on the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) website. Under "How to Apply" on its website, SGS has mounted the document "Your Future: A Guide for Potential Graduate Students" published by the Canadian Association of Graduate Studies (<http://www.unb.ca/gradschl/apply/index.html>). This contains useful points on the expectations of both candidates and supervisors. Combined with other documents on the SGS website such as "Guidelines for the Preparation of Dissertation, Thesis or Report," "Procedures for the Submission & Assessment of Doctoral Dissertations," and "Calendar Regulations," all of which articulate the importance of "process" in the supervision and execution of graduate students' research and writing, this "best practices" document may assist faculty in creating the "graduate supervision" or "graduate mentoring" section of their teaching dossiers. Finally, a key item in the graduate supervisor's "dossier" may be a list of graduate students supervised with their titles, graduation date, time to completion, and eventual career placement.

Mentoring: Other measures of graduate mentoring might include co-publication in disciplines where that is a norm; co-presentation at conferences; vetting graduate student articles prior to their being submitted to journals; being advisor-mentors in graduate students' first teaching experiences; co-marking with graduate students to train them in assessment criteria; educating graduate students about their intellectual property rights; and preparing graduate students for professional interviews and placement.

Support Required

The creation and assessment of teaching dossiers are tasks that need and benefit from support. CAUT (2007, p.16) describes the value of support from teaching and learning centers, colleagues and consultants to faculty members being assessed. Our consultations with UNB faculty and external experts indicate that a key component to successfully using teaching dossiers as a required part of the assessment process is the provision of support for faculty, assessment committees, and senior administrators. In many cases, historical practices that rely excessively on student opinion surveys (CAUT, 2007; Arreola, 2000) need to be countered by training in a more systematic and comprehensive approach. In addition, the types of information provided (for example, “products of good teaching”) may be unfamiliar and need to be explained to assessment committees. Furthermore, the CAUT guidelines, and others, suggests that teaching dossiers be updated regularly as part of ongoing formative assessment. Arreola (2000) echoes this idea and suggests the ongoing informal, formative mentoring provided by deans and chairs annually during the tenure and promotion process is an opportunity to support the development of appropriate teaching dossiers. We recognize that the time needed to create, update, and assess teaching dossiers appropriately will lead some people to object to requiring them. However, we agree with the conclusion drawn in the CAUT guidelines, which is, “If teaching is worth examining at all, then a reasonable commitment of time and resources must be made by both instructors and administrators” (p. 12).

UNB Fredericton has a Centre for Enhanced Teaching and Learning (CETL) to provide support for faculty members who voluntarily create and maintain teaching dossiers. However, there is currently no requirement that dossiers be developed, and no training provided to assessment committees or administrators on how to evaluate them. In order to guarantee that all faculty members, assessment committees, and administrators will receive the support they need once teaching dossiers are required, additional resources may need to be made available to the CETL for this purpose.

There is currently no equivalent to CETL on the Saint John campus, though one is on the drawing board. VPETC is a dedicated group of faculty volunteers who provide UNBSJ academic staff and graduate students with opportunities for professional development to enhance their teaching effectiveness. In order to guarantee that all faculty members, assessment committees, and administrators will receive the support they need to implement our committee’s recommendations, additional long-term resources will need to be made available to the proposed UNBSJ Teaching and Learning Centre.

The following recommendations are not intended to represent language for the Collective Agreement; however, we do propose that our recommendations be adapted and incorporated by AUNBT and UNB into the language of the next Collective Agreement.

In support of the need to enhance the quality of the documentary evidence provided for use in the assessment of academic competence in the dissemination of knowledge for faculty members (see Article 25D.06a), instructors (see Article 25E.06), and librarians (when classroom instruction is part of the librarian's workload) we recommend:

1. **That the Teaching Dossier becomes a required part of the documentary evidence to be used in the assessment process for probationary reappointment, tenure, and promotion as outlined in Articles 25B.05, for faculty members and instructors, and 25C.06, for librarians, (when classroom instruction is part of the librarian's workload).**
 - a) Teaching dossiers submitted for review will be for evaluative purposes. Dossiers will be compiled to show faculty at their best, but should also document their evolution as teachers. Thus, they should be flexible enough to allow faculty members to identify effective practices as well as areas needing improvement and to track growth in their teaching effectiveness. See CAUT Teaching Dossier (2007), section 1, Evaluating Teaching, and section 2, Administrative Use of the Teaching Dossier, for additional information.
 - b) When AUNBT and UNB make a joint commitment to require teaching dossiers for evaluative purposes, this requirement must be accompanied by the development and implementation of a training program for assessment committees, deans, and chairs in the evaluation of teaching dossiers. Expectations for mentoring and support at an administrative level will be made clear alongside expectations for faculty to enrich the evidence that demonstrates their teaching excellence.
 - c) Teaching dossiers should be designed to show growing congruency between faculty members' teaching philosophies and their teaching practices.
 - d) The narrative portion of teaching dossiers will be kept to a standard maximum length of 3-5 pages, with other materials included in appendices. Short dossiers will be encouraged. The creation of weighty tomes will cause unnecessary workload for faculty members and assessment committee members alike. The focus will be on providing only the most relevant items. This is in keeping with the guidelines provided in the CAUT Teaching Dossier (2007, p. 2).
 - e) Faculty members' teaching dossiers will include a set of standard items, but may also incorporate other items that faculty members feel are relevant to their teaching performance. The list of items to be included will provide enough

flexibility to allow faculty to highlight material specific to their own discipline, teaching style, and responsibilities. Our committee strongly supports the use of the CAUT (2007) Teaching Dossier booklet as a guide and recommends that it be the primary reference tool for developing a teaching dossier. In keeping with this, the following items are recommended for inclusion in the Teaching Dossier:

i. Standard items should be:

1. Teaching philosophy and context (types of courses, load, core/elective, types of students).
2. Description of activities related to teaching: changes to courses, curriculum development, scholarship of teaching and learning.
3. A reflection on key student feedback contained in available Senate-approved Student Opinion Surveys or departmental or faculty equivalents.
4. Initiatives faculty members take toward improving their teaching, and evidence of their impact.
5. Products of good teaching. See CAUT Teaching Dossier page 17 for a list of possible items to include here. Student essays, creative work, projects and field work reports are but a few examples of products of good teaching.
6. A list of teaching awards and recognition received for effective teaching
7. Evidence of the quality of graduate teaching, thesis supervision and mentoring (if appropriate given a faculty member's appointment).

ii. Optional items could come from those listed in the CAUT Teaching Dossier publication, section 3.2, pages 16 – 19.

2. **Training and support should be provided to faculty members, assessment committees and administrators in the assessment and development of graduate teaching, research supervision and mentoring (where appropriate for a faculty member's appointment).**
3. **That UNB invest materially in strong support of formative assessment and development of university teaching.**
 - a) UNB should continue to invest in improving resources offered through the Centre for Teaching and Learning on the Fredericton campus.
 - b) UNB should implement and fund the UNB Saint John Teaching and Learning Centre as outlined in the January 10, 2007 report prepared by VPETC entitled "Putting a Vision of Teaching Excellence Into Action."
 - c) Deans and chairs should provide for and manage appropriate mentoring of untenured faculty members to bring them into a model of assessment where teaching dossiers are required for tenure and promotion. There should be a clear expectation and verification by the relevant vice-presidents that structures and

processes that currently exist (e.g., annual informal reviews of performance with candidates in the promotion and tenure process) are consistently and appropriately used by deans and chairs as part of this mentoring process.

4. That the recommendations presented above be implemented together.

The changes we have recommended to the evidentiary basis for assessment decisions through the creation of a rich teaching dossier need to be supported by appropriate structures such as teaching and learning centers and a culture of systematic mentoring and development of faculty. Each component of our recommendations works synergistically with the others. Taking one without the others will substantially reduce our ability to impact student learning. In addition, it may raise substantial issues of fairness to faculty. As a result we strongly recommend to UNB and the AUNBT that the measures we propose be adopted as a package.

5. That the implementation of the four foregoing recommendations be monitored by a joint committee and the effectiveness of the implementation is assessed before the next collective agreement.

The Joint Committee's recommendations are aimed at improving the quality of assessment of teaching competence. Given the complex nature of faculty assessment and the challenge of implementing change to the process, we recommend that a new joint committee be formed and assigned the task of formally reviewing the effectiveness of teaching dossiers and the associated training processes. Significantly, before the expiration of the next collective agreement, the new joint committee will explore the question of whether the original recommended changes have improved the assessment process. If the 2009 collective agreement includes language that implements our recommendations, then the new joint committee will make recommendations to the parties for changes, if any, to the process prior to the signing of a subsequent collective agreement.

UNB is at a very important juncture in its history as a teaching institution. There have been substantial improvements in the support for university teaching through the creation of new teaching awards, of support units such as CETL and the creation of the Teaching and Learning Fund on the Fredericton campus, investments in improving student opinion surveys and a growing participation in the scholarship of teaching and learning on both campuses. We have invested in gathering institutional information on student engagement through the National Survey on Student Engagement. The growth in our graduate programs and plans to maintain or increase undergraduate enrolment create a need to continue to invest in the quality of teaching at UNB. One of the key initiatives to support teaching at the University is to provide systematic and thorough assessment of teaching competence. It is our fervent hope that the University and the AUNBT will take the opportunity provided by the MOU which gave rise to these recommendations to take this very important step.

References

Arreola, Raoul. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. 2nd ed. Bolton: Anker, 2000.

Bain, Ken. *What the best college teachers do*. Boston: Harvard University Press. 2004.

CAUT. *Policy on the Use of Anonymous Student Questionnaires in the Evaluation of Teaching*.
<http://www.caut.ca/en/policies/questionnaires.asp> as accessed on May 24, 2007

CAUT Teaching Dossier. Ottawa: Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2007.
http://www.caut.ca/en/publications/teaching_dossier_en.pdf as accessed on May 25, 2007

Boyer, Ernest. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1990.

Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber and Gene I. Maeroff. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate. First Edition*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. 1997

Appendices

Appendix I

**Assessment of Teaching Competence
Memorandum of Understanding Between AUNBT and UNB
from the Collective Agreement 2005-2009**

<http://www.unb.ca/hr/services/MOUAssessmentofTeachingCompetence.html>

Memorandum of Understanding

Between

The Association of University of New Brunswick Teachers (AUNBT)

and

The University of New Brunswick (UNB)

Subject: Assessment of Teaching Competence (Article 25D.06(a))

The Parties agree to form a Joint Committee, within 30 days of the signing of this Collective Agreement, to consider and make recommendations to the Parties on issues related to the assessment of teaching competence.

The Parties agree that it is desirable to employ fair and accurate mechanisms for the assessment of teaching competence as part of the overall assessment of a faculty member's academic competence in the dissemination of knowledge. The Parties have agreed on an established list of 13 criteria to assess teaching competence currently identified in Article 25D.06(a). Nevertheless, the Parties seek to identify and agree upon means of enhancing the quality of the documentary evidence related to assessment of academic competence in the dissemination of knowledge.

The Joint Committee shall consist of two co-chairs, one appointed by each party, in addition to three (3) other persons appointed by the University of New Brunswick and three (3) other persons appointed by the Association of University of New Brunswick Teachers. The Joint Committee shall consult stakeholders (including students) and persons knowledgeable in the field of assessment of teaching, but otherwise it shall determine its own procedures. The Committee shall report to the parties by June 30, 2006 or such later date as the Parties may mutually agree.

The Joint Committee will make recommendations on:

- Mechanisms (if any) that may be adopted to improve the assessment of faculty members' teaching competence as part of the overall assessment of academic competence in the dissemination of knowledge; and
- Changes (if any) to the Collective Agreement provisions governing the assessment of teaching competence as part of the overall assessment of academic competence in the dissemination of knowledge.

Feedback was solicited from faculty members, via a request for information from the Deans, and a survey of Instructors and Librarians was completed. The questions used in this survey included: 1) Do you use *informal* course surveys (in addition to the university-administered student opinion surveys) to solicit feedback? If so, would you mind providing me with some examples? 2) What are your thoughts on having instructors (and all faculty members) construct a teaching dossier/portfolio? How many of you are planning to, or have, submitted a dossier as part of your formal assessment? 3) What would you like to see collected as documentary evidence? and 4) Do you have information regarding teaching competence or teaching excellence that you would like to share?

Consultations have included:

Vice-Presidents:

Dr. Kathryn Hamer, Vice-President, UNB Saint John
Dr. Angelo Belcastro, Vice-President (Academic) UNB Fredericton
Dr. Greg Kealey, Vice-President Research, UNB

Deans' Councils:

UNB Fredericton and UNB Saint John

Vice-President's Excellence in Teaching Committee members, UNB Saint John

(Dr. David Creelman, English; Judith Buchanan, Nursing; Dr. Kate Frego, Biology; and Dr. Dale Roach, Engineering)

Teaching Excellence Policy Committee members

Dr. Greg Fleet, Business, UNB Saint John

Centre for Enhanced Teaching and Learning/ Teaching and Learning Services UNB Fredericton

(Ken Reimer, Director; Ted Needham, Coordinator; and Bev Bramble, Instructional Designer)

Teaching Support Services, The University of Guelph

(Trevor Holmes, Educational Development Associate)

Students' Representative Council, UNB Saint John

(Susan Barry, SRC President; and John Case, SRC Vice-President)

UNB Graduate Students' Association

(Colin Curry, President GSA, UNBF; Graham Cox, VP External GSA, UNBF; Ellen Campbell, VP Communications GSA, UNBSJ; Erin Holtz, VP Financial GSA UNBSJ)

Canadian Association of University Teachers

(Michael Piva, Assistant Executive Director, CAUT)

UNB Saint John Library

(Linda Hansen, Electronic Services Librarian, Ward Chipman Library)

UNB Fredericton Librarians (surveyed via questionnaire)

UNB Fredericton and UNB Saint John Instructors (surveyed via questionnaire)

Faculty of Education

(John Grant McLoughlin, Associate Professor UNBF)

Appendix III

Summary of Teaching Portfolio Use and Resources Julie Timmermans and Cynthia Weston Teaching and Learning Services, McGill

Please see attached MS Excel spreadsheet, Appendix III Summary of Teaching Portfolio Use and Resources.

Appendix IV

Summary of Teaching Portfolio Information from UNB's 13 Comparison Universities

NAME OF INSTITUTION	DOSSIER REQUIRED		DOSSIER PERMITTED		ADDITIONAL INFORMATION & LINKS TO RESOURCES
	YES	NO	YES	NO	
University of Calgary		No*	Yes		Promotion and tenure are outside the Collective Agreement and the information is currently contained in the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Manual. According to Sheila Miller, Executive Director, Calgary Faculty Association: "There is no requirement under the APT rules for a teaching dossier. In addition to the overall APT rules, each faculty establishes their own criteria (which can supplement but cannot change) the APT rules."
Carleton University		No	U/K**		FYI: Article 26: Teaching Evaluation – but no mention of teaching dossiers
Dalhousie University		No	U/K		FYI: Article 16.11: Promotion – similar to our collective agreement
McMaster University	Yes		Yes		www.mcmaster.ca/mufa/handbook/sps10.htm Section III of the Policy on the Encouragement of Teaching Excellence SPS 10
University of Manitoba		No	U/K		FYI: Article 20.A.1.2.2 Teaching – no mention of Dossier. CA = 2004 – 2007.
Memorial University	Yes		Yes		www.mun.ca/munfa/art12.htm Article 12.16 – Criteria for Promotion Collective Agreement: July 2003 – August 2005; undergoing negotiations currently for new agreement FYI – applies to Librarians as well
University of Ottawa	No		U/K		FYI: Article 23.24 – Formal Evaluation CA = 2001 –2004. Requested copy of new CA (2004-2008) not yet on website – no mention of teaching dossiers in the new settlement document although references are made to members providing all documentation they feel is relevant to their case in the promotion and tenure process.
Queen's University	Yes		Yes		www.qufa.ca/ca/ Article 29.2 – Member's Teaching Dossier Collective Agreement: May 2005 – April 2008
University of Regina		No	U/K		FYI: Article 17: Performance review (including assessment. For promotion – no mention of dossiers; 2005-08 CA
University of Saskatchewan		No	U/K		FYI: Article 16.0 and 16.61 Promotion; 2002-05 CA; 2 new 2 yr. Agreements ratified – reviewed newly ratified agreement on usaskfaculty.ca website – found no mention of teaching dossiers
University of Windsor		No	U/K		FYI: Article 13.11 Criteria – no mention of dossier CA = 2004 – 2008.
University of Victoria	Yes		Yes		www.uvic.ca/vpac/framework/framework.htm Article 13.1.2 a) – Definition and Assessment of Criteria (a). Teaching Effectiveness.
York University		No	Yes		www.yufa.org.docs.ca/T&P.htm/#B Article F.3.1.2. (a) iii – “the candidate may wish to prepare a Teaching Dossier for the use of referees....but it does not ordinarily become part of the tenure/promotion file”

*For example, Humanities at U of C requires a teaching dossier. (See <http://www.fp.ucalgary.ca/humanities/Word/Triennial%20Teaching%20Portfolio.doc>)

** Unknown

Appendix V Possible Contents of Teaching Dossier Excerpted from CAUT Teaching Dossier Guidelines

http://www.caut.ca/en/publications/teaching_dossier_en.pdf

1. Teaching responsibilities and practices (for example, list of courses, list of course materials prepared for students, steps taken to emphasize the interrelatedness and relevance of different types of learning)
2. Products of good teaching (for example, student scores on teacher-made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course is taken as evidence of learning; evidence of effective supervision of Honour's, Master's or Ph.D. theses; evidence of help given to colleagues on teaching improvement)
3. Evaluating and improving one's teaching (for example, instructional innovations attempted and evaluation of their effectiveness; conducting research on one's own teaching or course; participating in course curriculum development)
4. Contributions outside the classroom (for example, preparing textbooks or other instructional materials; editing or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one's subject)
5. Information from students (for example, student course and teaching evaluation data which suggests improvements or demonstrate effectiveness; evidence of student satisfaction including written comments from students)
6. Information from colleagues (for example, statements from colleagues who have observed teaching or who teach other sections of the same course)
7. Information from others (for example, honours received such as being nominated or named "teacher of the year"; invitations to teach from outside agencies)