

# Teaching & Learning Committee Reports

## Principles of Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Saskatchewan

Instructional Development Committee of Council  
*Approved by Council March 21, 2002*

### PART TWO :

**Appendix A Teaching Case File**

**Appendix B Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

**Appendix C Exemptions for Student Evaluation Processes**

### References

---

#### Appendix A - Teaching Case File

Consistent with the teacher-scholar model at the University of Saskatchewan, the minimum elements of the teaching case file should include:

1. An up-to-date curriculum vitae;
  2. A statement of teaching philosophy and an explanation of its application. The teaching philosophy should not be evaluated; it forms part of the record of a teacher's pedagogical development and may change over time. Writing a teaching philosophy is also an invaluable exercise in self-reflection and formative practice;
  3. A record of teaching roles (including time commitments and methods of delivery) in undergraduate and graduate courses, including
    - i. Teaching and/or supervision of students performing clinical work, undertaking practica or other types of field work;
    - ii. Advising and supervising graduate students;
  4. Student ratings/assessment of instruction;
  5. Other information from students (letters of support, correspondence submitted in confidence, etc.);
  6. Evaluations from peers;
  7. Assessments, explanations or interpretations by administrators or comments gathered from coordinators of multiple sections or multiple instructors or other instructors of the course;
  8. Additional supporting evidence of teaching accomplishment.
-

## **Appendix B - Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

Departments and colleges should develop criteria for peer evaluations. The criteria may include review of the classroom performance, quality of examinations, course outlines and course materials, syllabi, reading materials, reading lists, laboratory manuals, workbooks and classroom assignments. To evaluate classroom performance, peers should consider preparation, presentation, teaching methods, mode of delivery, student interest and engagement. All peer assessments shall culminate in a written assessment.

Under peer review, teachers and reviewers assume new responsibilities and take new roles. It is expected that colleagues that serve as peer reviewers be given recognition for their service in the same manner that reviewers of scholarship are given. For example, service as a peer assessor should be listed on curricula vitae. Departments and colleges should seek consensus about assessment standards for the peer evaluation process. Guidelines of expectations for the teacher being reviewed during the peer review process include:

1. Teachers choose materials that best convey their teaching strengths and their efforts at improvement; materials should be up-to-date, appropriate for the level of the course, and reflect current knowledge of the discipline and its scholarship;
2. Teachers reflect on their teaching activities and justify them to reviewers to reveal their assumptions and knowledge of relevant theory and practice;
3. Teachers defend the consistency between major elements of a course including stated goals for course activities; for example, do procedures for evaluation of students match course activity and reflect course goals?

Colleagues who serve as reviewers in the peer assessment process should be expected:

1. To discuss with the teacher under review what aspects can best be assessed;
2. Determine how much time and effort are to be devoted to reviewing each teacher including the review of materials and the time allotted for classroom visit(s);
3. Confront their own assumptions and practices about teaching and learning in light of their own experiences as reviewers.

If classroom visits are part of the process, the evaluation should include more than one observation. The teacher must be advised of the peer evaluation in advance. Information about the teacher's delivery, rapport, attentiveness and responsiveness to students should be included in the assessment of classroom teaching.

It is expected that peer evaluations will result in a written assessment forwarded to the Department Head or Dean. Peers are encouraged to provide formative and summative assessment to the teacher.

---

## Appendix C - Exemptions for Student Evaluation Processes

It is up to departments and colleges to consider and determine the frequency of evaluations for those who have achieved tenure or permanent or continuing status and for those who have been promoted to the highest rank at the University. However, it is recommended that all teachers be evaluated at least once every three years. Teachers under review for renewal, tenure or promotion and other collegial decisions shall have their teaching evaluated on an annual basis. Evaluations by students may include the following exemptions and exceptions:

1. A course with multiple teachers should use a modified student evaluation system that will include questions related to the entire course and a set of teacher-related questions for each teacher. Departments and colleges are encouraged to develop appropriate methods of assessment in these circumstances.
2. Courses with fewer than eight students should not use the same student evaluation instrument used in larger courses. Departments and colleges shall develop open-ended questionnaires to assess the quality of the course, possible improvements to the course, the quality of the instruction and ideas for improving the instruction of the course among other things. Student evaluation outcomes with fewer than five responses shall have the aggregate data suppressed to protect the anonymity of the students.
3. It is not appropriate to use the on campus in-class evaluation for other delivery modes including online learning, satellite distance education classes, correspondence courses, etc. Other evaluation instruments should be used to assess the quality of the course, the delivery style and the quality of the instruction in these circumstances. Units offering these types of alternative delivery should consult the Gwenna Moss Teaching and Learning Centre to consider other assessment processes.
4. Evaluation results that depart substantially from the norm for a particular teacher due to unusual circumstances (for example, extended serious illness, extended personal duress, etc.) may be removed from the teacher's file by the Department Head or Dean. Skewed results from an anomalous course or results based on new or alternative approaches to delivery may be removed from the instructor's record by the Department Head or Dean. Poor teaching results are not to be removed except in exceptional circumstances. Subsequent improvements should reflect favorably on the teacher's commitment and performance.
5. Courses taught by sessional lecturers shall be evaluated in accordance with the procedures of the CUPE 3287 Agreement. Sessional lecturers may opt to be evaluated using the regular student evaluation processes in the department or college as a vehicle to gather more data on their teaching effectiveness.

These are only a few examples of the exclusions that may be adopted by departments and colleges. The department head or dean may approve other exemptions.

---

## References

Barber, K. (Ed.) (1998). *The Canadian Oxford dictionary*. Don Mills, Ont. Oxford University Press.

Galbraith, P. (1997). *Student evaluation of instruction: Research implications and potential application*. Calgary, Alberta: The University of Calgary Students' Union.

Funk and Wagnalls (1963). *Standard college dictionary: Canadian edition*. Toronto: Longmans Canada.

Menges, R.J. (1999). Foreword to Nancy Van Note Chism. In N. Van Note Chism, *Peer review of teaching* (pp. ix-x). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Patton, M.Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (1996). *Ethical principles in university teaching*. North York, Ontario: York University Centre for the Support of Teaching.

Stanford University (1996). Subcommittee on the evaluation and improvement of teaching final report. Retrieved October 13, 2000 from the World Wide Web <http://portfolio.stanford.edu:80/105099>.

Tiberius, R., & Tipping, J. (1990). *Twelve principles of effective teaching and learning for which there is substantial empirical support*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto.

University of Alberta (1996). General faculties council policy manual, [section 111](#) teaching and learning, teaching and learning committee (TLC) and teaching evaluation. Retrieved October 6, 2000 from the World Wide Web

University of Calgary (1999). Universal student ratings of instruction: [Guide](#) to interpreting the USRI and sample report. Retrieved May 25, 2000 from the World Wide Web

University of Calgary (1999). Universal student ratings of instruction: [Report and recommendations](#). Retrieved May 25, 2000 from the World Wide Web

University of Saskatchewan (2000). [Collective agreement](#) between the University of Saskatchewan and the Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 3287 (sessional lecturers). Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan.

University of Saskatchewan (2000). [Collective agreement](#) between the University of Saskatchewan and the Professional Association of Internes and Residents for the period January 1, 1999 to December 31, 2001. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan.

University of Saskatchewan (1999). [Guidelines for academic conduct](#). Retrieved January 24, 2001 from the World Wide Web

University of Saskatchewan. (1998). A framework for planning at the University of Saskatchewan. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan.

University of Saskatchewan (1993). University of Saskatchewan [mission statement](#). Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan.

University of Saskatchewan (2000). 1998-2001 [collective agreement](#) between the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan.

University of Saskatchewan (2000). University of Saskatchewan [standards for promotion and tenure](#). Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan.

University of Saskatchewan (2002). [Teaching portfolios](#). Retrieved March 7, 2002 from the World Wide Web