

Documenting Teaching for Tenure and Promotion

Johanna Wandel

Geography and Environmental
Management, Faculty of Environment

Teaching-related elements of the ENV tenure package

- Candidate statement (max 3 pages)
- Teaching and advising summary
- Teaching evaluations
- Peer teaching evaluation
- Annual performance reviews
- “additional information as desired by candidate”

Candidate's Statement

The candidate should provide a short **(1-3 pages)** statement outlining his/her major strengths, contributions and accomplishments in the three areas of teaching, research and service. What has been the candidate's principal intellectual contribution? **It is important that the candidate include evidence of impact and effectiveness.** What is the candidate's career trajectory and overall research plan? This is especially important if the candidate switched research topics in mid-career. This section of the statement also provides an opportunity to identify any gaps in the record. Evidence of research impact may include references to citation indices, references to the candidate's work by leading researchers in the field, publications in leading journals, sole authorship, invitations to speak at major conferences, etc. Evidence of innovative design may include positive discussion of work in a journal review or related publication, awards, invitation to exhibit work, commentary by invited critics, invitation to serve on national juries, etc. The candidate may also provide evidence of significant contributions in the areas of curriculum development, administrative activities, and service to the public and academic communities.

- *I had 1560 words: 856 scholarship, 431 teaching, 269 service*

- Teaching and advising summary
 - List of courses taught, numbers, graduate student supervision
- Teaching evaluations
 - Quantitative summary of course, instructor and effectiveness
 - I didn't do this myself (admin assistant compiles)
- Peer teaching evaluation
 - My chair arranged for this (but I had to remind him)
- Annual performance reviews
 - Copies, provided by admin assistant
- “additional information as desired by candidate”
 - I included a letter from my Associate Dean UG commenting on success in one particular course

What the DTPC does with all this

- Qualitative assessment of all three categories: satisfactory, strong, very strong
- Need: “strong” in both teaching and scholarship and min. satisfactory on service *or* “very strong” in either teaching or scholarship and satisfactory in the other two categories
- ***For tenure decision, teaching does count as much as scholarship***

From the other side: what the DTPC really cared about

- External referees generally don't comment much on teaching (and don't have all the info)
- We looked for: enough breadth (high enrolment, core, graduate etc. mix) to evaluate; record of growing graduate supervision (potential red flags: no Masters student supervised to completion; students who withdrew)
- Peer teaching evaluation: a box to tick
- Student evaluations: taken in context of course
- Annual Performance: needed to see evidence that advice had been addressed ("encourage you to take on a PhD student"; "suggest CTE workshops")
- Supplementary information: unless there was a compelling need (i.e. potential to not be "good", we didn't read it)

What had the potential to lead to “very strong”

- Taught diverse array of courses, with >80% consistently scoring instructor in top two categories ; instructor scoring better than course in difficult (e.g. methods) courses
- Co-published with students (stress this!); consistent and growing graduate supervision
- LITE grants and other evidence of leadership on teaching
- External validation (letters from senior administrators, teaching awards...)
- (the best-written teaching portfolio in the world would not have led to “very strong” if the other elements weren’t strong)

Advice based on my experience as candidate and chair

- Get a copy of your Faculty's *Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Applicants* document (Chair or Assistant to the Dean)
- Talk to your Chair about expectations in your unit, including what is valued – the points below apply to my unit.
- Focus on evidence of strong teaching/efforts to improve teaching (e.g. TEA), but don't use anecdotal evidence from student comments
- Address potential red flags head on (the DTTC will come back to you if you don't in any case): grad students who failed to complete, no supervision to completion, low scores, only taught highly specialized upper year courses/graduate seminars, gentle or not-so-gentle "suggestions" on annual performance reviews
- If you've struggled, address what you've done to improve (workshop, overall positive trajectory...)
- If your faculty does peer teaching evaluations, bug your chair early – and if it's not good, have another done
- Use renewal as a chance to do a draft of your statement
- Ask senior colleagues to read and comment on your candidate statement before submission