**Teaching Summary**

The candidate and the unit are responsible for including sufficient information describing the candidate’s teaching performance in the tenure and promotion file. The teaching summary should be prepared by a senior faculty member or a committee of senior faculty members within the unit. The information in this summary should be based on clearly specified requirements given in the unit’s Tenure and Promotion Criteria. This summary must include the following:

1. A summary of the candidate’s peer and student evaluations, conducted throughout the faculty member’s tenure-track or tenured appointment at the university with particular emphasis placed on the teaching which occurred during the review period. At a minimum, the average of the student evaluation ratings on the question “Overall Instructor Performance” should be provided for each course taught during the review period.

2. Copies of peer evaluations conducted within the unit are to be included in the candidate’s primary file. In the case of joint appointments, peer evaluations from the secondary units must be included as well. Include peer evaluations at a minimum from each year of the candidate’s review period when the candidate has taught at least one course.

3. The summary should give context to student evaluations of the faculty member’s classroom teaching.

1. For example, if a statement is made that student evaluation ratings on “Overall Instructor Performance” for a course had been historically low, then evidence must be provided to support such a statement. Evidence may be in the form of the average, together with the standard deviation, of the average ratings on the “Overall Instructor Performance” of this course over the years or compared to other faculty members.
2. In a multi-section course the candidate’s student evaluation ratings should be compared with the student evaluation ratings of other faculty teaching other sections of the same course.
3. If appropriate, the student evaluation ratings of a candidate should be compared with ratings on the same or comparable courses of other faculty members over the years.
4. In such comparisons, a relatively low student evaluation rating for a candidate which could potentially be due to a relatively stricter grading standard or some other standard by the candidate compared to other faculty members should be noted or explained.

It is incumbent for the candidate and the unit to provide sufficient information for reviewers outside the unit to be able to review the candidate’s teaching performance fairly and effectively with respect to the unit criteria. If sufficient information is not given in the primary file for a fair and effective review, those reviewers may request additional information or remand the file to the unit.

4. To help reviewers of the candidate’s file in finding student evaluation ratings of the candidate it is strongly recommended that a table in the form given below be included in the primary file. At a minimum, this table should contain the candidate’s average rating on “Overall Instructor Performance” for each course taught during the review period, together with the average and standard deviation of the average ratings on “Overall Instructor Performance” for the same course or comparable courses in the unit during the same semester or over the years, whichever is deemed appropriate.

**Table: Summary of Student Teaching Evaluation Ratings**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Semester:** | **Year:** | **Course Number:** | **Title:** | **Information for the question: “Overall Instructor Performance”** | | | | | |
|  | | | **For the same or comparable courses in the unit:** | | |
| **Number of Students Responding:** | **Total Number of Students in Course:** | **Instructor’s Average Rating:** | **Number of Comparable Courses Used:** | **Average of the Average Ratings from the Comparable Courses:** | **Standard Deviation of the Average Ratings from the Comparable Courses:** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

It is important for the unit to provide sufficient information in the primary file to enable reviewers outside the unit to perform fair and effective review of the candidate’s teaching. If sufficient information or summary is not given, those reviewers may request additional information or remand the file to the unit.