



FOR RECOMMENDATION

PUBLIC

OPEN SESSION

TO: UTSC Academic Affairs Committee

SPONSOR: William Gough, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean
CONTACT INFO: 416-208-7027, vpdean@utsc.utoronto.ca

PRESENTER: Clare Hasenkampf, Associate Dean, Teaching & Learning
CONTACT INFO: 416-287-7680, hasenkampf@utsc.utoronto.ca

DATE: February 7, 2018 for February 13, 2018

AGENDA ITEM: 2

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Revised Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

University of Toronto Scarborough Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) “is concerned with matters affecting the teaching, learning and research functions of the Campus” (*AAC Terms of Reference, Section 4*). Under section 5.5 of its terms of reference, the Committee recommends for approval to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: “Revised divisional guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching and/or Creative Professional Activity.”

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. **UTSC Academic Affairs Committee [For recommendation] (February 13, 2018)**
2. **UT Committee on Academic Policy and Programs [For approval] (February 27, 2018)**

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

No previous action in governance has been taken on this item.

HIGHLIGHTS:

The *University of Toronto Scarborough Guidelines: Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness for Decisions Concerning Tenure, Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Promotion to Full Professor* came into effect on July 1 2004 following approval by UTSC College Council and the Academic Board of the University of Toronto. These guidelines were drafted in response to P&D memo #20 (2003), which stated that: “each division is expected to develop its own teaching effectiveness guidelines and review them on a regular basis.” As part of the cycle of review, the guidelines were revised in 2012 following broad consultation with faculty and academic administrators at UTSC. The *2012 Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching in Tenure and Promotions Decisions* superseded the 2004 guidelines following approval by UTSC College council and Academic Board.

The attached, newly revised Divisional Guidelines for UTSC (2018) are part of a University-wide initiative to bring divisional teaching evaluation guidelines into line with recent changes to the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* [PPAA] and the approval of the new *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream* [PPPTS]. The Special Joint Advisory Committee negotiations in December 2014 between the University of Toronto administration and the University of Toronto Faculty Association resulted in agreement on a series of changes in principle with respect to teaching stream faculty (Approved February 26, 2015). Revisions to the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* [PPAA] were approved in June 2015 by Governing Council. These included a number of changes including the introduction of professorial ranks and titles for faculty in the teaching stream.

The new PPPTS (approved December 16, 2016) specifies that the promotion from Associate Professor, Teaching Stream to Professor, Teaching Stream “shall be based on excellent teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years.” In order to be implemented, the new policy relies on divisional teaching evaluation guidelines. As outlined in PDAD&C memo #134 (Revised 2004-05), the University's "Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions" provides the framework for the development of divisional guidelines for the evaluation of teaching, and the “approved divisional guidelines have the force of policy.” Divisional guidelines:

- Explain what evidence will be gathered to assess the candidate’s teaching;
- Specify what a teaching dossier should contain;
- Clarify what constitutes excellent teaching in the divisional context; and
- Describe the standards / expectations against which external referees should be evaluated.

The revisions being made to divisional teaching evaluation guidelines by all divisions at this time include changes to bring them in line with policy, and reflect changes to the existing PPAA including:

- New professorial rank for the teaching stream;
- Introduction of mandatory probationary review;

*UTSC Academic Affairs Committee- Revised Guidelines for the
Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching*

- Change in terminology where teaching stream faculty now come forward for “continuing status review” rather than “promotion”;
- New language clarifying the criteria for continuing status;
- New language clarifying the scope of what is included under scholarship; and
- The continuing status dossier must include “Written specialist assessments of the candidate's teaching and pedagogical/professional activities from outside the University.”

The attached, newly revised *Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness in Teaching* for UTSC establish the norms and expectations for teaching at UTSC, describe how teaching effectiveness is to be evaluated at the University of Toronto Scarborough, specify what documentation should be collected to support that assessment and the nature of the parties engaged in assessment, and refer to procedural matters related to these assessments.

These new Divisional *Guidelines* significantly expand on the 2012 *Guidelines*, with material that focuses on the context, criteria and materials to be provided for assessment of Teaching, organized into two separate sections; one for faculty in the Tenure Stream and one for faculty in the Teaching Stream at UTSC. This separation allows clear and accurate reference to the policy related to teaching assessment and the context for teaching assessment in each stream. The *Guidelines* are designed to make the materials, criteria, and process clear for academic administrators running reviews, candidates preparing for reviews, and evaluators considering material provided as part of a review. The ways of demonstrating teaching effectiveness are elaborated, with an emphasis on the expectation that the criteria could be demonstrated in a variety of ways, and that these are expected to vary with discipline and approach. In addition, guidance is provided to emphasize the importance of a complete CV that includes a range of different records of activities or accomplishments that can satisfy the criteria. Finally, the new *Guidelines* include a section aimed at evaluators that emphasizes the importance of using all the materials made available to them to develop a cohesive impression of the teaching accomplishments and practice of the individual being evaluated.

The process by which these Divisional *Guidelines* were revised was highly consultative. The revision team consisted of Vice Dean Faculty Affairs & Equity, Associate Dean Teaching & Learning and Director of the Centre for Teaching and Learning, and the Assistant Dean Academic. An initial draft was circulated for input and comment first to the UTSC Chairs & Directors group, then in March 2017 to all faculty. This was followed by four presentations of the draft and discussion sessions open to all faculty in March and April 2017. All senior Associate Professors, Teaching Stream were invited to a separate discussion. Additional revisions were made based on these consultations and following input from the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life (VPFAL). A draft of the *Guidelines* attached here were again circulated to all faculty in December 2017 after presentation to the Chairs & Directors at UTSC. Comments from the VPFAL were integrated. Email commentaries from faculty were accepted, and additional sessions, open to all faculty, were held for feedback in January 2018 before finalizing the version of the *Guidelines* attached here.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no net financial implications to the campus operating budget.

RECOMMENDATION:

Be It Recommended to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs,

THAT the revised UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of the Effectiveness of Teaching, as described in the proposal dated February 13, 2018, recommended by the Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, Professor William Gough, be approved.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

1. UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of the Effectiveness of Teaching, dated February 13, 2018.
2. Previous guidelines, dated 2012-13 (to be replaced by these new guidelines under consideration).



GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING

February 13, 2018

Contents

Preamble	4
A. Tenure Stream.....	5
I. Context for Assessing Teaching Performance: Tenure Stream	5
A. Interim Review.....	5
B. Tenure Review	5
C. Promotion to Professor	6
II. Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance: Tenure Stream.....	6
A. Competence in Teaching: Tenure Stream.....	6
B. Excellence in Teaching: Tenure Stream	7
III. Elements of Assessment: Tenure Stream	8
A. Materials Provided by the Candidate:.....	9
B. Materials Collected by the Academic Unit Head.....	11
IV. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE’S TEACHING	13
A. Teaching Evaluation Committee: Tenure Stream	13
B. External Reviewers: Promotion to Professor based on Excellent Teaching Alone	13
C. Triangulating Multiple Sources of Information	13
V. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: Tenure Stream.....	14
B. Teaching Stream.....	15
VI. Context for Assessing Teaching Performance: Teaching Stream	15
A. Probationary Review.....	15
B. Continuing Status Review.....	15
C. Review for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream.....	16
VII. Criteria for Assessing Performance: Teaching Stream	17
A. Excellence in Teaching/ Excellent Teaching	17
B. Pedagogical/Professional Development: Teaching Stream.....	19
C. Additional Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor, Teaching Stream.....	19
VIII. Elements of Assessment: Teaching stream.....	19
A. Materials Provided by the Candidate:.....	20
B. Materials Collected by the Unit Head	22
IX. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE’S TEACHING	24
A. Teaching Evaluation Committee: Teaching Stream	24

B. External Reviewers: Teaching Stream 25

C. Triangulating Multiple Sources of Information 25

X. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: Teaching Stream 25

Preamble

At the University of Toronto, it is recognized that “excellence flourishes in an environment that embraces the broadest range of people, that helps them to achieve their full potential,” and “that facilitates the free expression of their diverse perspectives through respectful discourse”.¹ Central to our function as a University is a commitment to Excellence in Teaching and Research. Recognizing Excellence in Teaching and providing opportunities to improve teaching are commitments that support the global objectives of the University². Effective teaching strives to provide to all students not only knowledge of facts but also the skills to analyze, to assess critically, to develop creative expression, to understand in context, to present arguments in a clear and compelling fashion, to solve problems, and to generate new knowledge. As well, effective teaching promotes development of empathy and multicultural sensitivity, the pursuit of learning as a life-long endeavor, and a commitment to responsible citizenship to succeed in, and enhance, a diverse, global society.

It is critical that units undertaking reviews of Teaching Effectiveness adhere to the appropriate University of Toronto policies throughout the process. These include the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments, Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions, and Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream*. In addition, the *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions*³ provide some guidance regarding the values and norms set out in policy. They also describe the overarching standards for teaching across the University. Throughout this UTSC document, explanations draw heavily on, or use the language of, the University policy documents that govern career reviews.⁴ Policy documents are explicitly cited only where direct reference may be helpful, but it should be understood that they are interwoven throughout this document. Unit heads should refer to the cited documents directly for details and should provide these documents to the Candidate for reference.

The *UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching* (i.e. Divisional guidelines) establish the norms and expectations for teaching at UTSC, describe how teaching effectiveness is to be evaluated at the University of Toronto Scarborough and specifies what documentation should be collected to support that assessment. These Divisional guidelines apply to the evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for faculty in the Tenure Stream (Section A) and Teaching Stream (Section B) at the University of Toronto Scarborough. Guidelines for each stream are provided in separate sections for clarity.

¹ See the University of Toronto’s Statement on Equity, Diversity, and Excellence

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppdec142006.pdf>

² See the University of Toronto’s Statement of Institutional Purpose

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/mission.pdf>

³ *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions*:

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppmay142003.pdf>

⁴ Policy & Procedures on Academic Appointments, 2015

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppoct302003.pdf>, Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppapr201980.pdf>; Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream 2016: <http://www.governingcouncil.lamp4.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/p0105-papfip-2016-2017pol.pdf>

A. Tenure Stream

I. Context for Assessing Teaching Performance: Tenure Stream

Faculty members in the Tenure Stream are engaged in a University career of research and teaching. Assessment of performance in the Tenure Stream thus includes assessment of teaching effectiveness. A Tenure Stream faculty member demonstrates capabilities as a teacher in direct and indirect contexts including: lectures, seminars, laboratories, tutorials and online learning materials; less formal teaching situations such as academic skills coaching and advising students; through involvement in curriculum development or academic support for co-curricular programming; or in supporting or developing opportunities for student learning or research outside the classroom and directly supervising the research of undergraduate and graduate students. For Tenure Stream faculty, assessment of teaching performance occurs during PTR, interim reviews, tenure reviews and reviews for promotion to Professor.

A. Interim Review

As specified in University policy⁵ the interim review Committee considers two questions:

- a) Has the appointee's performance been sufficiently satisfactory for a second probationary appointment to be recommended?
- b) If reappointment is recommended, what counselling should be given to the appointee to assist them in improving areas of weakness and maintaining areas of strength?"

Candidates for interim review should consult with the head of their Unit concerning the materials expected to support the review of their teaching performance, as practices may vary among disciplines. Although the interim review is different in scope and purpose from the tenure review, candidates who submit CVs and Teaching Portfolios modelled on that recommended below for the tenure review process may receive valuable feedback on the quality of their documentation of their teaching effectiveness.

B. Tenure Review

For tenure stream faculty, The Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (PPAA 2015)⁶ outlines the criteria relative to tenure. Tenured appointments should be granted on the basis of three essential criteria⁷:

- a) achievement in research and creative professional work
- b) effectiveness in teaching, and
- c) clear promise of future intellectual and professional development

In addition to clear demonstration of future intellectual and professional development, a positive recommendation for tenure **requires** the judgement of demonstrated excellence in one of research (including equivalent creative or professional work) and teaching, and clearly established competence in the other.⁸ A successful tenure review will normally also involve promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

⁶ [PPAA 2015](#) p. 5, Section II.8

⁷ [PPAA 2015](#), p. 8, Section III

⁸ [PPAA](#), p. 9, Section III.13.d

For tenure reviews, teaching is assessed relative to competence or excellence as set out in the PPAA. This and other relevant University policies (see Preamble) must be used in conjunction with these UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching for the purposes of assessing teaching for tenure review. Candidates should consult University policy and Section III of these Guidelines for guidance on the materials they should provide for assessment (CV and Teaching Portfolio).

C. Promotion to Professor

The University's *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions* (PPP) states, "The successful candidate for promotion will be expected to have established a wide reputation in [their] field of interest, to be deeply engaged in scholarly work, and to have shown [themselves] to be an effective teacher".⁹

For Tenure-Stream faculty, promotion is normally granted on the basis of excellent scholarship and effective teaching, but the PPP also specifies that "...either excellent teaching alone or excellent scholarship alone, sustained over many years, could also in itself justify eventual promotion to the rank of Professor."⁹

The PPP must be used in conjunction with these UTSC guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching for the purposes of the promotion review. Candidates should consult the PPP and Section III of these Guidelines for guidance on the materials they should provide for assessment (CV and Teaching Portfolio).

II. Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance: Tenure Stream

A. Competence in Teaching: Tenure Stream

Competence in teaching is the minimal requirement to demonstrate effective teaching. An effective teacher must demonstrate that they meet all of the following requirements:

1. stimulate and challenge students, and promote their intellectual and scholarly or creative development;
2. communicate effectively;
3. develop students' mastery of a subject, including the latest developments in the subject area;
4. develop students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject;
5. create opportunities that involve students in the research process, creative activities, or technical practices of the discipline
6. create and maintain supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth, and academic progress. In the case of graduate students, faculty must ensure their practices in this regard are consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*;¹⁰
7. deal with students fairly and ethically, taking care to make themselves accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation, to maintain teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances, to inform students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructions and to comply with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of their students;¹¹

⁹ PPP, Section 7

¹⁰ *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*: <https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf>

¹¹ Section 2(a) of Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Faculty Association: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf>

8. promote academic integrity;
9. implement fair and transparent grading practices, with clear connections between course learning outcomes, assignments and assessments.

B. Excellence in Teaching: Tenure Stream

The expectations for excellence in teaching build on and significantly exceed the standard of competence. To meet the standard of **Excellence in Teaching**, a Tenure Stream faculty member is expected to demonstrate a high level of achievement in **all** of the Criteria for Competence in Teaching (A.II.A. 1-9, above) and demonstrate excellence ***in some combination*** of the following elements:

1. Superlative teaching skills

This may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including some combination of the following:

- a. exemplary in-class or on-line teaching
- b. rigorous use of evidence-informed approaches to improve course or curriculum design or to motivate student learning
- c. use of scholarly or professional expertise to augment student understanding
- d. winning, or being nominated for, teaching awards or other significant recognitions of accomplishments in teaching, or in course or curriculum design
- e. evidence of significant, sustained, positive effects on student understanding or application of knowledge in contexts outside the classroom
- f. evidence of sustained, positive effects on student empathy, multi-cultural sensitivity and sense of responsible citizenship.

2. Pedagogical/ Professional Development supporting a critically reflective teaching practice.

This may be demonstrated in in a variety of ways, including some combination of the following:

- a. incorporating best practices from the pedagogical literature in teaching practice
- b. regular participation in workshops and/or conferences concerned with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

3. Creative educational leadership and/or achievement

This may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including some combination of the following:

- a. significant participation in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning or pedagogical scholarship, which might include publications on pedagogical research, or publication of scholarly textbooks or online tools and resources adapted for use by others in their courses
- b. significant engagement in activities such as mentoring, and presenting seminars or workshops on pedagogical practice that have demonstrable impact on others' teaching
- c. significant engagement in creative, technical, or community-based practices related to the subject of pedagogical expertise, with clear links between these practices and learning opportunities for students in programs, curriculum, classroom teaching, co-curricular or integrated learning opportunities
- d. development of new courses using high impact teaching practices, improved curricula, or design of new programs approved by University governance
- e. significant engagement in professional teaching and learning organizations/associations or teaching centres, which may include serving in leadership roles in such organizations, or

- serving as a regular reviewer or referee for pedagogical conferences or journals, or serving as an editor for pedagogical journals or conference proceedings.
- f. significant participation in initiatives that lead to changes in policy related to teaching as a profession
 - g. successful innovations in the teaching domain; for example, the creation of novel or progressive teaching processes, materials, forms of evaluation, or influencing pedagogical changes in the discipline
 - h. development of effective and creative ways to promote students' involvement in the research process and to provide opportunities for them to learn, for example, through discovery-based or other appropriate methods.
 - i. significant contribution to the technological enrichment of teaching in a given area, for example, through the development of effective, new technology or the use of new media to fullest advantage

The preceding three sections (II.B.1-3) represent an overview of ways in which Excellence in Teaching may be demonstrated. It is understood that the nature of the contributions in each area will depend on the discipline, and that teaching accomplishments can be demonstrated in a variety of ways. This overview is not intended to be a comprehensive list, but rather is intended to make clear the types of evidence and standard of achievement that may be presented to support a judgement of excellence in teaching.

III. Elements of Assessment: Tenure Stream

Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness requires review by the Tenure or Promotion Committee of materials provided by the candidate and materials collected or solicited by the Academic Unit head. These consist of the following items:

Materials provided by the candidate and added to the Teaching Dossier (Section III.A, below)

- a *Curriculum Vitae* (Item 1),
- a Teaching Portfolio (Item 2)

Materials collected by the Academic Unit Head and added to the Teaching Dossier (Section III.B, below):

- Students' Course Evaluations (Item 3)

Confidential materials solicited by the Academic Unit Head (Section III.B, below):

- Teaching Observation Report (Item 4), which is added to the Teaching Dossier
- Letters from students (Items 5a-c), which are added to the Teaching Dossier as well as the Tenure or Promotion Dossier
- Letters from Departmental colleagues (Item 5d), which are added to the Tenure or Promotion Dossier

Confidential, independent evaluations of teaching effectiveness solicited by the Academic Unit Head and added to the Tenure or Promotion Dossier (see Section IV):

- Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee (where relevant, Section IV.A)
- Letters from External Referees (for Promotion to Professor based on excellent teaching alone, Section IV.B)

A. Materials Provided by the Candidate:

1. Curriculum Vitae

The candidate must provide a *curriculum vitae* in a standard format. The candidate is advised to include all of the following that are applicable to their discipline:

- a. A list of titles of all courses (undergraduate and graduate) taught for at least the preceding five years and whether the candidate has had major responsibility for course design.
- b. A list of: graduate students for whom the candidate has been the principal supervisor at either the masters or doctoral levels; graduate students for whom the candidate has provided either co- or secondary supervision should also be included. Thesis or research titles and dates of supervision/degree conferral should be included.
- c. A list of undergraduate students whose research work has been supervised, together with their project or thesis topics and the dates of the period of supervision.
- d. A list of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative professional work. This should include any books (or textbooks), chapters in books (or textbooks), research papers, articles, and reviews, including work published, in press, submitted for publication, completed but not yet published, and in progress. It should also include scholarly or creative professional work such as the presentation of papers at meetings and symposia, original artistic design, or distinguished contributions to the arts or in professional areas.
- e. A list of creative professional activities (if relevant) that demonstrate one or more of the following: professional innovation; creative excellence; exemplary professional practice; contributions to the development of the profession/discipline.
- f. A list of administrative positions held within the University, major committees and organizations in which the candidate has served within or outside the University, and participation in learned societies and professional associations that relate to the candidate's academic discipline and pedagogical or professional activities or educational leadership. The list should indicate in each case the period of service and the nature of the candidate's participation.
- g. Other information relevant to the candidate's accomplishments or the impact of their teaching should also be included as appropriate. For example, this could include a list of invitations to speak in teaching symposia or to edit textbooks (whether accepted or not), or other indicators of achievement related to the criteria outlined in Section A.II.
- h. Other information relevant to the candidate's accomplishments and career progression should also be included as appropriate. For example, the CV could include brief information on any career delays due to University-approved leaves (nature of the leave, dates, impact on productivity).

2. Teaching Portfolio

Each faculty member should maintain a Teaching Portfolio that is updated annually.¹² Faculty are advised to seek feedback on the development of their Teaching Portfolio from colleagues, the Academic Unit head, UTSC's Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the tri-campus Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI)¹³ as appropriate. The types of elements typically provided in a Teaching Portfolio are outlined below. This list is not intended to be exhaustive; other types of evidence may be added by the candidate to support their demonstration of effective teaching, or may be required by different disciplines (candidates should consult with their Unit head about other requirements).

¹² See: [Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions](#)

¹³ CTSI web site: <http://teaching.utoronto.ca/>

The Teaching Portfolio would normally include the following items,¹⁴ although it is understood that there may be some variation based on discipline and teaching practice:

- a. A statement of the faculty member's teaching philosophy and goals and an accompanying narrative that contextualizes the other components of the portfolio and demonstrates how these components align both with their own philosophy and goals, and with the criteria specified in the *UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching*.
- b. Documents that reflect progress, success, experimentation and innovation (such as course syllabi, sample tests, classroom activities) or pedagogical development (such as documentation of participation in workshops).
- c. Representative undergraduate and graduate course syllabi, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, co-curricular learning activities, teaching assessment activities, and evidence of student learning.
- d. New course or program proposals, and plans for co-curricular learning.
- e. Efforts to provide experiential or work integrated learning opportunities and a list of students and the type of experience provided; for undergraduate research supervised this should be an overview that refers to, summarizes or augments the detailed list in the CV.
- f. Commentary on the official student evaluations, or other student feedback received by the candidate, as appropriate.
- g. Evidence that will enable the committee to assess the candidate's success in graduate supervision; this overview should summarize and augment information provided in the list of graduate supervision provided in the CV, including:
 - a. number of students supervised and graduated
 - b. indicators of the quality of graduate students' research
 - c. indicators of the quality of theses produced, where possible
 - d. information on other efforts to foster scholarly, creative and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers or records of students' conference presentations, especially those papers or abstracts that have been published.
- h. Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents, including information on whether the application is pending or was successful.
- i. Documentation of efforts made (through both formal and informal means) to improve teaching skills or course design, and commentary on the outcomes of these efforts.
- j. Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence or teaching leadership.
- k. Documentation concerning innovations in teaching methods and contributions to curricular development, and the use and development of technology in the teaching process.
- l. Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in pedagogical design and documentation of effects of these efforts (where possible).
- m. Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching, such as presentations at workshops, pedagogical conferences, or discipline based conferences on teaching, or publications on teaching.
- n. Evidence of professional contributions to academic teaching organizations/societies or centres, or leadership in such organizations, such as refereeing teaching grant applications, pedagogical publications, or symposium contributions, acting as an editor for pedagogical publications, or organizing symposia or conferences dedicated to the Scholarship of teaching and learning.
- o. Service to other professional bodies or community organizations through teaching activities at a level comparable to university instruction.

¹⁴ Additional advice on assembling a Teaching Portfolio can be found at <http://teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching-support/documenting-teaching/teaching-dossier/>.

B. Materials Collected by the Academic Unit Head

3. Student Course Evaluations

The following documents are added to the Teaching Dossier:

- a. A comprehensive summary of the candidate's course evaluations and an analysis that helps put these results into context. Typically, this would be provided by the Centre for Teaching and Learning upon request, using the standardized analysis provided by the course evaluation system.

For tenure reviews this would typically summarize all course evaluations; for promotion to Professor this would normally include summaries of at least the previous ten years of evaluations, or all evaluations since the date of hire (if ten years of evaluations are not available). These summaries should also include data on class size and response rates.

- b. Copies of the individual teaching evaluations for at least the most recent five-year period.
- c. Copies of course evaluations from any other unit at the University of Toronto for which the candidate has taught (where relevant). Where a candidate has taught at another university within the last five years, course evaluation information from that institution should be obtained, if possible, along with normative information.

Where the amount of teaching the candidate has done at either the undergraduate or graduate level varies from the norms of the department, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained by the Academic Unit head or other suitable representative of the candidate's unit. This explanation should be included in the Teaching Dossier.

4. A Teaching Observation Report

One Teaching Observation Report will normally be completed and added to the confidential materials in the Teaching Dossier. For courses delivered traditionally, the Teaching Observation Report would normally be based on live, class visit(s) by at least two colleagues to allow observation of both teacher and student interactions. Under exceptional circumstances videotapes of lectures might be permissible, but these would ideally include student interactions. For online courses, appropriate modules should be identified and assessed.

The Teaching Observation Report may be completed by the Teaching Evaluation Committee, or by at least two other Tenured or Continuing-Status faculty commissioned by the Academic Unit head, with the condition that the teaching observation cannot be conducted by any members of the Tenure or Promotion committee.

The Teaching Observation Report must be based on at least one class visit, ideally completed within the year of the Tenure or Promotion Review. Unit heads are advised to anticipate necessary exceptions to the 12 month period that might occur (for example, if a leave occurs just prior to or during the year of assessment), and to plan for early teaching visits where needed.

Some academic units, or the candidate, may suggest more than one class visit to allow observation of courses at different levels, or classes that feature different pedagogical approaches. A single Teaching Observation Report should be drafted based on these visits.

Classroom visits must be arranged in consultation with the candidate in order to find an appropriate date for the visit and so the candidate can provide contextual material for the visitors, if desired. If the candidate refuses a visit, this should be noted in the Unit Head's Report. Other guidelines for best practices on classroom visits are available through CTL and CTSI.

5. Written Opinions of Departmental Colleagues and Students

The Unit head will solicit written opinions from a variety of individuals who have direct experience with the candidate's teaching practice, including students. In soliciting these letters, it is advisable that the Unit head makes it clear that responses are voluntary and that they will be held in confidence. These documents will form part of the Tenure or Promotions Dossier.

a. The Unit head will solicit letters from **current and former Undergraduate students** taught by the candidate. The students should be invited to comment on the candidate's success in:

- i. stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development;
- ii. developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field;
- iii. encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning or other appropriate methods;
- iv. creating opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process;
- v. creating a lasting impact on students' appreciation of the subject or on their career path.

In addition, students should be asked to comment on the candidate's communication skills, active engagement with student's learning progress and accessibility to students. These requests will invite substantive comments rather than numerical rankings and should be signed or clearly indicate the respondent.

Normally, for tenure review, a random sample of approximately 100 of the candidate's current or former students should be solicited for opinions.

For promotion to Professor based on Excellent Teaching alone, comments from a random sample of no fewer than 200 of the candidate's current and former students, distributed across the candidate's normal pattern of teaching should be solicited for opinions.

All student responses are confidential and should be sent directly to the Unit head. Students may be contacted by letter or email, provided the process is random or comprehensive (at the Unit head's discretion), and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate. (The Registrar's Office provides student addresses for this purpose.).

b. The Unit head will solicit letters from **current and former Graduate students** supervised or co-supervised by the candidate. The students should be invited to comment on:

- i. the opportunities created by the candidate to involve students in research;
- ii. whether the supervisory conditions fostered by the candidate were conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies' *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*;
- iii. the quality of supervision provided by the candidate.

c. The Unit head will solicit letters from **Teaching Assistants** (if applicable) who should be invited to comment on the candidate's mentoring, management, organization and communications skills.

d. The Unit head will solicit letters from **peers** who are in a position to comment on the candidate's teaching. Where cross-appointment is involved, letters from peers in other departments and divisions may be solicited. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching effectiveness of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues who co-taught those courses and the roles of each co-teacher should be explicitly considered.

IV. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S TEACHING

The material that follows should be read in conjunction with the relevant Policies and directions in the Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual, and the appropriate UTSC Guidelines.

A. Teaching Evaluation Committee: Tenure Stream

1. For all tenure reviews and promotion reviews, the Unit head must establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee to prepare a written assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness which will be included in the Tenure or Promotion Dossier. The Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should be a single report critically assessing Teaching effectiveness using the Teaching Dossier (Section III.A.1 & 2; III.B.3 & 4), including confidential letters from students (Section III.B.5a-c). The report should indicate whether and how the candidate meets the applicable standards, but should not make a recommendation for or against the tenure or promotion. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should **not** be provided with letters from External Reviewers (where such reports have been solicited) nor from Departmental colleagues (Section III.B.5d).
2. The Teaching Observation Report must be included in the materials considered by the Teaching Evaluation Committee. The written evaluation of teaching effectiveness by the Teaching Evaluation Committee may refer to the Teaching Observation Report, but these must be two separate documents.

B. External Reviewers: Promotion to Professor based on Excellent Teaching Alone

For promotion to Professor based on sustained **Excellent Teaching** alone, the Unit head would normally solicit letters from External Referees in relevant disciplines who are in a position to evaluate the teaching accomplishments of the candidate. External referees should each be asked to provide an independent evaluation of the **Teaching Dossier** (Section III.A.1&2 and III.B.3), and to explicitly address whether and how the candidate meets the standard of Excellence in Teaching as laid out in these guidelines (Section A.II). These evaluations would be added to the confidential Promotion Dossier.

C. Triangulating Multiple Sources of Information

1. The material that relates to a candidate's teaching collected during this process contains perspectives on the candidate's teaching practice and effectiveness presented by the candidate and collected by the Unit head (see Section B.III above).

2. Evaluators are tasked with using all the materials made available to them to develop a concordant and integrated understanding of the candidate's teaching effectiveness as it relates to the assessment of teaching effectiveness outlined in these guidelines and in the policies of the University.

V. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: Tenure Stream

Unit heads must consult the relevant policies, appropriate sections of the *Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual*, and the relevant UTSC Procedural Guidelines for detailed instructions on procedures and timelines required for notifications, committee memberships, number of external reviewers, the review process, and other important aspects of procedure associated with these processes. In the case of any inconsistency between these guidelines and the applicable University policy, the applicable University policy will govern.

B. Teaching Stream

VI. Context for Assessing Teaching Performance: Teaching Stream

Faculty members in the Teaching Stream are engaged in a career that combines high levels of expertise in their field with a focus on excellence in teaching. In addition to the development of their own courses, Teaching Stream faculty may enrich teaching and learning in their Units, Division and across the University through their contributions to curriculum and program design, through sharing their pedagogical expertise with their colleagues, by demonstrating and leading teaching innovation, and through their commitment to evidence-based practices that support student learning. The Teaching Stream appointment indicates the importance of these contributions to the high standards of the University, and provides the framework through which a scholarly approach to teaching excellence and innovation is mandated, supported, and recognized¹⁵ (Policy & Procedures on Academic Appointment, [PPAA] 2015, p. 18, also see Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream).

Assessment of teaching effectiveness occurs during PTR, Probationary reviews, Continuing Status reviews and reviews for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream.

A. Probationary Review

As specified in University policy¹⁶ the probationary review committee considers two questions regarding a faculty member in the Teaching Stream:

- a) “Has the appointee's performance been sufficiently satisfactory for a second probationary appointment to be recommended?”
- b) If reappointment is recommended, what counselling should be given to the appointee to assist them in improving areas of weakness and maintaining areas of strength?”

Candidates for probationary review should consult with the head of their Unit concerning the materials expected to support the review of their teaching performance, as practices may vary among disciplines. Although the probationary review is different in scope and purpose from the continuing status review, candidates who submit teaching portfolios and CVs modelled on that recommended below for the continuing status review process may receive valuable feedback on the quality of their documentation of their teaching effectiveness.

B. Continuing Status Review

For faculty in the teaching stream the PPAA 2015¹⁷ outlines how performance is assessed in general terms:

Performance will be assessed on teaching effectiveness and pedagogical/ professional development related to teaching duties in accordance with approved divisional guidelines on the assessment of teaching.

The specific criteria to be met for a positive recommendation for continuing status are:¹⁸

1. excellence in teaching *and*

¹⁵ [PPAA 2015; Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

¹⁶ [PPAA 2015](#) p. 20, Section VII.30.vii

¹⁷ [PPAA 2015, Section VII.30.vj; Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

¹⁸ [PPAA 2015, Section VII.30.x; Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

2. evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.

*Administrative service will be considered, where such service is related to teaching or to curricular and professional development.*¹⁹

Relevant administrative service can include the co-ordination of undergraduate or graduate programs, administration of large undergraduate courses, and student advising and/or mentoring.

The Policy also outlines, in general terms, how the specific criteria for continuing status may be demonstrated:

- a) *“Excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through a combination of excellent teaching skills, creative educational leadership and/or achievement, and innovative teaching initiatives in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines.”*
- b) *“Evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development may be demonstrated in a variety of ways e.g. discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches; participation at, and contributions to, academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent; teaching-related activity by the faculty member outside of his or her classroom functions and responsibilities; professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines”*

A successful continuing status review will normally also involve promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream to the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream.

The relevant University policy (see above) must be used in conjunction with these UTSC guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching for the purposes of assessing excellence in teaching for the continuing status review. Candidates should consult the University policy and the guidelines below for the materials that should be included in their Teaching Portfolio (Section B.VIII).

C. Review for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

For faculty in the teaching stream, promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream requires a judgment of

- a) excellent teaching,
- b) creative educational leadership and/or achievement, and
- c) ongoing pedagogical/professional development,

where these must be sustained over many years.²⁰

Administrative or other service to the University and related activities will be taken into account in assessing candidates for promotion, but promotion will not be based primarily on such service.²¹

Review for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream must occur in accordance with the University Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream (PPPTS,2016),²² used in conjunction with these UTSC guidelines.

¹⁹ [PPAA 2015, Section VII.30.vi](#)

²⁰ [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#) , part six.

²¹ [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream, part 10](#)

²² [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

VII. Criteria for Assessing Performance: Teaching Stream

A. Excellence in Teaching/ Excellent Teaching

Teaching includes:

- conventional teaching activities (lectures, seminars, laboratories, tutorials) and online learning that result directly in improved learning outcomes for students;
- activities that indirectly support student learning through the acquisition of practical skills, competencies and learning opportunities outside the classroom through creative activities, community-based or work-integrated learning opportunities, co-curricular activities, or research-intensive experiences;

Faculty in the teaching Stream are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching. In order to do so they must demonstrate the fundamental elements of effective teaching, plus go significantly beyond this.

An effective teacher must demonstrate that they meet all of the following requirements:

- i. stimulate and challenge students, and promote their intellectual and scholarly or creative development;
- ii. communicate effectively;
- iii. develop students' mastery of a subject, including the latest developments in the subject area;
- iv. develop students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject;
- v. create opportunities that involve students in the research process, creative activities, or technical practices of the discipline, where applicable.
- vi. deal with students fairly and ethically, taking care to make themselves accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation, to maintain teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances, to inform students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructions and to comply with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of their students;²³
- vii. promote academic integrity;
- viii. implement fair and transparent grading practices, with clear connections between course learning outcomes, assignments and assessments.
- ix. where applicable, create and maintain supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth, and academic progress²⁴. In the case of graduate students²⁵, faculty must ensure their practices in this regard are consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*;²⁶

Beyond these fundamental qualities, a judgement of **Excellence in Teaching** requires the candidate demonstrate a combination of: (1) Excellent teaching skills, and (2) Creative educational leadership and/or achievement, and Innovative Teaching Initiatives. The following section represents an overview of ways in which Excellence in Teaching may be demonstrated. It is understood that the nature of the contributions in each area will depend on discipline, and that there are a variety of ways to demonstrate teaching accomplishments. This overview is not intended to be a comprehensive list, but rather is intended to make clear

²³ Section 2(a) of Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Faculty Association: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf>

²⁴ This would only apply to those whose teaching assignments include courses that enable such opportunities.

²⁵ This would only apply to those Teaching Stream faculty whose teaching assignments include graduate courses, or who are appointed to the School of Graduate Studies

²⁶ *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*: <https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf>

the standard of achievement and types of evidence and that may be presented to support a judgement of Excellence in Teaching.

1. Excellent teaching skills

These are skills that signal a critically reflective teaching practice in an individual who shows superlative teaching in the classroom or in other educational contexts that benefit student learning. Demonstration of superlative teaching may include some combination of the following:

- a. exemplary in-class or on-line teaching
- b. rigorous use of evidence-informed approaches to improve course or curriculum design or to motivate student learning
- c. use of scholarly or professional expertise to augment student understanding
- d. winning, or being nominated for, teaching awards or other significant recognitions of accomplishments in teaching, or in course design
- e. evidence of significant, sustained, positive effects on student understanding or application of knowledge in contexts outside the classroom
- f. evidence of sustained, positive effects on student empathy, multi-cultural sensitivity and sense of responsible citizenship.

2. Creative Educational Leadership and/or Achievement (a-f), and Innovative Teaching Initiatives (g-i)

These may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including some combination of the following.

Examples of Creative Educational Leadership and/or Achievement:

- a. significant participation in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning or pedagogical scholarship, which might include publications on pedagogical research, or publication of scholarly textbooks or online tools and resources adapted for use by others in their courses
- b. significant engagement in activities such as mentoring, and presenting seminars or workshops on pedagogical practice that have demonstrable impact on others' teaching
- c. significant engagement in creative, technical or community-based practices related to the subject of teaching expertise, with clear links between such practice and learning opportunities for students in programs, curriculum, classroom teaching, co-curricular or integrated learning opportunities
- d. development of new courses using high impact teaching practices, improved curricula, or design of new programs approved by University governance
- e. significant engagement in professional teaching and learning organizations/associations or teaching centres, which may include serving in leadership roles in such organizations, serving as a regular reviewer or referee for pedagogical conferences or journals, or serving as an editor for pedagogical journals or conference proceedings.
- f. significant participation in initiatives that lead to changes in policy related to teaching as a profession

Examples of Innovative Teaching Initiatives include:

- g. successful innovations in the teaching domain; for example, the creation of novel or progressive teaching processes, materials, forms of evaluation, or influencing pedagogical changes in the discipline
- h. development of effective and creative ways to promote students' involvement in the research process and providing opportunities for them to learn, for example, through discovery-based or other appropriate methods.

- i. significant contribution to the technological enrichment of teaching in a given area, for example, through the development of effective, new technology or the use of new media to fullest advantage

B. Pedagogical/Professional Development: Teaching Stream

For both continuing status and for promotion, teaching stream faculty are expected to demonstrate continued/ongoing pedagogical/professional development. Teaching Stream faculty members may demonstrate continuing pedagogical/professional development in a variety of ways, including:

- Participation in or contributions to workshops, seminars and other development opportunities aimed at pedagogical development within the University;
- Discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches,
- Participation at and contributions to academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent;
- The ongoing pursuit of further academic or professional qualifications and/or discipline-based scholarship or techniques relevant to the field in which the faculty member teaches;
- Professional or creative work that allows the candidate to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area, Examples include engagement with professional organizations associated with the candidate's area of expertise.

C. Additional Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor, Teaching Stream

For promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream, candidates must consistently meet the standard of excellence in teaching, as specified above (VII.A), sustained over many years. Moreover, policy²⁷ requires that educational leadership and/or achievement (section VII.A.2a - f) must be one of the demonstrated criteria, in addition to excellent teaching skills (VII.A.1). For Promotion to Professor Teaching Stream, candidates must also demonstrate ongoing pedagogical/professional development (VII.B, above) that is also sustained over many years. The PPPTS says: "Sustained over many years., educational leadership and/or achievement is often reflected in teaching-related activities that show significant impact in a variety of ways, for example: through enhanced student learning; through creation and/or development of models of effective teaching; through engagement in the scholarly conversation via pedagogical scholarship, or creative professional activity; through significant changes in policy related to teaching as a profession; through technological or other advances in the delivery of education in a discipline or profession."

VIII. Elements of Assessment: Teaching stream

Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness requires review by the Continuing Status or Promotion committee of materials provided by the candidate, and materials collected or solicited by the Academic Unit head. These consist of the following items:

Materials provided by the candidate and added to the Teaching Dossier (Section VIII.A, below)

²⁷ [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

- a *Curriculum Vitae* (Item 1),
- a Teaching Portfolio (Item 2)

Materials collected by the Academic Unit Head and added to the Teaching Dossier (Section VIII.B, below):

- Students' Course Evaluations (Item 3)

Confidential materials solicited by the Academic Unit Head (Section VIII.B, below):

- Teaching Observation Report (Item 4), which is added to the Teaching Dossier
- Letters from students (Item 5a-c) which are added to the Teaching Dossier as well as the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier
- Letters from Departmental Colleagues (Item 5d), which are added to the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier

Confidential, independent evaluations of teaching effectiveness solicited by the Academic Unit Head and added to the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier (see Section IX).

- Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee (Section IX.A)
- Letters from External Referees (Section IX.B)

A. Materials Provided by the Candidate:

1. Curriculum Vitae

The candidate must provide a *Curriculum Vitae* in a standard format. The candidate is advised to include the following items if they are applicable to their discipline and teaching practice:

- a. A list of titles of all courses (undergraduate and graduate) taught over at least the preceding five years, and whether the candidate has had major responsibility for course design.
- b. A list of undergraduate students whose research work has been supervised should be included, together with their project or thesis topics and the dates of the period of supervision.
- c. Where applicable, a list of graduate students for whom the candidate has provided supervision, co- or secondary supervision. Thesis or research titles and dates of supervision should be included.
- d. A list of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative professional work related to pedagogy, or providing the basis for the integration of scholarly expertise in teaching. This should include any books (or textbooks), chapters in books (or textbooks), research papers, articles, and reviews, including work published, in press, submitted for publication, completed but not yet published, and in progress. It should also include scholarly or creative professional work such as the presentation of papers at meetings and symposia, original artistic design, or distinguished contributions to the arts or in professional areas related to the area of pedagogical expertise.
- e. A list of creative professional activities, related to the area of teaching expertise, that demonstrate one or more of the following: professional innovation; creative excellence; exemplary professional practice; contributions to the development of the profession/discipline in ways that inform pedagogy.
- f. A list of administrative positions held within the University, major committees and organizations in which the candidate has served within or outside the University, and participation in learned societies and professional associations that relate to the candidate's academic discipline and pedagogical or professional activities or educational leadership. The list should indicate in each case the period of service and the nature of the candidate's participation.
- g. Other information relevant to the candidate's accomplishments or the impact of their teaching should also be included as appropriate. For example, this could include significant educational outreach to schools, providing mentoring or experiential learning opportunities to individual students, accepting invitations to share teaching practices across disciplines, divisions or

Universities or other indicators of achievement related to the criteria outlined in sections VII.A & B.

- h. Other information relevant to career progression. For example, the CV could include brief information on any career delays due to University-approved leaves (nature of the leave, dates, and impact on teaching performance).

2. Teaching Portfolio

Each faculty member should maintain a Teaching Portfolio that is updated annually.²⁸ Faculty are advised to seek feedback on the development of their Teaching Portfolio from colleagues, the department Unit head, UTSC's Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the tri-campus Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI)²⁹ as appropriate. The types of elements typically provided in a Teaching Portfolio are outlined below. This list is not intended to be proscriptive or exhaustive; other types of evidence may be added by the candidate to support their demonstration of effective teaching, or may be required by different disciplines (candidates should consult with their Unit head about other requirements).

The Teaching Portfolio would normally include the following items, if they are relevant to the candidate's discipline and teaching practice:

- a. A statement of the faculty member's teaching philosophy and goals and an accompanying narrative that contextualizes the other components of the portfolio and demonstrates how these components align both with their own philosophy and goals, and with the criteria specified in the *UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching*.
- b. Documents that reflect progress, success, experimentation and innovation (such as course syllabi, sample tests, classroom activities) or pedagogical development (such as documentation of participation in workshops).
- c. Representative undergraduate and graduate course syllabi, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, co-curricular learning activities, teaching assessment activities, and evidence of student learning.
- d. New course or program proposals, and plans for co-curricular learning.
- e. Documentation of efforts to provide experiential, work integrated learning opportunities or community-based experiences and a list of students and the type of experience provided; for undergraduate research supervised this should be an overview that refers to the detailed list in the CV.
- f. Commentary on the official student evaluations, or other student feedback received by the candidate, as appropriate.
- g. Where applicable, evidence that will enable the committee to assess the candidate's success in graduate student support; this overview should augment information provided in the list of graduate supervision/co-supervision in the CV, including:
 - i. number of Master's students supervised or co-supervised and graduated
 - ii. Number of graduate thesis supervisory committees in which the candidate served as member
 - iii. Quality of papers or theses produced and/or attendance at conferences by Master's students
 - iv. Information on other efforts to foster scholarly, creative and professional advancement of Master's students.
- h. Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents, including information on whether the application is pending or was successful.
- i. Documentation on efforts made (through both formal and informal means) to improve teaching skills or course design and commentary on the outcomes of these efforts.

²⁸ See: [Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions](#)

²⁹ CTSI web site: <http://teaching.utoronto.ca/>

- j. Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence
- k. Documentation concerning innovations in teaching methods and contributions to curricular development, and the use and development of technology in the teaching process.
- l. Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in pedagogical design.
- m. Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching, such as presentations at workshops, pedagogical conferences, discipline based conferences on teaching or publications on teaching.
- n. Evidence of professional contributions to academic teaching organizations/societies or centres, or leadership in such organizations, such as refereeing teaching grant applications, pedagogical publications, or symposium contributions, acting as an editor for pedagogical publications, or organizing symposia or conferences dedicated to the Scholarship of teaching and learning.
- o. Service to other professional bodies or community organizations through teaching activities at a level comparable to university instruction.

B. Materials Collected by the Unit Head

3. Student Course Evaluations

The following documents are added to the Teaching Dossier:

- a. A comprehensive summary of the candidate's course evaluations and an analysis that helps put these results into context. Typically, a summary table would be provided by the Centre for Teaching and Learning upon request, using the standardized analysis provided by the course evaluation system.

For continuing status reviews this would typically summarize all course evaluations; for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream this would normally include summaries of at least the previous ten years of evaluations, or all evaluations since the date of hire (if ten years of evaluations are not available). These summaries should also include data on class size and response rates.

- b. Copies of teaching evaluations for at least the most recent five-year period should be provided.
- c. Copies of course evaluations from any other unit at the University of Toronto for which the candidate has taught (where relevant). Where a candidate has taught at another university within the last five years, course evaluation information from that institution should be obtained, if possible, along with normative information.

Where the amount of teaching the candidate has done at either the undergraduate or graduate level varies from the norms of the department, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained by the Unit head or other suitable representative of the candidate's unit. This explanation should be included in the Teaching Dossier.

4. A Teaching Observation Report

One Teaching Observation Report must be completed and added to the confidential materials in the Teaching Dossier. For courses delivered traditionally, the Teaching Observation Report would normally be based on a live, in-class visit(s) by at least two colleagues to allow observation of both teacher and student interactions. Under exceptional circumstances videotapes of lectures might be permissible, but these should include student interactions. For online courses appropriate modules should be identified and assessed.

The Teaching Observation Report may be completed by the Teaching Evaluation Committee (where relevant), or by at least two other Tenured or Continuing-Status faculty commissioned by the Unit head, with the condition that the faculty doing the teaching observation cannot include any members of the Continuing Status or Promotion committee.

The Teaching Observation Report must be based on at least one class visit, ideally completed within the year of the Continuing Status or Promotion Review. Unit heads are advised to anticipate necessary exceptions to the 12 month period that might occur (for example, if research leave occurs just prior to or during the year of assessment, or due to variation in class scheduling), and to plan for early teaching visits where needed. Some academic units, or the candidate, may suggest more than one class visit to allow observation of courses at different levels, or that feature different pedagogical approaches. A single Teaching Observation Report should be drafted based on these visits.

Some academic units may encourage additional earlier visits to ensure Teaching Stream faculty receive formative feedback on teaching. Unit heads must ensure these are clearly distinguished from the class visits that will form part of the evaluative assessment that will be included in the Teaching Observation Report.

Classroom visits must be arranged in consultation with the candidate in order to find an appropriate date for the visit and so candidates can provide contextual material for the visitors, if desired. If the candidate refuses a visit, this should be noted in the Unit Head's Report. Other guidelines for best practices on classroom visits are available through CTL and CTSI.

5. Written Opinions of Departmental Colleagues and Students

The Unit head will solicit written opinions from a variety of different individuals who have direct experience with the candidate's teaching practice. In soliciting these letters, it is advisable that the Unit head makes it clear that responses are voluntary and that they will be held in confidence. These documents will form part of the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier.

- a. The Unit head will solicit letters from **current and former Undergraduate students** taught by the candidate. The students should be invited to comment on the candidate's success in:
 - i. stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development;
 - ii. developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field;
 - iii. encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning or other appropriate methods;
 - iv. creating opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process;
 - v. creating a lasting impact on students' appreciation of the subject or on their career path.

In addition, students should be asked to comment on the candidate's communication skills, active engagement with student's learning progress and accessibility to students.

Normally, for continuing status review, a random sample of approximately 100 of the candidate's current or former students should be solicited for opinions.

For promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream, comments from a random sample of no fewer than 200 of the candidate's current or and former students, distributed across the candidate's normal pattern of teaching should be solicited.

All student responses should be sent directly to the Unit head. Students may be contacted by letter or email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate. (The Registrar's Office provides student addresses for this purpose.)

b. The Unit head will solicit letters from **current and former Graduate students** supervised or co-supervised by the candidate, for those candidates for which this is relevant. The students should be invited to comment on:

- i. the opportunities created by the candidate to involve students in research;
- ii. whether the supervisory conditions fostered by the candidate were conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies' *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*;
- iii. the quality of supervision provided by the candidate.

c. The Unit head will solicit letters from **Teaching Assistants** (if applicable) who should be invited to comment on the candidate's mentoring, management, organization and communications skills

d. The Unit head will solicit letters from **peers** who are in a position to comment on the candidate's teaching. Where cross-appointment is involved, letters from peers in other departments and divisions may be solicited. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching effectiveness of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues who co-taught those courses, and the roles of each co-teacher explicitly considered.

IX. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S TEACHING

The material that follows should be read in conjunction with the relevant Policies and directions in the Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual, and the appropriate UTSC Guidelines.

A. Teaching Evaluation Committee: Teaching Stream

1. The Unit head will normally strike a Teaching Evaluation Committee to assist the Continuing status or Promotion Committee by preparing a written assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness which will be included in the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must produce a single report critically assessing teaching effectiveness using the Teaching Dossier (Sections VIII.A.1&2; VIII.B.3 & 4), including confidential letters from students (VIII.B.5a-c). The report should indicate whether and how the candidate meets the standards of Excellence in Teaching laid out in these Guidelines (Section VII.A), The Teaching Evaluation Committee should not make a recommendation for or against the continuing status or promotion. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should **not** be provided with reports from External Reviewers nor letters from Departmental colleagues (Section VIII.B.5d)

2. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must consist of at least two continuing status or tenured faculty members who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. Members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee cannot be members of the Continuing Status Committee or Promotions committee for a given candidate.

In the review of candidates for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream, only in exceptional circumstances and with the permission of the Dean may a member(s) of the Promotion Committee also be a member of the Teaching Evaluation Committee.

3. The Teaching Observation Report must be included in the materials given to the Teaching Evaluation Committee. One or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee may also be asked by the Unit head to conduct the class visit(s) and prepare the Teaching Observation Report (See Section VIII.B.4 above). The written evaluation of the Teaching Evaluation Committee may refer to the Teaching Observation Report, but these must be two distinct documents.

B. External Reviewers: Teaching Stream

For Continuing Status review and consideration for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream, written evaluations of the candidate's teaching must be done by qualified referees from outside the University who are at arms-length from the candidate. A referee is considered to be 'at arms-length' if there has been neither substantive professional nor personal interaction between the candidate and reviewer, and thus there is no actual, potential, or apparent conflict of interest for the reviewer in making a fair and unbiased assessment of the candidate's teaching. External Referees should be asked to provide an independent evaluation of the Teaching Dossier (Sections VIII.A.1&2; VIII.B.3) relative to the criteria outlined in the applicable category of Section VI above. Referees must **not** receive the evaluation of teaching effectiveness done independently by the Teaching Evaluation Committee. Referees should be asked to explicitly address whether and how the candidate meets the standards of Excellence in Teaching as laid out in these guidelines (Section VII.B), which include mastering criteria for teaching competence (Section VII.A).

C. Triangulating Multiple Sources of Information

1. The material that relates to a candidate's teaching collected during this process contains perspectives on the candidate's teaching practice and effectiveness presented by the candidate and collected by the Unit head (see Section VIII above).
2. At all steps in this process, Evaluators are tasked with using all the materials made available to them to develop a concordant and integrated understanding of the candidate's teaching effectiveness as it relates to the assessment of teaching effectiveness outlined in these guidelines and in the policies of the University.

X. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: Teaching Stream

Unit heads must consult the relevant policies, appropriate sections of the *Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual*, and the relevant UTSC Guidelines for detailed instructions on procedures and timelines required for notifications, committee memberships, number of external reviewers, the review process, and other important aspects of procedure associated with these processes. In the case of any inconsistency between these guidelines and the applicable University policy, the applicable University policy will govern.



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO
SCARBOROUGH

GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING

February 13, 2018

Contents

Preamble	4
A. Tenure Stream.....	5
I. Context for Assessing Teaching Performance: Tenure Stream	5
A. Interim Review.....	5
B. Tenure Review	5
C. Promotion to Professor	6
II. Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance: Tenure Stream.....	6
A. Competence in Teaching: Tenure Stream.....	6
B. Excellence in Teaching: Tenure Stream	7
III. Elements of Assessment: Tenure Stream	8
A. Materials Provided by the Candidate:.....	9
B. Materials Collected by the Academic Unit Head.....	11
IV. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE’S TEACHING	13
A. Teaching Evaluation Committee: Tenure Stream	13
B. External Reviewers: Promotion to Professor based on Excellent Teaching Alone	13
C. Triangulating Multiple Sources of Information	13
V. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: Tenure Stream.....	14
B. Teaching Stream.....	15
VI. Context for Assessing Teaching Performance: Teaching Stream	15
A. Probationary Review.....	15
B. Continuing Status Review.....	15
C. Review for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream.....	16
VII. Criteria for Assessing Performance: Teaching Stream	17
A. Excellence in Teaching/ Excellent Teaching	17
B. Pedagogical/Professional Development: Teaching Stream.....	19
C. Additional Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor, Teaching Stream.....	19
VIII. Elements of Assessment: Teaching stream.....	19
A. Materials Provided by the Candidate:.....	20
B. Materials Collected by the Unit Head	22
IX. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE’S TEACHING	24
A. Teaching Evaluation Committee: Teaching Stream	24

B. External Reviewers: Teaching Stream25

C. Triangulating Multiple Sources of Information25

X. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: Teaching Stream.....25

Preamble

At the University of Toronto, it is recognized that “excellence flourishes in an environment that embraces the broadest range of people, that helps them to achieve their full potential,” and “that facilitates the free expression of their diverse perspectives through respectful discourse”.¹ Central to our function as a University is a commitment to Excellence in Teaching and Research. Recognizing Excellence in Teaching and providing opportunities to improve teaching are commitments that support the global objectives of the University². Effective teaching strives to provide to all students not only knowledge of facts but also the skills to analyze, to assess critically, to develop creative expression, to understand in context, to present arguments in a clear and compelling fashion, to solve problems, and to generate new knowledge. As well, effective teaching promotes development of empathy and multicultural sensitivity, the pursuit of learning as a life-long endeavor, and a commitment to responsible citizenship to succeed in, and enhance, a diverse, global society.

It is critical that units undertaking reviews of Teaching Effectiveness adhere to the appropriate University of Toronto policies throughout the process. These include the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments, Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions, and Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream*. In addition, the *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions*³ provide some guidance regarding the values and norms set out in policy. They also describe the overarching standards for teaching across the University. Throughout this UTSC document, explanations draw heavily on, or use the language of, the University policy documents that govern career reviews.⁴ Policy documents are explicitly cited only where direct reference may be helpful, but it should be understood that they are interwoven throughout this document. Unit heads should refer to the cited documents directly for details and should provide these documents to the Candidate for reference.

The *UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching* (i.e. Divisional guidelines) establish the norms and expectations for teaching at UTSC, describe how teaching effectiveness is to be evaluated at the University of Toronto Scarborough and specifies what documentation should be collected to support that assessment. These Divisional guidelines apply to the evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for faculty in the Tenure Stream (Section A) and Teaching Stream (Section B) at the University of Toronto Scarborough. Guidelines for each stream are provided in separate sections for clarity.

¹ See the University of Toronto’s Statement on Equity, Diversity, and Excellence

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppdec142006.pdf>

² See the University of Toronto’s Statement of Institutional Purpose

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/mission.pdf>

³ *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions*:

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppmay142003.pdf>

⁴ Policy & Procedures on Academic Appointments, 2015

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppoct302003.pdf>, Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppapr201980.pdf>; Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream 2016: <http://www.governingcouncil.lamp4.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/p0105-papfip-2016-2017pol.pdf>

A. Tenure Stream

I. Context for Assessing Teaching Performance: Tenure Stream

Faculty members in the Tenure Stream are engaged in a University career of research and teaching. Assessment of performance in the Tenure Stream thus includes assessment of teaching effectiveness. A Tenure Stream faculty member demonstrates capabilities as a teacher in direct and indirect contexts including: lectures, seminars, laboratories, tutorials and online learning materials; less formal teaching situations such as academic skills coaching and advising students; through involvement in curriculum development or academic support for co-curricular programming; or in supporting or developing opportunities for student learning or research outside the classroom and directly supervising the research of undergraduate and graduate students. For Tenure Stream faculty, assessment of teaching performance occurs during PTR, interim reviews, tenure reviews and reviews for promotion to Professor.

A. Interim Review

As specified in University policy⁵ the interim review Committee considers two questions:

- a) Has the appointee's performance been sufficiently satisfactory for a second probationary appointment to be recommended?
- b) If reappointment is recommended, what counselling should be given to the appointee to assist them in improving areas of weakness and maintaining areas of strength?"

Candidates for interim review should consult with the head of their Unit concerning the materials expected to support the review of their teaching performance, as practices may vary among disciplines. Although the interim review is different in scope and purpose from the tenure review, candidates who submit CVs and Teaching Portfolios modelled on that recommended below for the tenure review process may receive valuable feedback on the quality of their documentation of their teaching effectiveness.

B. Tenure Review

For tenure stream faculty, The Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (PPAA 2015)⁶ outlines the criteria relative to tenure. Tenured appointments should be granted on the basis of three essential criteria⁷:

- a) achievement in research and creative professional work
- b) effectiveness in teaching, and
- c) clear promise of future intellectual and professional development

In addition to clear demonstration of future intellectual and professional development, a positive recommendation for tenure **requires** the judgement of demonstrated excellence in one of research (including equivalent creative or professional work) and teaching, and clearly established competence in the other.⁸ A successful tenure review will normally also involve promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

⁶ [PPAA 2015](#) p. 5, Section II.8

⁷ [PPAA 2015](#), p. 8, Section III

⁸ [PPAA](#), p. 9, Section III.13.d

For tenure reviews, teaching is assessed relative to competence or excellence as set out in the PPAA. This and other relevant University policies (see Preamble) must be used in conjunction with these UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching for the purposes of assessing teaching for tenure review. Candidates should consult University policy and Section III of these Guidelines for guidance on the materials they should provide for assessment (CV and Teaching Portfolio).

C. Promotion to Professor

The University's *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions* (PPP) states, "The successful candidate for promotion will be expected to have established a wide reputation in [their] field of interest, to be deeply engaged in scholarly work, and to have shown [themselves] to be an effective teacher".⁹

For Tenure-Stream faculty, promotion is normally granted on the basis of excellent scholarship and effective teaching, but the PPP also specifies that "...either excellent teaching alone or excellent scholarship alone, sustained over many years, could also in itself justify eventual promotion to the rank of Professor."⁹

The PPP must be used in conjunction with these UTSC guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching for the purposes of the promotion review. Candidates should consult the PPP and Section III of these Guidelines for guidance on the materials they should provide for assessment (CV and Teaching Portfolio).

II. Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance: Tenure Stream

A. Competence in Teaching: Tenure Stream

Competence in teaching is the minimal requirement to demonstrate effective teaching. An effective teacher must demonstrate that they meet all of the following requirements:

1. stimulate and challenge students, and promote their intellectual and scholarly or creative development;
2. communicate effectively;
3. develop students' mastery of a subject, including the latest developments in the subject area;
4. develop students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject;
5. create opportunities that involve students in the research process, creative activities, or technical practices of the discipline
6. create and maintain supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth, and academic progress. In the case of graduate students, faculty must ensure their practices in this regard are consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*;¹⁰
7. deal with students fairly and ethically, taking care to make themselves accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation, to maintain teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances, to inform students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructions and to comply with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of their students;¹¹

⁹ PPP, Section 7

¹⁰ *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*: <https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf>

¹¹ Section 2(a) of Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Faculty Association: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf>

8. promote academic integrity;
9. implement fair and transparent grading practices, with clear connections between course learning outcomes, assignments and assessments.

B. Excellence in Teaching: Tenure Stream

The expectations for excellence in teaching build on and significantly exceed the standard of competence. To meet the standard of **Excellence in Teaching**, a Tenure Stream faculty member is expected to demonstrate a high level of achievement in **all** of the Criteria for Competence in Teaching (A.II.A. 1-9, above) and demonstrate excellence ***in some combination*** of the following elements:

1. Superlative teaching skills

This may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including some combination of the following:

- a. exemplary in-class or on-line teaching
- b. rigorous use of evidence-informed approaches to improve course or curriculum design or to motivate student learning
- c. use of scholarly or professional expertise to augment student understanding
- d. winning, or being nominated for, teaching awards or other significant recognitions of accomplishments in teaching, or in course or curriculum design
- e. evidence of significant, sustained, positive effects on student understanding or application of knowledge in contexts outside the classroom
- f. evidence of sustained, positive effects on student empathy, multi-cultural sensitivity and sense of responsible citizenship.

2. Pedagogical/ Professional Development supporting a critically reflective teaching practice.

This may be demonstrated in in a variety of ways, including some combination of the following:

- a. incorporating best practices from the pedagogical literature in teaching practice
- b. regular participation in workshops and/or conferences concerned with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

3. Creative educational leadership and/or achievement

This may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including some combination of the following:

- a. significant participation in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning or pedagogical scholarship, which might include publications on pedagogical research, or publication of scholarly textbooks or online tools and resources adapted for use by others in their courses
- b. significant engagement in activities such as mentoring, and presenting seminars or workshops on pedagogical practice that have demonstrable impact on others' teaching
- c. significant engagement in creative, technical, or community-based practices related to the subject of pedagogical expertise, with clear links between these practices and learning opportunities for students in programs, curriculum, classroom teaching, co-curricular or integrated learning opportunities
- d. development of new courses using high impact teaching practices, improved curricula, or design of new programs approved by University governance
- e. significant engagement in professional teaching and learning organizations/associations or teaching centres, which may include serving in leadership roles in such organizations, or

- serving as a regular reviewer or referee for pedagogical conferences or journals, or serving as an editor for pedagogical journals or conference proceedings.
- f. significant participation in initiatives that lead to changes in policy related to teaching as a profession
 - g. successful innovations in the teaching domain; for example, the creation of novel or progressive teaching processes, materials, forms of evaluation, or influencing pedagogical changes in the discipline
 - h. development of effective and creative ways to promote students' involvement in the research process and to provide opportunities for them to learn, for example, through discovery-based or other appropriate methods.
 - i. significant contribution to the technological enrichment of teaching in a given area, for example, through the development of effective, new technology or the use of new media to fullest advantage

The preceding three sections (II.B.1-3) represent an overview of ways in which Excellence in Teaching may be demonstrated. It is understood that the nature of the contributions in each area will depend on the discipline, and that teaching accomplishments can be demonstrated in a variety of ways. This overview is not intended to be a comprehensive list, but rather is intended to make clear the types of evidence and standard of achievement that may be presented to support a judgement of excellence in teaching.

III. Elements of Assessment: Tenure Stream

Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness requires review by the Tenure or Promotion Committee of materials provided by the candidate and materials collected or solicited by the Academic Unit head. These consist of the following items:

Materials provided by the candidate and added to the Teaching Dossier (Section III.A, below)

- a *Curriculum Vitae* (Item 1),
- a Teaching Portfolio (Item 2)

Materials collected by the Academic Unit Head and added to the Teaching Dossier (Section III.B, below):

- Students' Course Evaluations (Item 3)

Confidential materials solicited by the Academic Unit Head (Section III.B, below):

- Teaching Observation Report (Item 4), which is added to the Teaching Dossier
- Letters from students (Items 5a-c), which are added to the Teaching Dossier as well as the Tenure or Promotion Dossier
- Letters from Departmental colleagues (Item 5d), which are added to the Tenure or Promotion Dossier

Confidential, independent evaluations of teaching effectiveness solicited by the Academic Unit Head and added to the Tenure or Promotion Dossier (see Section IV):

- Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee (where relevant, Section IV.A)
- Letters from External Referees (for Promotion to Professor based on excellent teaching alone, Section IV.B)

A. Materials Provided by the Candidate:

1. Curriculum Vitae

The candidate must provide a *curriculum vitae* in a standard format. The candidate is advised to include all of the following that are applicable to their discipline:

- a. A list of titles of all courses (undergraduate and graduate) taught for at least the preceding five years and whether the candidate has had major responsibility for course design.
- b. A list of: graduate students for whom the candidate has been the principal supervisor at either the masters or doctoral levels; graduate students for whom the candidate has provided either co- or secondary supervision should also be included. Thesis or research titles and dates of supervision/degree conferral should be included.
- c. A list of undergraduate students whose research work has been supervised, together with their project or thesis topics and the dates of the period of supervision.
- d. A list of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative professional work. This should include any books (or textbooks), chapters in books (or textbooks), research papers, articles, and reviews, including work published, in press, submitted for publication, completed but not yet published, and in progress. It should also include scholarly or creative professional work such as the presentation of papers at meetings and symposia, original artistic design, or distinguished contributions to the arts or in professional areas.
- e. A list of creative professional activities (if relevant) that demonstrate one or more of the following: professional innovation; creative excellence; exemplary professional practice; contributions to the development of the profession/discipline.
- f. A list of administrative positions held within the University, major committees and organizations in which the candidate has served within or outside the University, and participation in learned societies and professional associations that relate to the candidate's academic discipline and pedagogical or professional activities or educational leadership. The list should indicate in each case the period of service and the nature of the candidate's participation.
- g. Other information relevant to the candidate's accomplishments or the impact of their teaching should also be included as appropriate. For example, this could include a list of invitations to speak in teaching symposia or to edit textbooks (whether accepted or not), or other indicators of achievement related to the criteria outlined in Section A.II.
- h. Other information relevant to the candidate's accomplishments and career progression should also be included as appropriate. For example, the CV could include brief information on any career delays due to University-approved leaves (nature of the leave, dates, impact on productivity).

2. Teaching Portfolio

Each faculty member should maintain a Teaching Portfolio that is updated annually.¹² Faculty are advised to seek feedback on the development of their Teaching Portfolio from colleagues, the Academic Unit head, UTSC's Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the tri-campus Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI)¹³ as appropriate. The types of elements typically provided in a Teaching Portfolio are outlined below. This list is not intended to be exhaustive; other types of evidence may be added by the candidate to support their demonstration of effective teaching, or may be required by different disciplines (candidates should consult with their Unit head about other requirements).

¹² See: [Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions](#)

¹³ CTSI web site: <http://teaching.utoronto.ca/>

The Teaching Portfolio would normally include the following items,¹⁴ although it is understood that there may be some variation based on discipline and teaching practice:

- a. A statement of the faculty member's teaching philosophy and goals and an accompanying narrative that contextualizes the other components of the portfolio and demonstrates how these components align both with their own philosophy and goals, and with the criteria specified in the *UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching*.
- b. Documents that reflect progress, success, experimentation and innovation (such as course syllabi, sample tests, classroom activities) or pedagogical development (such as documentation of participation in workshops).
- c. Representative undergraduate and graduate course syllabi, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, co-curricular learning activities, teaching assessment activities, and evidence of student learning.
- d. New course or program proposals, and plans for co-curricular learning.
- e. Efforts to provide experiential or work integrated learning opportunities and a list of students and the type of experience provided; for undergraduate research supervised this should be an overview that refers to, summarizes or augments the detailed list in the CV.
- f. Commentary on the official student evaluations, or other student feedback received by the candidate, as appropriate.
- g. Evidence that will enable the committee to assess the candidate's success in graduate supervision; this overview should summarize and augment information provided in the list of graduate supervision provided in the CV, including:
 - a. number of students supervised and graduated
 - b. indicators of the quality of graduate students' research
 - c. indicators of the quality of theses produced, where possible
 - d. information on other efforts to foster scholarly, creative and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers or records of students' conference presentations, especially those papers or abstracts that have been published.
- h. Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents, including information on whether the application is pending or was successful.
- i. Documentation of efforts made (through both formal and informal means) to improve teaching skills or course design, and commentary on the outcomes of these efforts.
- j. Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence or teaching leadership.
- k. Documentation concerning innovations in teaching methods and contributions to curricular development, and the use and development of technology in the teaching process.
- l. Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in pedagogical design and documentation of effects of these efforts (where possible).
- m. Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching, such as presentations at workshops, pedagogical conferences, or discipline based conferences on teaching, or publications on teaching.
- n. Evidence of professional contributions to academic teaching organizations/societies or centres, or leadership in such organizations, such as refereeing teaching grant applications, pedagogical publications, or symposium contributions, acting as an editor for pedagogical publications, or organizing symposia or conferences dedicated to the Scholarship of teaching and learning.
- o. Service to other professional bodies or community organizations through teaching activities at a level comparable to university instruction.

¹⁴ Additional advice on assembling a Teaching Portfolio can be found at <http://teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching-support/documenting-teaching/teaching-dossier/>

B. Materials Collected by the Academic Unit Head

3. Student Course Evaluations

The following documents are added to the Teaching Dossier:

- a. A comprehensive summary of the candidate's course evaluations and an analysis that helps put these results into context. Typically, this would be provided by the Centre for Teaching and Learning upon request, using the standardized analysis provided by the course evaluation system.

For tenure reviews this would typically summarize all course evaluations; for promotion to Professor this would normally include summaries of at least the previous ten years of evaluations, or all evaluations since the date of hire (if ten years of evaluations are not available). These summaries should also include data on class size and response rates.

- b. Copies of the individual teaching evaluations for at least the most recent five-year period.
- c. Copies of course evaluations from any other unit at the University of Toronto for which the candidate has taught (where relevant). Where a candidate has taught at another university within the last five years, course evaluation information from that institution should be obtained, if possible, along with normative information.

Where the amount of teaching the candidate has done at either the undergraduate or graduate level varies from the norms of the department, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained by the Academic Unit head or other suitable representative of the candidate's unit. This explanation should be included in the Teaching Dossier.

4. A Teaching Observation Report

One Teaching Observation Report will normally be completed and added to the confidential materials in the Teaching Dossier. For courses delivered traditionally, the Teaching Observation Report would normally be based on live, class visit(s) by at least two colleagues to allow observation of both teacher and student interactions. Under exceptional circumstances videotapes of lectures might be permissible, but these would ideally include student interactions. For online courses, appropriate modules should be identified and assessed.

The Teaching Observation Report may be completed by the Teaching Evaluation Committee, or by at least two other Tenured or Continuing-Status faculty commissioned by the Academic Unit head, with the condition that the teaching observation cannot be conducted by any members of the Tenure or Promotion committee.

The Teaching Observation Report must be based on at least one class visit, ideally completed within the year of the Tenure or Promotion Review. Unit heads are advised to anticipate necessary exceptions to the 12 month period that might occur (for example, if a leave occurs just prior to or during the year of assessment), and to plan for early teaching visits where needed.

Some academic units, or the candidate, may suggest more than one class visit to allow observation of courses at different levels, or classes that feature different pedagogical approaches. A single Teaching Observation Report should be drafted based on these visits.

Classroom visits must be arranged in consultation with the candidate in order to find an appropriate date for the visit and so the candidate can provide contextual material for the visitors, if desired. If the candidate refuses a visit, this should be noted in the Unit Head's Report. Other guidelines for best practices on classroom visits are available through CTL and CTSI.

5. Written Opinions of Departmental Colleagues and Students

The Unit head will solicit written opinions from a variety of individuals who have direct experience with the candidate's teaching practice, including students. In soliciting these letters, it is advisable that the Unit head makes it clear that responses are voluntary and that they will be held in confidence. These documents will form part of the Tenure or Promotions Dossier.

a. The Unit head will solicit letters from **current and former Undergraduate students** taught by the candidate. The students should be invited to comment on the candidate's success in:

- i. stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development;
- ii. developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field;
- iii. encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning or other appropriate methods;
- iv. creating opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process;
- v. creating a lasting impact on students' appreciation of the subject or on their career path.

In addition, students should be asked to comment on the candidate's communication skills, active engagement with student's learning progress and accessibility to students. These requests will invite substantive comments rather than numerical rankings and should be signed or clearly indicate the respondent.

Normally, for tenure review, a random sample of approximately 100 of the candidate's current or former students should be solicited for opinions.

For promotion to Professor based on Excellent Teaching alone, comments from a random sample of no fewer than 200 of the candidate's current and former students, distributed across the candidate's normal pattern of teaching should be solicited for opinions.

All student responses are confidential and should be sent directly to the Unit head. Students may be contacted by letter or email, provided the process is random or comprehensive (at the Unit head's discretion), and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate. (The Registrar's Office provides student addresses for this purpose.).

b. The Unit head will solicit letters from **current and former Graduate students** supervised or co-supervised by the candidate. The students should be invited to comment on:

- i. the opportunities created by the candidate to involve students in research;
- ii. whether the supervisory conditions fostered by the candidate were conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies' *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*;
- iii. the quality of supervision provided by the candidate.

c. The Unit head will solicit letters from **Teaching Assistants** (if applicable) who should be invited to comment on the candidate's mentoring, management, organization and communications skills.

d. The Unit head will solicit letters from **peers** who are in a position to comment on the candidate's teaching. Where cross-appointment is involved, letters from peers in other departments and divisions may be solicited. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching effectiveness of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues who co-taught those courses and the roles of each co-teacher should be explicitly considered.

IV. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S TEACHING

The material that follows should be read in conjunction with the relevant Policies and directions in the Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual, and the appropriate UTSC Guidelines.

A. Teaching Evaluation Committee: Tenure Stream

1. For all tenure reviews and promotion reviews, the Unit head must establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee to prepare a written assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness which will be included in the Tenure or Promotion Dossier. The Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should be a single report critically assessing Teaching effectiveness using the Teaching Dossier (Section III.A.1 & 2; III.B.3 & 4), including confidential letters from students (Section III.B.5a-c). The report should indicate whether and how the candidate meets the applicable standards, but should not make a recommendation for or against the tenure or promotion. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should **not** be provided with letters from External Reviewers (where such reports have been solicited) nor from Departmental colleagues (Section III.B.5d).
2. The Teaching Observation Report must be included in the materials considered by the Teaching Evaluation Committee. The written evaluation of teaching effectiveness by the Teaching Evaluation Committee may refer to the Teaching Observation Report, but these must be two separate documents.

B. External Reviewers: Promotion to Professor based on Excellent Teaching Alone

For promotion to Professor based on sustained **Excellent Teaching** alone, the Unit head would normally solicit letters from External Referees in relevant disciplines who are in a position to evaluate the teaching accomplishments of the candidate. External referees should each be asked to provide an independent evaluation of the **Teaching Dossier** (Section III.A.1&2 and III.B.3), and to explicitly address whether and how the candidate meets the standard of Excellence in Teaching as laid out in these guidelines (Section A.II). These evaluations would be added to the confidential Promotion Dossier.

C. Triangulating Multiple Sources of Information

1. The material that relates to a candidate's teaching collected during this process contains perspectives on the candidate's teaching practice and effectiveness presented by the candidate and collected by the Unit head (see Section B.III above).

2. Evaluators are tasked with using all the materials made available to them to develop a concordant and integrated understanding of the candidate's teaching effectiveness as it relates to the assessment of teaching effectiveness outlined in these guidelines and in the policies of the University.

V. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: Tenure Stream

Unit heads must consult the relevant policies, appropriate sections of the *Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual*, and the relevant UTSC Procedural Guidelines for detailed instructions on procedures and timelines required for notifications, committee memberships, number of external reviewers, the review process, and other important aspects of procedure associated with these processes. In the case of any inconsistency between these guidelines and the applicable University policy, the applicable University policy will govern.

B. Teaching Stream

VI. Context for Assessing Teaching Performance: Teaching Stream

Faculty members in the Teaching Stream are engaged in a career that combines high levels of expertise in their field with a focus on excellence in teaching. In addition to the development of their own courses, Teaching Stream faculty may enrich teaching and learning in their Units, Division and across the University through their contributions to curriculum and program design, through sharing their pedagogical expertise with their colleagues, by demonstrating and leading teaching innovation, and through their commitment to evidence-based practices that support student learning. The Teaching Stream appointment indicates the importance of these contributions to the high standards of the University, and provides the framework through which a scholarly approach to teaching excellence and innovation is mandated, supported, and recognized¹⁵ (Policy & Procedures on Academic Appointment, [PPAA] 2015, p. 18, also see Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream).

Assessment of teaching effectiveness occurs during PTR, Probationary reviews, Continuing Status reviews and reviews for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream.

A. Probationary Review

As specified in University policy¹⁶ the probationary review committee considers two questions regarding a faculty member in the Teaching Stream:

- a) “Has the appointee's performance been sufficiently satisfactory for a second probationary appointment to be recommended?”
- b) If reappointment is recommended, what counselling should be given to the appointee to assist them in improving areas of weakness and maintaining areas of strength?”

Candidates for probationary review should consult with the head of their Unit concerning the materials expected to support the review of their teaching performance, as practices may vary among disciplines. Although the probationary review is different in scope and purpose from the continuing status review, candidates who submit teaching portfolios and CVs modelled on that recommended below for the continuing status review process may receive valuable feedback on the quality of their documentation of their teaching effectiveness.

B. Continuing Status Review

For faculty in the teaching stream the PPAA 2015¹⁷ outlines how performance is assessed in general terms:

Performance will be assessed on teaching effectiveness and pedagogical/ professional development related to teaching duties in accordance with approved divisional guidelines on the assessment of teaching.

The specific criteria to be met for a positive recommendation for continuing status are:¹⁸

1. excellence in teaching *and*

¹⁵ PPAA 2015; [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

¹⁶ PPAA 2015 p. 20, Section VII.30.vii

¹⁷ PPAA 2015, Section VII.30.vj; [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

¹⁸ PPAA 2015, Section VII.30.x; [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

2. evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.

*Administrative service will be considered, where such service is related to teaching or to curricular and professional development.*¹⁹

Relevant administrative service can include the co-ordination of undergraduate or graduate programs, administration of large undergraduate courses, and student advising and/or mentoring.

The Policy also outlines, in general terms, how the specific criteria for continuing status may be demonstrated:

- a) *“Excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through a combination of excellent teaching skills, creative educational leadership and/or achievement, and innovative teaching initiatives in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines.”*
- b) *“Evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development may be demonstrated in a variety of ways e.g. discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches; participation at, and contributions to, academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent; teaching-related activity by the faculty member outside of his or her classroom functions and responsibilities; professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area in accordance with appropriate divisional guidelines”*

A successful continuing status review will normally also involve promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream to the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream.

The relevant University policy (see above) must be used in conjunction with these UTSC guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching for the purposes of assessing excellence in teaching for the continuing status review. Candidates should consult the University policy and the guidelines below for the materials that should be included in their Teaching Portfolio (Section B.VIII).

C. Review for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

For faculty in the teaching stream, promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream requires a judgment of

- a) excellent teaching,
- b) creative educational leadership and/or achievement, and
- c) ongoing pedagogical/professional development,

where these must be sustained over many years.²⁰

Administrative or other service to the University and related activities will be taken into account in assessing candidates for promotion, but promotion will not be based primarily on such service.²¹

Review for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream must occur in accordance with the University Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream (2016),²² used in conjunction with these UTSC guidelines.

¹⁹ [PPAA 2015, Section VII.30.vi](#)

²⁰ [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#), part six.

²¹ [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream, part 10](#)

²² [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

VII. Criteria for Assessing Performance: Teaching Stream

A. Excellence in Teaching/ Excellent Teaching

Teaching includes:

- conventional teaching activities (lectures, seminars, laboratories, tutorials) and online learning that result directly in improved learning outcomes for students;
- activities that indirectly support student learning through the acquisition of practical skills, competencies and learning opportunities outside the classroom through creative activities, community-based or work-integrated learning opportunities, co-curricular activities, or research-intensive experiences;

Faculty in the teaching Stream are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching. In order to do so they must demonstrate the fundamental elements of effective teaching, plus go significantly beyond this.

An effective teacher must demonstrate that they meet all of the following requirements:

- i. stimulate and challenge students, and promote their intellectual and scholarly or creative development;
- ii. communicate effectively;
- iii. develop students' mastery of a subject, including the latest developments in the subject area;
- iv. develop students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject;
- v. create opportunities that involve students in the research process, creative activities, or technical practices of the discipline, where applicable.
- vi. deal with students fairly and ethically, taking care to make themselves accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation, to maintain teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances, to inform students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructions and to comply with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of their students;²³
- vii. promote academic integrity;
- viii. implement fair and transparent grading practices, with clear connections between course learning outcomes, assignments and assessments.
- ix. where applicable, create and maintain supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth, and academic progress²⁴. In the case of graduate students²⁵, faculty must ensure their practices in this regard are consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*;²⁶

Beyond these fundamental qualities, a judgement of **Excellence in Teaching** requires the candidate demonstrate a combination of: (1) Excellent teaching skills, and (2) Creative educational leadership and/or achievement, and (3) Innovative Teaching Initiatives. The following section represents an overview of ways in which Excellence in Teaching may be demonstrated. It is understood that the nature of the contributions in each area will depend on discipline, and that there are a variety of ways to demonstrate teaching accomplishments. This overview is not intended to be a comprehensive list, but rather is intended to make clear

²³ Section 2(a) of Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Faculty Association: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf>

²⁴ This would only apply to those whose teaching assignments include courses that enable such opportunities.

²⁵ This would only apply to those Teaching Stream faculty whose teaching assignments include graduate courses, or who are appointed to the School of Graduate Studies

²⁶ *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*: <https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf>

the standard of achievement and types of evidence and that may be presented to support a judgement of Excellence in Teaching.

1. Excellent teaching skills

These are skills that signal a critically reflective teaching practice in an individual who shows superlative teaching in the classroom or in other educational contexts that benefit student learning. Demonstration of superlative teaching may include some combination of the following:

- a. exemplary in-class or on-line teaching
- b. rigorous use of evidence-informed approaches to improve course or curriculum design or to motivate student learning
- c. use of scholarly or professional expertise to augment student understanding
- d. winning, or being nominated for, teaching awards or other significant recognitions of accomplishments in teaching, or in course design
- e. evidence of significant, sustained, positive effects on student understanding or application of knowledge in contexts outside the classroom
- f. evidence of sustained, positive effects on student empathy, multi-cultural sensitivity and sense of responsible citizenship.

2. Creative Educational Leadership and/or Achievement (a-f), and 3. Innovative Teaching Initiatives (g-i)

These may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including some combination of the following.

Examples of Creative Educational Leadership and/or Achievement:

- a. significant participation in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning or pedagogical scholarship, which might include publications on pedagogical research, or publication of scholarly textbooks or online tools and resources adapted for use by others in their courses
- b. significant engagement in activities such as mentoring, and presenting seminars or workshops on pedagogical practice that have demonstrable impact on others' teaching
- c. significant engagement in creative, technical or community-based practices related to the subject of teaching expertise, with clear links between such practice and learning opportunities for students in programs, curriculum, classroom teaching, co-curricular or integrated learning opportunities
- d. development of new courses using high impact teaching practices, improved curricula, or design of new programs approved by University governance
- e. significant engagement in professional teaching and learning organizations/associations or teaching centres, which may include serving in leadership roles in such organizations, serving as a regular reviewer or referee for pedagogical conferences or journals, or serving as an editor for pedagogical journals or conference proceedings.
- f. significant participation in initiatives that lead to changes in policy related to teaching as a profession

Examples of Innovative Teaching Initiatives include:

- g. successful innovations in the teaching domain; for example, the creation of novel or progressive teaching processes, materials, forms of evaluation, or influencing pedagogical changes in the discipline
- h. development of effective and creative ways to promote students' involvement in the research process and providing opportunities for them to learn, for example, through discovery-based or other appropriate methods.

- i. significant contribution to the technological enrichment of teaching in a given area, for example, through the development of effective, new technology or the use of new media to fullest advantage

B. Pedagogical/Professional Development: Teaching Stream

For both continuing status and for promotion, teaching stream faculty are expected to demonstrate continued/ongoing pedagogical/professional development. Teaching Stream faculty members may demonstrate continuing pedagogical/professional development in a variety of ways, including:

- Participation in or contributions to workshops, seminars and other development opportunities aimed at pedagogical development within the University;
- Discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches,
- Participation at and contributions to academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent;
- The ongoing pursuit of further academic or professional qualifications and/or discipline-based scholarship or techniques relevant to the field in which the faculty member teaches;
- Professional or creative work that allows the candidate to maintain a mastery of their subject area, Examples include engagement with professional organizations associated with the candidate's area of expertise.

C. Additional Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor, Teaching Stream

For promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream, candidates must consistently meet the standard of excellence in teaching, as specified above (VII.B1 & VII.B2), sustained over many years. Moreover, policy²⁷ requires that educational leadership and/or achievement (section VII.B.2a - f) must be one of the demonstrated criteria, in addition to excellent teaching skills (VII.B.1). For Promotion to Professor Teaching Stream, candidates must also demonstrate ongoing pedagogical/professional development (VII.C, above), also sustainedA.1). The PPPTS says: " Sustained over many years., educational leadership and/or achievement is often reflected in teaching-related activities that show significant impact in a variety of ways, for example: through enhanced student learning; through creation and/or development of models of effective teaching; through engagement in the scholarly conversation via pedagogical scholarship, or creative professional activity; through significant changes in policy related to teaching as a profession; through technological or other advances in the delivery of education in a discipline or profession "

VIII. Elements of Assessment: Teaching stream

Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness requires review by the Continuing Status or Promotion committee of materials provided by the candidate, and materials collected or solicited by the Academic Unit head. These consist of the following items:

Materials provided by the candidate and added to the Teaching Dossier (Section VIII.A, below)

²⁷ [Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream](#)

- a *Curriculum Vitae* (Item 1),
- a Teaching Portfolio (Item 2)

Materials collected by the Academic Unit Head and added to the Teaching Dossier (Section VIII.B, below):

- Students' Course Evaluations (Item 3)

Confidential materials solicited by the Academic Unit Head (Section VIII.B, below):

- Teaching Observation Report (Item 4), which is added to the Teaching Dossier
- Letters from students (Item 5a-c) which are added to the Teaching Dossier as well as the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier
- Letters from Departmental Colleagues (Item 5d), which are added to the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier

Confidential, independent evaluations of teaching effectiveness solicited by the Academic Unit Head and added to the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier (see Section IX).

- Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee (Section IX.A)
- Letters from External Referees (Section IX.B)

A. Materials Provided by the Candidate:

1. Curriculum Vitae

The candidate must provide a *Curriculum Vitae* in a standard format. The candidate is advised to include the following items if they are applicable to their discipline and teaching practice:

- a. A list of titles of all courses (undergraduate and graduate) taught over at least the preceding five years, and whether the candidate has had major responsibility for course design.
- b. A list of undergraduate students whose research work has been supervised should be included, together with their project or thesis topics and the dates of the period of supervision.
- c. Where applicable, a list of graduate students for whom the candidate has provided supervision, co- or secondary supervision. Thesis or research titles and dates of supervision should be included.
- d. A list of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative professional work related to pedagogy, or providing the basis for the integration of scholarly expertise in teaching. This should include any books (or textbooks), chapters in books (or textbooks), research papers, articles, and reviews, including work published, in press, submitted for publication, completed but not yet published, and in progress. It should also include scholarly or creative professional work such as the presentation of papers at meetings and symposia, original artistic design, or distinguished contributions to the arts or in professional areas related to the area of pedagogical expertise.
- e. A list of creative professional activities, related to the area of teaching expertise, that demonstrate one or more of the following: professional innovation; creative excellence; exemplary professional practice; contributions to the development of the profession/discipline in ways that inform pedagogy.
- f. A list of administrative positions held within the University, major committees and organizations in which the candidate has served within or outside the University, and participation in learned societies and professional associations that relate to the candidate's academic discipline and pedagogical or professional activities or educational leadership. The list should indicate in each case the period of service and the nature of the candidate's participation.
- g. Other information relevant to the candidate's accomplishments or the impact of their teaching should also be included as appropriate. For example, this could include significant educational outreach to schools, providing mentoring or experiential learning opportunities to individual students, accepting invitations to share teaching practices across disciplines, divisions or

Universities or other indicators of achievement related to the criteria outlined in sections VII.A & B.

- h. Other information relevant to career progression. For example, the CV could include brief information on any career delays due to University-approved leaves (nature of the leave, dates, and impact on teaching performance).

2. Teaching Portfolio

Each faculty member should maintain a Teaching Portfolio that is updated annually.²⁸ Faculty are advised to seek feedback on the development of their Teaching Portfolio from colleagues, the department Unit head, UTSC's Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the tri-campus Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI)²⁹ as appropriate. The types of elements typically provided in a Teaching Portfolio are outlined below. This list is not intended to be proscriptive or exhaustive; other types of evidence may be added by the candidate to support their demonstration of effective teaching, or may be required by different disciplines (candidates should consult with their Unit head about other requirements).

The Teaching Portfolio would normally include the following items, if they are relevant to the candidate's discipline and teaching practice:

- a. A statement of the faculty member's teaching philosophy and goals and an accompanying narrative that contextualizes the other components of the portfolio and demonstrates how these components align both with their own philosophy and goals, and with the criteria specified in the *UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching*.
- b. Documents that reflect progress, success, experimentation and innovation (such as course syllabi, sample tests, classroom activities) or pedagogical development (such as documentation of participation in workshops).
- c. Representative undergraduate and graduate course syllabi, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, co-curricular learning activities, teaching assessment activities, and evidence of student learning.
- d. New course or program proposals, and plans for co-curricular learning.
- e. Documentation of efforts to provide experiential, work integrated learning opportunities or community-based experiences and a list of students and the type of experience provided; for undergraduate research supervised this should be an overview that refers to the detailed list in the CV.
- f. Commentary on the official student evaluations, or other student feedback received by the candidate, as appropriate.
- g. Where applicable, evidence that will enable the committee to assess the candidate's success in graduate student support; this overview should augment information provided in the list of graduate supervision/co-supervision in the CV, including:
 - i. number of Master's students supervised or co-supervised and graduated
 - ii. Number of graduate thesis supervisory committees in which the candidate served as member
 - iii. Quality of papers or theses produced and/or attendance at conferences by Master's students
 - iv. Information on other efforts to foster scholarly, creative and professional advancement of Master's students.
- h. Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents, including information on whether the application is pending or was successful.
- i. Documentation on efforts made (through both formal and informal means) to improve teaching skills or course design and commentary on the outcomes of these efforts.

²⁸ See: [Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions](#)

²⁹ CTSI web site: <http://teaching.utoronto.ca/>

- j. Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence
- k. Documentation concerning innovations in teaching methods and contributions to curricular development, and the use and development of technology in the teaching process.
- l. Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in pedagogical design.
- m. Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching, such as presentations at workshops, pedagogical conferences, discipline based conferences on teaching or publications on teaching.
- n. Evidence of professional contributions to academic teaching organizations/societies or centres, or leadership in such organizations, such as refereeing teaching grant applications, pedagogical publications, or symposium contributions, acting as an editor for pedagogical publications, or organizing symposia or conferences dedicated to the Scholarship of teaching and learning.
- o. Service to other professional bodies or community organizations through teaching activities at a level comparable to university instruction.

B. Materials Collected by the Unit Head

3. Student Course Evaluations

The following documents are added to the Teaching Dossier:

- a. A comprehensive summary of the candidate's course evaluations and an analysis that helps put these results into context. Typically, a summary table would be provided by the Centre for Teaching and Learning upon request, using the standardized analysis provided by the course evaluation system.

For continuing status reviews this would typically summarize all course evaluations; for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream this would normally include summaries of at least the previous ten years of evaluations, or all evaluations since the date of hire (if ten years of evaluations are not available). These summaries should also include data on class size and response rates.

- b. Copies of teaching evaluations for at least the most recent five-year period should be provided.
- c. Copies of course evaluations from any other unit at the University of Toronto for which the candidate has taught (where relevant). Where a candidate has taught at another university within the last five years, course evaluation information from that institution should be obtained, if possible, along with normative information.

Where the amount of teaching the candidate has done at either the undergraduate or graduate level varies from the norms of the department, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained by the Unit head or other suitable representative of the candidate's unit. This explanation should be included in the Teaching Dossier.

4. A Teaching Observation Report

One Teaching Observation Report must be completed and added to the confidential materials in the Teaching Dossier. For courses delivered traditionally, the Teaching Observation Report would normally be based on a live, in-class visit(s) by at least two colleagues to allow observation of both teacher and student interactions. Under exceptional circumstances videotapes of lectures might be permissible, but these should include student interactions. For online courses appropriate modules should be identified and assessed.

The Teaching Observation Report may be completed by the Teaching Evaluation Committee (where relevant), or by at least two other Tenured or Continuing-Status faculty commissioned by the Unit head, with the condition that the faculty doing the teaching observation cannot include any members of the Continuing Status or Promotion committee.

The Teaching Observation Report must be based on at least one class visit, ideally completed within the year of the Continuing Status or Promotion Review. Unit heads are advised to anticipate necessary exceptions to the 12 month period that might occur (for example, if research leave occurs just prior to or during the year of assessment, or due to variation in class scheduling), and to plan for early teaching visits where needed. Some academic units, or the candidate, may suggest more than one class visit to allow observation of courses at different levels, or that feature different pedagogical approaches. A single Teaching Observation Report should be drafted based on these visits.

Some academic units may encourage additional earlier visits to ensure Teaching Stream faculty receive formative feedback on teaching. Unit heads must ensure these are clearly distinguished from the class visits that will form part of the evaluative assessment that will be included in the Teaching Observation Report.

Classroom visits must be arranged in consultation with the candidate in order to find an appropriate date for the visit and so candidates can provide contextual material for the visitors, if desired. If the candidate refuses a visit, this should be noted in the Unit Head's Report. Other guidelines for best practices on classroom visits are available through CTL and CTSI.

5. Written Opinions of Departmental Colleagues and Students

The Unit head will solicit written opinions from a variety of different individuals who have direct experience with the candidate's teaching practice. In soliciting these letters, it is advisable that the Unit head makes it clear that responses are voluntary and that they will be held in confidence. These documents will form part of the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier.

a. The Unit head will solicit letters from **current and former Undergraduate students** taught by the candidate. The students should be invited to comment on the candidate's success in:

- i. stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development;
- ii. developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field;
- iii. encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning or other appropriate methods;
- iv. creating opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process;
- v. creating a lasting impact on students' appreciation of the subject or on their career path.

In addition, students should be asked to comment on the candidate's communication skills, active engagement with student's learning progress and accessibility to students.

Normally, for continuing status review, a random sample of approximately 100 of the candidate's current or former students should be solicited for opinions.

For promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream, comments from a random sample of no fewer than 200 of the candidate's current or former students, distributed across the candidate's normal pattern of teaching should be solicited.

All student responses should be sent directly to the Unit head. Students may be contacted by letter or email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate. (The Registrar's Office provides student addresses for this purpose.)

b. The Unit head will solicit letters from **current and former Graduate students** supervised or co-supervised by the candidate, for those candidates for which this is relevant. The students should be invited to comment on:

- i. the opportunities created by the candidate to involve students in research;
- ii. whether the supervisory conditions fostered by the candidate were conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies' *Graduate Supervision: Guidelines for Students, Faculty and Administrators*;
- iii. the quality of supervision provided by the candidate.

c. The Unit head will solicit letters from **Teaching Assistants** (if applicable) who should be invited to comment on the candidate's mentoring, management, organization and communications skills

d. The Unit head will solicit letters from **peers** who are in a position to comment on the candidate's teaching. Where cross-appointment is involved, letters from peers in other departments and divisions may be solicited. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching effectiveness of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues who co-taught those courses, and the roles of each co-teacher explicitly considered.

IX. EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S TEACHING

The material that follows should be read in conjunction with the relevant Policies and directions in the Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual, and the appropriate UTSC Guidelines.

A. Teaching Evaluation Committee: Teaching Stream

1. The Unit head will normally strike a Teaching Evaluation Committee to assist the Continuing status or Promotion Committee by preparing a written assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness which will be included in the Continuing Status or Promotion Dossier. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must produce a single report critically assessing teaching effectiveness using the Teaching Dossier (Sections VIII.A.1&2; VIII.B.3 & 4), including confidential letters from students (VIII.B.5a-c). The report should indicate whether and how the candidate meets the standards of Excellence in Teaching laid out in these Guidelines (Section VII.A), The Teaching Evaluation Committee should not make a recommendation for or against the continuing status or promotion. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should **not** be provided with reports from External Reviewers nor letters from Departmental colleagues (Section VIII.B.5d)

2. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must consist of at least two continuing status or tenured faculty members who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. Members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee cannot be members of the Continuing Status Committee or Promotions committee for a given candidate.

In the review of candidates for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream, only in exceptional circumstances and with the permission of the Dean may a member(s) of the Promotion Committee also be a member of the Teaching Evaluation Committee.

3. The Teaching Observation Report must be included in the materials given to the Teaching Evaluation Committee. One or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee may also be asked by the Unit head to conduct the class visit(s) and prepare the Teaching Observation Report (See Section VIII.B.4 above). The written evaluation of the Teaching Evaluation Committee may refer to the Teaching Observation Report, but these must be two distinct documents.

B. External Reviewers: Teaching Stream

For Continuing Status review and consideration for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream, written evaluations of the candidate's teaching must be done by qualified referees from outside the University who are at arms-length from the candidate. A referee is considered to be 'at arms-length' if there has been neither substantive professional nor personal interaction between the candidate and reviewer, and thus there is no actual, potential, or apparent conflict of interest for the reviewer in making a fair and unbiased assessment of the candidate's teaching. External Referees should be asked to provide an independent evaluation of the Teaching Dossier (Sections VIII.A.1&2; VIII.B.3) relative to the criteria outlined in the applicable category of Section VI above. Referees must **not** receive the evaluation of teaching effectiveness done independently by the Teaching Evaluation Committee. Referees should be asked to explicitly address whether and how the candidate meets the standards of Excellence in Teaching as laid out in these guidelines (Section VII.B), which include mastering criteria for teaching competence (Section VII.A).

C. Triangulating Multiple Sources of Information

1. The material that relates to a candidate's teaching collected during this process contains perspectives on the candidate's teaching practice and effectiveness presented by the candidate and collected by the Unit head (see Section VIII above).
2. At all steps in this process, Evaluators are tasked with using all the materials made available to them to develop a concordant and integrated understanding of the candidate's teaching effectiveness as it relates to the assessment of teaching effectiveness outlined in these guidelines and in the policies of the University.

X. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: Teaching Stream

Unit heads must consult the relevant policies, appropriate sections of the *Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual*, and the relevant UTSC Guidelines for detailed instructions on procedures and timelines required for notifications, committee memberships, number of external reviewers, the review process, and other important aspects of procedure associated with these processes. In the case of any inconsistency between these guidelines and the applicable University policy, the applicable University policy will govern.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO SCARBOROUGH

GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING IN TENURE AND PROMOTION DECISIONS

A commitment to excellence in teaching and research is the core of our mission as a University. Effective teaching strives to provide to students not only knowledge of facts but, more importantly, the skills to analyze, to critically assess, to understand in context, to present arguments in a clear and compelling fashion, to solve problems, to generate new knowledge, and to pursue learning as a life-long endeavour.

The evaluation of teaching is relevant to decisions on tenure, promotion to Professor and promotion to Senior Lecturer. The policies¹ and guidelines² for tenure and promotions prescribe in detail the standards and procedures to be followed and the documentation to be collected. The following guidelines for the assessment of effectiveness of teaching describe how teaching effectiveness is to be evaluated at the University of Toronto Scarborough and what documentation should be collected to support that assessment.

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

A faculty member demonstrates capabilities as a teacher in lectures, seminars, laboratories, and tutorials; in less formal teaching situations, including directing the research of undergraduate and graduate students and advising students; and through involvement in curriculum development.

A. Competence in Teaching

To establish competence in teaching for the purpose of achieving tenure or promotion, a faculty member must demonstrate that he or she:

1. stimulates and challenges students, and promotes their intellectual and scholarly or creative development;
2. communicates effectively;
3. develops students' mastery of a subject, including the latest developments in the subject area of instruction;
4. develops students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject;
5. creates opportunities that involve students in the research process;³
6. creates and maintains supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth, and academic progress.⁴ In the case of graduate students, faculty in the tenure

¹ See the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*:

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/phoct302003i.htm>

² See the Provostial *Academic Administrative Procedures Manual*: <http://aapm.utoronto.ca/academic-administrative-procedures-manual>

³ For teaching-stream faculty, this would normally apply to those whose teaching assignments include courses that enable such opportunities.

⁴ Ibid.

stream must ensure their practices in this regard are consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*;

7. deals with students fairly and ethically, taking care to make himself or herself accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation, to maintain teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances, to inform students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructions and to comply with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of his or her students;⁵
8. promotes academic integrity;
9. implements fair and transparent grading practices, with a clear connection between course learning objectives, assignments and assessments.

B. Excellence in Teaching

To meet the standard of excellence in teaching for tenure, promotion to professor, or promotion to Senior Lecturer, the candidate must demonstrate a high level of achievement in all of the criteria for competence listed above, and further demonstrate additional attributes of an excellent teacher, including:

1. superlative teaching skills, that signal a critically reflective, teaching practice;
2. regular engagement in professional development that supports teaching, keeping abreast of advances in both the subjects of instruction and pedagogy;
3. creative educational leadership in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. successful innovations in the teaching domain; for example, the creation of novel or progressive teaching processes, materials, forms of evaluation, and pedagogical changes in the discipline
 - b. significant contribution to the technological enrichment of teaching in a given area, for example, through the development of effective, new technology or the use of new media to fullest advantage
 - c. publication of textbooks or online tools and resources adapted for use by others in their courses
 - d. engagement in activities such as mentoring, and presenting seminars or workshops on pedagogical practice that have demonstrable impact on others' teaching
 - e. development of significant new courses or reform of curricula
 - f. development of effective and creative ways to promote students' involvement in the research process and to provide opportunities for them to learn, for example, through discovery-based or other appropriate methods.

As stated in Section 7 of the *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion*⁶, excellent teaching alone "sustained over many years, could in itself justify eventual promotion to the rank of Professor". For such cases, the candidate must have consistently met the standard of excellence as set out above over a period of at least ten years.

⁵ Section 2(a) of Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto and the University of Toronto Faculty Association

⁶ See [Http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/promote.htm](http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/promote.htm)

ELEMENTS OF THE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1. MATERIAL INCLUDED IN TEACHING DOSSIERS

The Teaching Dossier typically consists of a *Curriculum Vitae* (Item A), a Teaching Portfolio (Item B), Course Evaluations (Item C) and other materials gathered by the faculty member's department or academic unit (Item D).

A. Curriculum Vitae (to be provided by the candidate)

The faculty member must provide a curriculum vitae in a standard format which, for the purposes of assessing teaching effectiveness, must include: in the case of tenure or promotion to Senior Lecturer, all courses taught; and in the case of promotion to Professor, all courses taught in the last five years. For tenure and promotion to Professor (i.e., for candidates in the tenure stream), the curriculum vitae must include a complete list of graduate students for whom the candidate has been the principal supervisor at both the masters and doctoral levels, as well as all other graduate students for whom the candidate has provided either co- or secondary supervision.

B. The Teaching Portfolio (to be provided by the candidate)

Each faculty member should maintain a Teaching Portfolio that is updated annually. The general advice that should be given to all faculty is to add to the Teaching Portfolio any document that reflects progress, success, experimentation and innovation (such as course syllabi, sample tests, and classroom activities).⁷ Faculty are also advised to solicit feedback from colleagues, the department chair, and UTSC's Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), as appropriate, on the development of their Teaching Portfolio. Support for Teaching Portfolio development is also available through the tri-campus Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI).⁸

The Teaching Portfolio should include all of the items below that are relevant to the applicant's circumstances:

1. A statement of teaching philosophy, teaching goals, and plans for ongoing development of teaching expertise;
2. Representative course outlines, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, teaching assessment activities, and evidence of student learning;
3. New course proposals;

⁷ In some cases this can include courses taught at other universities in the recent past.

⁸ Information on assembling a Teaching Portfolio can be found at

<http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/topics/documenting-teaching/teaching-dossier.htm>

4. Commentary on the official student evaluations, or other student feedback solicited by the applicant;
5. For tenure or promotion to Professor, evidence that will enable the committee to assess the candidate's success in graduate supervision, including:
 - number of students being supervised
 - quality of graduate students' research
 - quality of theses produced, where possible
 - number of students graduated
 - information on other efforts to foster scholarly, creative and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published
6. Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents;
7. Documentation on efforts made (through both formal and informal means) to improve teaching skills or course design and commentary on the outcomes of these efforts;
8. Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence;
9. Documentation concerning innovations in teaching methods and contributions to curricular development, and the use and development of technology in the teaching process;
10. Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in pedagogical design;
11. Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching, such as presentations at workshops, pedagogical conferences, discipline based conferences on teaching or publications on teaching;
12. Service to professional bodies or community organizations through teaching activities at a level comparable to university instruction.

Note: This list is not intended to be exhaustive; other types of evidence of teaching skill may be required by the relevant discipline or added by the candidate.

C. Student Course Evaluations (to be collected and tabulated by the candidate's academic unit)

1. The candidate's course evaluation results.
2. A comprehensive summary of all of the candidate's course evaluations and an analysis that helps put into context the candidate's course evaluation results.
3. Where a faculty member has taught in another unit at the University of Toronto, the Chair should obtain course evaluations from that unit and include them in the candidate's

teaching dossier. Where a candidate has taught at another university within the last five years, course evaluation information from that institution should be obtained, if possible.

4. In cases of promotion to Professor, copies of teaching evaluations for at least the most recent five-year period should be provided.

D. Other Material Solicited/Provided Candidates Academic Unit

The following material must be included in the Teaching Dossier whenever possible:

1. Letters from current and former undergraduate students commenting on the candidate's success in:
 - stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development;
 - developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field;
 - encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning or other appropriate methods;
 - creating opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process;
 - creating a lasting impact on students' appreciation of the subject or on their career path.

In addition, students should be asked to comment on the candidate's communication skills, active engagement with student's learning progress and accessibility to students.

Normally, a random sample of approximately 100 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, and responses should be sent directly to the Chair. Students may be contacted by letter or email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate. (The Registrar's Office provides student addresses for this purpose.)

2. For tenure and promotion to Professor, letters from former and current graduate students commenting on:
 - the opportunities created by the applicant to involve students in research;
 - whether the supervisory conditions fostered by the applicant were conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies' *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*;
 - the quality of supervision provided by the applicant.
3. Letters from Teaching Assistants commenting on the candidate's management, organization and communications skills. In soliciting these opinions, it is advisable to make clear that responses are voluntary and that they will be held in strict confidence.
4. Letters from peers who are in a position to comment on the candidate's teaching. Where cross-appointment is involved, letters from peers in other departments and divisions may be solicited. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the

teaching competence of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues who co-taught those courses.

5. Course enrolment data, including evidence of demand for elective/senior courses, attrition rates and grade distributions.
6. Where the amount of teaching the candidate has done at either the undergraduate or graduate level varies from the norms of the department, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained by the head or other suitable representative of the candidate's unit.
7. Teaching observation report(s) prepared by one or more colleagues, based on in-class visit(s). Classroom visits must be arranged with the consent of the candidate. If the candidate refuses, this should be noted in the Chair's Report. It is expected that at least one class observation be done within 12 months of the tenure or promotion meeting, and it is advisable that reports by at least two different individuals be prepared. Some units may elect to adopt guidelines encouraging additional earlier visits.
8. For candidates being considered for promotion to Professor on the basis of excellent teaching alone, the following additional material is required:
 - a. copies of teaching evaluations for the candidate's entire career at the University;
 - b. comments from a random sample of no fewer than 200 present and former students (graduate and undergraduate), distributed across the candidate's normal pattern of teaching;
 - c. letters from former students who are scholars or high-level practitioners in the field; those solicited should not be current or recent colleagues of the candidate. Individuals should be asked to comment on how the candidate's teaching influenced their careers and their intellectual, scholarly or creative development.

2. EVALUATION OF THE TEACHING DOSSIER

1. For tenure and for promotion to Professor, the evaluation of the teaching dossier must be done in accordance with procedures laid out in the relevant sections of the Academic Administrator's Procedures Manual.⁹
2. For promotion to Senior Lecturer, written evaluations of the teaching dossier from at least four qualified referees who are at arms-length from the candidate are required. None of these reviewers may be from the candidate's department; at least two of them must be academics from outside the University of Toronto and at least one must be from another department/unit at the University of Toronto. The referees should be asked to provide a critical assessment of all the Teaching Dossier material described in items A-C above, and to explicitly address whether and how the candidate meets the standard of teaching excellence laid out in these Guidelines.

⁹ See <http://aapm.utoronto.ca/academic-administrative-procedures-manual>

The Chair will ask the candidate to submit a list of several potential referees (ideally from both within and outside the University of Toronto) who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's Teaching Dossier and are at arms-length from the candidate. The referees must include at least one suggested by the candidate, and at least one not suggested by the candidate.

At the Chair's discretion, a Teaching Evaluation Committee may also be struck to assist the Promotion Committee.¹⁰ The Teaching Evaluation Committee consists of at least two faculty members who are not on the Promotion Committee, and must produce a single report commenting on the Teaching Dossier, and whether and how the candidate meets the standard of teaching excellence laid out in these Guidelines. The Teaching Evaluation Committee, if one is struck, should be provided only the Teaching Dossier, and not the referees' reports.

¹⁰ Unlike the case of tenure and promotion to full professor where the committee in charge must evaluate both teaching and research, and therefore seeks the assistance of two separate committees each providing an assessment of one of these components, for promotion to senior lecturer only teaching is assessed. Thus, it is left to the Chair's discretion to determine whether a separate teaching committee is required.

Request for recommendation for approval of the revised

**GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVENESS OF
TEACHING (at UTSC)**

Existing Guidelines were revised in 2012. They have been used to assess the teaching effectiveness of those faculty with teaching duties at each rank change. In 2012 there were 5 ranks for faculty who teach.

Asst. Professor, tenure stream



Associate Professor, tenure stream



Professor, tenure stream

Lecturer in our teaching stream



Senior Lecturer in our teaching stream

The 2012 guidelines were still robust for all ranks, even with the rank changes approved through governance as of November 2016

Asst. Professor, tenure stream



Associate Professor, tenure stream



Professor , tenure stream

Lecturer became



Senior Lecturer became

Assistant Professor, teaching stream



Associate Professor, teaching stream

Asst. Professor, tenure stream



Associate Professor, tenure stream



Professor, tenure stream

Assistant Professor, teaching stream



Associate Professor, teaching stream



Professor, teaching stream

**required change to U of T
policy for assessing
teaching effectiveness and
changes to Divisional
guidelines such as UTSC's**

December 2016:

- *Policy & Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream* introduces new rank: Professor, Teaching Stream
- Necessitates revision of Divisional Teaching guidelines

March/April 2017:

- Instruction by Vice Provost Faculty & Academic Life (VPFAL) on revising guidelines
- UTSC: broad consultation on draft 1
 - Expanded format, criteria remained the same as 2012

Summer 2017: First round of review by VPFAL

- *All divisions instructed to rewrite guidelines to ensure clear alignment with policy*

Proposed Timeline

Current status:

Guidelines:

- circulated to faculty @ UTSC (December 2017)
- reviewed & approved in principle by Vice Provost Faculty & Academic Life (December 2017)
- Revisions done after consultations with UTSC Chairs and faculty (January 2018)
- Minor Language revisions done after last consultation with VPFAL Feb 12, 2018

Consultations:

- VPFAL (complete done in multiple iterations)
- Dean, UTSC (complete, done in two major iterations)
- Chairs & Directors (complete, done in two major iterations)
- UTSC Faculty: complete done in 2X2 major iterations

Revised document to enter Governance in cycle 4:

- February 13: UTSC Academic Affairs requesting a recommendation for approval
- February 27: Academic Policy & Programs (final approval)**

Passage on February 27th would allow Promotion applications this year

Guiding ideas: New draft

Vice Provost FAL (and Dean's Office):

- Adherence to policy & language of policy, not just for the new language for promotion to Professor, teaching stream, but for the language for Guidelines for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness for all Ranks.

UTSC revision team: Andrade, Hasenkampf, Lewis

- **Incorporate comments from** discussions since 2012 and in particular in the recent multiple rounds of UTSC consultations
- **Create a useful, practical document** for use by Chairs, Directors, and candidates that makes very clear 'who provides what' both to the candidates and their departmental administrators.
- **Explicitly includes** different forms of scholarly practice
- **Clarity** Increase examples of how demonstrate criteria
Decrease use of footnotes & creation of separate sections for
tenure stream and teaching stream

We believe that the guidelines presented retain the essence of our previous guidelines but

- provide more flexibility in how excellence is achieved
- provide more examples of how effectiveness and excellence could be demonstrated that resonant with both streams
- align more explicitly with U of T policy for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness across the document
- provide clarity for both academic administrators and candidates in the assembly of materials, and in the assessment of the assembled materials

Thank You, questions?