| **FOR APPROVAL** | **PUBLIC** | **OPEN SESSION** |

TO: Academic Board

SPONSOR: Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and Provost
CONTACT INFO: (416) 978-2122, provost@utoronto.ca,

PRESENTER: See Sponsor
CONTACT INFO:

DATE: May 22, 2018 for May 31, 2018

AGENDA ITEM: 8a

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Revised Divisional Teaching Evaluation Guidelines for the University of Toronto Mississauga:
  "University of Toronto Mississauga Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching"

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs has the authority to approve revised
  Divisional Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching and/or Creative Professional Activity
  (AP&P Terms of Reference, Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval)

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. University of Toronto Mississauga, Academic Affairs Committee: March 28, 2018
2. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs AP&P (May 10, 2018) [for approval]
3. **Academic Board (May 31, 2018) [for information]**

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

HIGHLIGHTS:

The University of Toronto Mississauga brought forward its revised Divisional Guidelines for the
Assessment of Teaching and /or Creative Professional Activity to AP&P for approval in the fall
as part of a University-wide initiative to bring divisional teaching 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].

UTM's revised guidline was approved by the Academic Affairs Committee on October 30, 2017
and by the Committee on Academic Policy & Programs (AP&P) on November 2, 2017.

Subsequent to approval by AP&P, a number of small changes were proposed to wording to ensure that the revised Guidelines conform explicitly to policy and to avoid any potential for confusion. The edits do not alter the expectations, requirements or processes laid out in the original revised document as approved by the AAC and AP&P. Attached is a track changes version of the revised document which allows colleagues to see the changes made. A clean copy with the changes accepted is also provided.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

None

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

- University of Toronto Mississauga:
    - "University of Toronto Mississauga Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching" (clean copy)
    - "University of Toronto Mississauga Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching" (track changes copy)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA
GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING

This document sets out the guidelines for the evaluation of teaching at the University of Toronto Mississauga. Following the *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions[1]*, UTM's guidelines clarify attributes that UTM considers particularly relevant in evaluating teaching to arrive at the judgement of competence or excellence in teaching in our academic community.   There are four administrative appendices to this document to be used for the evaluation of teaching for the purposes of: 1) tenure review; 2) promotion to Professor for tenure stream faculty; 3) continuing status review for teaching stream faculty; and 4) promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream for teaching steam faculty. Criteria defined under policy set out the attributes that must be met to achieve competence or excellence in teaching as required by the relevant policy and criteria and will be discussed within each of the appendices.

A.   The Teaching Portfolio (to be submitted by the candidate)

Each tenure stream and teaching stream faculty member should maintain a teaching portfolio or dossier which should be updated annually. The candidate, with appropriate assistance and advice from the Unit head, will prepare a dossier in accordance with these guidelines. The general advice that should be given to all faculty, especially junior faculty, is to keep any document that is relevant to their teaching progress and achievements.

It is important for faculty to recognize that the teaching portfolio is composed of documentation which can demonstrate their involvement and quality of teaching relative to the attributes expected of a faculty member at each stage of their career. Each teaching dossier will differ depending upon the discipline and therefore it is incumbent upon the candidate to clearly describe their involvement in teaching such that an assessment can be properly made as set out in policy. The candidate should seek advice and input from colleagues, the Unit head as well as a variety of teaching support services such as the Center for Teaching Support and Innovation, University of Toronto[2] and the Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre, UTM[3]

Examples of material in a teaching portfolio are listed below. This list is a guideline of the types of material that can be included in a teaching portfolio. It is not expected that all of these areas will be covered in each portfolio since they are discipline-dependent. Please include as appropriate:

1.   The faculty member's curriculum vitae, containing a list of all courses taught and, if applicable, a complete list of undergraduate and graduate students for whom the candidate has been the principal supervisor and/or a member of the supervisory committee.

The preparation of the CV is the responsibility of the candidate. The CV should be comprehensive and include the academic history of the candidate including teaching, and scholarly and/or creative professional work and, if applicable, any creative professional activities such as professional innovation, creative excellence, exemplary professional practice, and contributions to the development of the profession/discipline. It should also include 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 which relate to the candidate's academic discipline and pedagogical or professional activities or educational leadership.

2.   A statement of teaching philosophy.

---

[1] *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
[2] Center for Teaching Support and Innovation http://teaching.utoronto.ca/
[3] Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/asc/our-mission-0

3. Representative course outlines, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, and teaching assessment activities, including examples of efforts to promote students' understanding of the research process.
4. New course proposals
5. Plans for developing teaching and learning effectiveness.
6. Digests of annual student course evaluations and letters or testimonials from students regarding teaching performance, including details of how the material was procured.
7. Any other forms of teaching evaluations.
8. Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents.
9. Documentation on efforts made through both formal and informal means to improve teaching skills or course design and a description of the outcomes.
10. Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence.
11. Documentation concerning innovations in teaching methods and contributions to curricular development, including activities related to the administrative, organizational, and developmental aspects of education and the use and development of technology in the teaching process.
12. Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in the area of pedagogical design.
13. Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching, such as publications or conference presentations on teaching and learning.
14. Service to professional bodies or organizations that are related to teaching and learning.
15. Creative professional practice that contributes to enhancement of teaching and learning.
16. Community outreach and service through teaching functions.

This list is not definitive and may vary by discipline. Significant variations should be reported to the Dean for approval.

B. Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

A faculty member demonstrates capabilities as a teacher in lectures, seminars, laboratories and tutorials as well as in less formal teaching situations, including directing graduate students and counselling and mentoring graduate and undergraduate students. The guidelines for tenure, continuing status and promotion prescribe in detail the procedures to be followed in the evaluation of teaching activities. The level of achievement deemed necessary will depend on the rank being sought. Accordingly, there will be some variation in the components and emphases of the documentation collected for each process, reflecting the different stages of an academic career.

The minimum standards required of all faculty members for achieving competence or excellence in teaching are outlined below. Effectiveness in teaching may be assessed as demonstrating either competence or excellence in teaching.

B(1)   Competence in Teaching

The minimum standards for an assessment of competence are:

1. Success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development.
2. Strong communication skills.
3. Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field.
4. Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry.
5. Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, as well as discipline-specific skills.
6. Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress.

7. Adherence to the expectations of academic integrity and to the grading standards of the division and, as appropriate, the ethical standards of the profession.
8. Where possible, creation of opportunities that involve students in the research process.
9. For members of the graduate faculty, creation of supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*[4].

B(2)   Excellence in Teaching

In order for teaching to be judged as excellent, the following criteria are considered:

1. Superlative teaching skills, as evidenced by superior performance in many of the points above.
2. Creative educational leadership.
3. Successful innovations in the teaching domain, including the creation of new and innovative teaching processes and materials, assignments, and forms of evaluation.
4. 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.
5. Publication of innovative textbooks, articles about pedagogy, websites and other online material and/or teaching guides.
6. Development of significant new courses and/or reform of curricula.
7. Development of innovative and creative ways to promote students' involvement in the research process and provide opportunities for them to learn through discovery-based methods.
8. Significant contribution to pedagogical changes in a discipline.

---

[4] *School of Graduate Studies Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*;
https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf

APPENDIX 1: EVALUATION OF TEACHING IN TENURE REVIEW

Policy References: Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (June 26, 2015)[5]

A.   Criteria for tenure (PPAA, 2015, Section III, Part 13b)

Tenure is granted "on the basis of three essential criteria: achievement in research and creative professional work, effectiveness in teaching, and clear promise of future intellectual and professional development." Specifically "[c]lear promise of future intellectual and professional development must be affirmed for tenure to be awarded. Demonstrated excellence in one of research (including equivalent and creative or professional work) and teaching, and clearly established competence in the other, form the second essential requirement for a positive judgment by the tenure committee."

The PPAA observes that "Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated in lectures, seminars, laboratories and tutorials as well as in more informal teaching situations such as counselling students and directing graduate students in the preparation of theses. It is, however, recognized that scholarship must be manifested in the teaching function and that a dogmatic attempt to separate "scholarship" and "teaching" is somewhat artificial. Three major elements should be considered in assessing the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching: the degree to which he or she is able to stimulate and challenge the intellectual capacity of students; the degree to which the candidate has an ability to communicate well; and the degree to which the candidate has a mastery of his or her subject area."

B.   Teaching Portfolio (UTM's *Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*)

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain a teaching portfolio, in accordance with UTM's *Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*.   The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the Unit head at the beginning of the tenure process and comprises one of the elements for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

C.   Information to be solicited/provided by the Department, Centre or Institute

1.   Copies of UTM's student course evaluations. Where a candidate has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, student course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Unit head and included in the candidate's teaching portfolio.

2.   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
   - Ability to communicate well
   - Mastery of subject area
   - Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
   - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
   - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
   - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
   - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

   Normally, a random sample of at least 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Unit head. The Unit may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

---

[5] Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (June 26, 2015)
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppoct302003.pdf

3. Letters from all former and current graduate students commenting on the candidate's ability in creating:
   - Opportunities to involve students in the research process.
   - Supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*.[6]

4. Formal peer evaluation (internal and external), including other departmental, divisional, or college assessments where cross-appointment is involved. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.

5. Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

6. Course enrolment data.

7. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.

8. In the case of individuals being recommended for appointment from outside the University, information from the institutions in which they have taught that will help us to assess how their teaching experience compares with that expected of internal tenure candidates.

D.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee

1. The Unit head should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the unit or a closely-related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. The individuals cannot be members of the tenure committee and may be drawn from the rank of associate or full professor, teaching stream, and associate or full professor tenure stream, although the committee should include at least one tenured faculty member.

2. With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

3. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C. Using the criteria outlined in the UTM *Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*, its report should be a critical assessment of all materials, including an analysis of student course evaluation results and an evaluative summary of the classroom visit (this visit involving at least one member of the committee and made subject to the candidate's permission). If permission for this visit is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's report.

4. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement[7] which states that:

   A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, taking care to make himself or herself accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments,

---

[6] School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision;*
https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf
[7] Memorandum of Agreement, 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf

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.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved competence or excellence in teaching using the criteria set out in policy. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against the conferral of tenure.

APPENDIX 2: EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR PURPOSES OF PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Policy Reference: Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions[8]

A.   **Criteria for promotion** (PPP, Section 7)

"The successful candidate for promotion will be expected to have established a wide reputation in his or her field of interest, to be deeply engaged in scholarly work, and to have shown himself or herself to be an **effective teacher**. These are the main criteria. However, either excellent teaching alone or excellent scholarship alone, sustained over many years, could also in itself justify eventual promotion to the rank of Professor."

B.   **Attributes of teaching for promotion** (PPP, Section 12a)

"Teaching includes lecturing, activity in seminars and tutorials, individual and group discussion, laboratory teaching, and any other means by which students derive educational benefit. Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated by the degree to which the candidate for promotion is able to stimulate and challenge the intellectual ability of students, to communicate academic material effectively, and to maintain a mastery of his or her subject areas. It also involves maintaining accessibility to students, and the ability to influence the intellectual and scholarly development of students."

C.   **Teaching Portfolio** (*UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*)

It is the responsibility of the each faculty member to maintain a teaching portfolio, in accordance with *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*.   The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the Unit head at the beginning of the promotions process and comprise one of the elements for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

D.   **Information to be solicited/provided by the Department, Centre or Institute**

1.   Copies of UTM's student course evaluations. Where a candidate has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, student course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Unit head and included in the candidate's teaching portfolio.

2.   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
   - Ability to communicate academic material effectively
   - Mastery of the subject area
   - Success in developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
   - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
   - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
   - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
   - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

Normally, a random sample of at least 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Unit head. The Unit may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

---

[8] Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion, http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppapr201980.pdf

3. Letters from all former and current graduate students commenting on the candidate's ability in creating:
    *   Opportunities to involve students in the research process
    *   Supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision.*[9]

4. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses

5. Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

6. Course enrolment data.

7. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.

D.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee

1. The Unit head should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the Unit or of a closely related program, who are in a position to the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. The individuals may be drawn from the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream or Full Professor, Teaching Stream and Associate or Full Professor, although the committee should include at least one tenured faculty member. Teaching Evaluation Committee members should not normally be members of the Promotions Committee.

2. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C. Using the *UTM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching,* the Committee's report should be a critical assessment of all these materials, including an analysis of course evaluations results.

3. With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

4. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement[10] which states that:

    A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, 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.

---

[9] School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision;*
https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf
[10] Memorandum of Agreement, 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf

5.   Note that, for promotion on the basis of teaching alone, the Promotions Policy requires evidence of excellence 'sustained over many years' so the documentation to support such a recommendation would need to be extremely comprehensive and, in addition to superlative teaching skills, the candidate would need to meet additional criteria for excellence cited in *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching.* In addition to solicitation of letters from a random sample of 200 former students, letters should be solicited from former students who are scholars in the field. Those solicited should not be current or recent colleagues of the candidate and should be asked to comment on how the candidate's teaching influenced their careers and influenced their intellectual and scholarly development.

6.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate is an effective teacher as per the criteria set out in policy, and in the case of promotion on the basis of teaching alone, a judgement of excellence in teaching must be concluded. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against promotion.

**APPENDIX 3: EVALUATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES AND
PEDAGOGICAL/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
FOR CONTINUING STATUS REVIEW**

Policy Reference: Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (June 26, 2015)[11]

A.   **Criteria for continuing status** (PPAA, Section VII, Part 30, x)

"A positive recommendation for continuing status will require the judgment of excellence in teaching and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.

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."

B.   **Teaching Portfolio** (*UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*)

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain a teaching portfolio, in accordance with *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*.   The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the Unit head at the beginning of the continuing status review process and comprise one of the elements for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

C.   **Information to be solicited/provided by the Department, Centre or Institute**

1.   Copies of UTM's student course evaluations. Where a candidate has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, student course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Unit head and included in the candidate's teaching portfolio.

2.   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
   - Ability to communicate well
   - Mastery of subject area
   - Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
   - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
   - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
   - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
   - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

   Normally, a random sample of at least 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Unit head. The Unit may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

---

[11] Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (June 26, 2015),
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppoct302003.pdf

3. Formal peer evaluation (internal and external), including other departmental, divisional, or college assessments where cross-appointment is involved. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.

4. (If applicable) Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

5. Course enrolment data.

6. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.

7. In the cases of persons being newly appointed from outside the University, information from the institutions in which they have taught, with an indication of how this teaching experience compares with UTM's requirements of internal candidates for continuing status review.

For evaluation of continued future pedagogical/professional development in relation to the criteria cited above, the candidate could provide evidence pertaining to:

1. Participation in curricular development and any relevant work in progress and the introduction of new pedagogical techniques.

2. Ongoing pursuit of further academic qualifications.

3. Discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches.

4. Participation at, and contributions to academic conferences in sessions on pedagogical research and technique.

5. Teaching-related activity by the candidate outside of his/her classroom functions and responsibilities.

6. Professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of their subject area.

For evaluation of administrative service, the candidate should provide:

Information on administration of large courses, program coordination, committee service, organization of labs, appointment of teaching assistants, committee work, service to the University of Toronto Faculty Association, and student counselling.

D.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee

1. The Unit head should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the Unit or a closely related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously.

2. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C. Using the *UTM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching,* the Committee's report should be a critical assessment of all these materials, including an analysis of course evaluations results.

3. With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or both members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom on at least two separate occasions. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

4. The success of the candidate's supervision of undergraduate or graduate students, where appropriate, should be reviewed explicitly.

5. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement[12] which states that:

   A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, 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.

6. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved excellence in teaching and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development   as set out in policy. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against continuing status.

E. The Selection and Role of the Referees

1. As per policy (PPAA, 2015, Section VII, Part 30, x) "Written specialist assessments of the candidate's teaching and pedagogical/professional activities should also be obtained from outside the University; the candidate should be invited to nominate several external referees, and the division head or chair should solicit letters of reference from at least one of them and from one or more additional specialists chosen by himself or herself. These referees should be invited to assess the candidate's work against the Divisional Guidelines for the granting of continuing status and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellence in teaching and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development."

2. Referees are expected to assess the candidate's work against the Divisional Guidelines for the granting of continuing status and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellence in teaching and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.

3. Referees are not to make a recommendation either for or against the granting of continuing status.

---

[12] Memorandum of Agreement, 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf

APPENDIX 4: EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR PURPOSES OF PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR, TEACHING STREAM

Policy Reference: Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion to Teaching Stream 2016[13], PPPTS)

Each year, unit heads will identify all of the Associate Professors, Teaching Stream, who are eligible to be considered for promotion to Full Professor, Teaching Stream. The names and CVs of these individuals will be forwarded to the unit level Promotions Committee for initial review. The Promotion Committee considering a teaching stream candidate will consist of at least five tenured or continuing status faculty at the rank of Professor and/or Professor, Teaching Stream, with at least one faculty member at the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream[14].

Associate Professors, Teaching Stream may request, in writing to their unit head, that they be considered for promotion in any given year. The Promotions Committee is obliged to give the candidate detailed consideration along with any other candidates under consideration.

A.   Criteria for promotion (PPPTS, 2016, part 6)

"Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream will be granted on the basis of excellent teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years, outlined more fully below in paragraphs 8, 9, and 10 and recommendation on their assessment are set forth in paragraph 11. Administrative or other service to the University and related activities will be taken into account in assessing candidates for promotion, but given less weight than the main criteria: promotion will not be based primarily on such service."

B.   Teaching Portfolio (*UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching***)**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain a teaching portfolio, in accordance with *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*.   The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the Chair at the beginning of the review process and comprise one of the elements for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

C.   Information to be solicited/provided by the Department, Centre or Institute

1.   Copies of UTM's student course evaluations. Where a candidate has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, student course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Chair and included in the candidate's teaching portfolio.

2.   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
  - Ability to communicate well
  - Mastery of subject area
  - Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
  - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
  - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
  - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
  - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

---

[13] Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion to Teaching Stream 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.lamp4.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/p0105-papfgp-2016-2017pol.pdf
[14] Until a sufficient number of teaching stream faculty have attained this rank, this requirement shall be waived and the full committee shall be constituted by five tenured faculty at the rank of Professor.

Normally, a random sample of at least 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Unit head. The Unit may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

3. Formal peer evaluation (internal and external), including other departmental, divisional, or college assessments where cross-appointment is involved. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.

4. (If applicable) Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

5. Course enrolment data.

6. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.

7. In the cases of persons being newly appointed from outside the University, information from the institutions in which they have taught, with an indication of how this teaching experience compares with UTM's requirements of internal candidates for review.

For evaluation of educational leadership and/or achievement in relation to the criteria cited above , the candidate could provide evidence of any teaching-related activities that show significant impact in the following:

1. Enhanced student learning.

2. Creation and/or development of models of effective teaching.

3. Engagement in the scholarly conversation via pedagogical scholarship or creative professional activity.

4. Significant changes in policy related to teaching as a profession.

5. Technological or other advances in the delivery of education in a discipline or profession.

For evaluation of continued future pedagogical/professional development in relation to the criteria cited above, the candidate could provide evidence pertaining to any of the following activities:

1. Participation in curricular development and any relevant work in progress and the introduction of new pedagogical techniques.

2. Ongoing pursuit of further academic qualifications.

3. Discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches.

4. Participation at and contributions to academic conferences in sessions on pedagogical research and technique.

5. Teaching-related activity by the candidate outside of his/her classroom functions and responsibilities.

6.   Professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of their subject area.

For evaluation of administrative service, the candidate should provide:

Information on administration of large courses, program coordination, committee service, organization of labs, appointment of teaching assistants, committee work, service to the University of Toronto Faculty Association, and student counselling.

D.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee

1.   The Unit head should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the unit or a closely related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously.

2.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C.   Using the *UTM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching,* the Committee's report should be a critical assessment of all these materials, including an analysis of course evaluations results.

3.   With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or both members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom on at least two separate occasions. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

4.   The success of the candidate's supervision of undergraduate or graduate students, where appropriate, should be reviewed explicitly.

5.   The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement[15] which states that:

A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, 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.

6.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved excellence in teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years as set out in policy.   Note that the committee should not recommend for or against promotion.

E.   The Selection and Role of the Referees

1.   As per policy letters must be solicited from internal and external assessors as per policy (PPPTS, 2016, Part 11)   "Confidential written assessments of the candidate's teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, should be

---

[15] Memorandum of Agreement, 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf

obtained from specialists in the candidate's field from outside the University and whenever possible from inside the University. When a teaching stream faculty member is or recently has been cross- appointed to another division, assessments should be sought from the other division. The candidate will be invited to nominate several external referees. The Dean or Chair and the Promotions Committee (see paragraph 20) will whenever possible add to the list of referees. The Dean or Chair will solicit letters from at least three external referees and where possible these should include at least one referee suggested by the candidate and one referee suggested by the Promotions Committee. Where the Chair solicits the letters, the referee should send a copy of the response to the Dean. These referees should be invited to assess the candidate's work against the Divisional Guidelines and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellent teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years. All referees' letters will be transmitted to the Promotions Committee and held in confidence by its members."

2.   Referees are expected to assess the candidate's work against the Divisional Guidelines for the granting of promotion and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellence in teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development.

3.   Referees are not to make a recommendation either for or against the granting of promotion.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA
GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING

This document sets out the guidelines for the evaluation of teaching at the University of Toronto Mississauga. Following the *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions[1]*, UTM's guidelines clarify attributes that UTM considers particularly relevant in evaluating teaching to arrive at the judgement of competence and or excellence in teaching in our academic community.   There are four administrative appendices to this document to be used for the evaluation of teaching for the purposes of: 1) tenure review; 2) promotion to Professor for tenure stream faculty; 3) continuing status review for teaching stream faculty; and 4) promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream for teaching steam faculty. Criteria defined under policy set out the attributes that must be met to achieve competence or excellence in teaching as required by the relevant policy and criteria and will be discussed within each of the appendices.

A.   **The Teaching Portfolio (to be submitted by the candidate)**

Each tenure stream and teaching stream faculty member should maintain a teaching portfolio or dossier which should be updated annually. The candidate, with appropriate assistance and advice from the Unit head, will prepare a dossier in accordance with these guidelines. The general advice that should be given to all faculty, especially junior faculty, is to keep any document that is relevant to their teaching progress and achievements.

It is important for faculty to recognize that the teaching portfolio is composed of documentation which can demonstrate their involvement and quality of teaching relative to the attributes expected of a faculty member at each stage of their career. Each teaching dossier will differ depending upon the discipline and therefore it is incumbent upon the candidate to clearly describe their involvement in teaching such that an assessment can be properly made as set out in policy. The candidate should seek advice and input from colleagues, the Unit head as well as a variety of teaching support services such as the Center for Teaching Support and Innovation, University of Toronto[2] and the Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre, UTM[3]

Examples of material in a teaching portfolio are listed below. This list is a guideline of the types of material that can be included in a teaching portfolio. It is not expected that all of these areas will be covered in each portfolio since they are discipline-dependent. Please include as appropriate:

1.   The faculty member's curriculum vitae, containing a list of all courses taught and, if applicable, a complete list of undergraduate and graduate students for whom the candidate has been the principal supervisor and/or a member of the supervisory committee.

The preparation of the CV is the responsibility of the candidate. The CV should be comprehensive and include the academic history of the candidate including teaching, and scholarly and/or creative professional work and, if applicable, any creative professional activities such as professional innovation, creative excellence, exemplary professional practice, and contributions to the development of the profession/discipline. It should also include 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 which relate to the candidate's academic discipline and pedagogical or professional activities or educational leadership.

2.   A statement of teaching philosophy.

---

[1] *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
[2] Center for Teaching Support and Innovation http://teaching.utoronto.ca/
[3] Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/asc/our-mission-0

3. Representative course outlines, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, and teaching assessment activities, including examples of efforts to promote students' understanding of the research process.
4. New course proposals
5. Plans for developing teaching and learning effectiveness.
6. Digests of annual student course evaluations and letters or testimonials from students regarding teaching performance, including details of how the material was procured.
7. Any other forms of teaching evaluations.
8. Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents.
9. Documentation on efforts made through both formal and informal means to improve teaching skills or course design and a description of the outcomes.
10. Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence.
11. Documentation concerning innovations in teaching methods and contributions to curricular development, including activities related to the administrative, organizational, and developmental aspects of education and the use and development of technology in the teaching process.
12. Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in the area of pedagogical design.
13. Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching, such as publications or conference presentations on teaching and learning.
14. Service to professional bodies or organizations that are related to teaching and learning.
15. Creative professional practice that contributes to enhancement of teaching and learning.
16. Community outreach and service through teaching functions.

This list is not definitive and may vary by discipline. Significant variations should be reported to the Dean for approval.

B.   Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

A faculty member demonstrates capabilities as a teacher in lectures, seminars, laboratories and tutorials as well as in less formal teaching situations, including directing graduate students and counselling and mentoring graduate and undergraduate students. The guidelines for tenure, continuing status and promotion prescribe in detail the procedures to be followed in the evaluation of teaching activities. The level of achievement deemed necessary will depend on the rank being sought. Accordingly, there will be some variation in the components and emphases of the documentation collected for each process, reflecting the different stages of an academic career.

The minimum standards required of all faculty members for achieving competence or excellence in teaching are outlined below. Effectiveness in teaching may be assessed as demonstrating either competence or excellence in teaching.

B(1)   Competence in Teaching

The minimum standards required of all faculty members are as followsfor an assessment of competence are:

1. Success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development.
2. Strong communication skills.
3. Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field.
4. Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry.
5. Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, as well as discipline-specific skills.
6. Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress.

Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching

7. Adherence to the expectations of academic integrity and to the grading standards of the division and, as appropriate, the ethical standards of the profession.
8. Where possible, creation of opportunities that involve students in the research process.
9. For members of the graduate faculty, creation of supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision[4]*.

B(2)   Excellence in Teaching

In order for teaching to be judged as excellent, the following criteria are considered:

1. Superlative teaching skills, as evidenced by superior performance in many of the points above.
2. Creative educational leadership.
3. Successful innovations in the teaching domain, including the creation of new and innovative teaching processes and materials, assignments, and forms of evaluation.
4. 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.
5. Publication of innovative textbooks, articles about pedagogy, websites and other online material and/or teaching guides.
6. Development of significant new courses and/or reform of curricula.
7. Development of innovative and creative ways to promote students' involvement in the research process and provide opportunities for them to learn through discovery-based methods.
8. Significant contribution to pedagogical changes in a discipline.

---

[4] *School of Graduate Studies Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*;
https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf

APPENDIX 1: EVALUATION OF TEACHING IN TENURE REVIEW

Policy References: Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (June 26, 2015)[5]

A.   Criteria for tenure (PPAA, 2015, Section III, Part 13b)

Tenure is granted "on the basis of three essential criteria: achievement in research and creative professional work, effectiveness in teaching, and clear promise of future intellectual and professional development." Specifically "[c]lear promise of future intellectual and professional development must be affirmed for tenure to be awarded. Demonstrated excellence in one of research (including equivalent and creative or professional work) and teaching, and clearly established competence in the other, form the second essential requirement for a positive judgment by the tenure committee."

The PPAA observes that "Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated in lectures, seminars, laboratories and tutorials as well as in more informal teaching situations such as counselling students and directing graduate students in the preparation of theses. It is, however, recognized that scholarship must be manifested in the teaching function and that a dogmatic attempt to separate "scholarship" and "teaching" is somewhat artificial. Three major elements should be considered in assessing the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching: the degree to which he or she is able to stimulate and challenge the intellectual capacity of students; the degree to which the candidate has an ability to communicate well; and the degree to which the candidate has a mastery of his or her subject area."

B.   Teaching Portfolio (UTM's *Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*)

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain a teaching portfolio, in accordance with UTM's *Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*.   The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the Unit head at the beginning of the tenure process and comprises one of the elements for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

C.   Information to be solicited/provided by the Department, Centre or Institute

1.   Copies of UTM's student course evaluations. Where a candidate has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, student course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Unit head and included in the candidate's teaching portfolio.

2.   Letters ~~of assessment~~ from current and former undergraduate students commenting on the candidate's:
   - Success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development
   - Ability to communicate well
   - Mastery of subject area
   - Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
   - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
   - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
   - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
   - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

   Normally, a random sample of at least~~approximately~~ 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Unit head. The Unit may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

---

[5] Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (June 26, 2015)
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppoct302003.pdf

3. Letters from all former and current graduate students commenting on the candidate's ability in creating:
   - Opportunities to involve students in the research process.
   - Supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*.[6]

4. Formal peer evaluation (internal and external), including other departmental, divisional, or college assessments where cross-appointment is involved. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.

5. Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

6. Course enrolment data.

7. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.

8. In the case of individuals being recommended for appointment from outside the University, information from the institutions in which they have taught that will help us to assess how their teaching experience compares with that expected of internal tenure candidates.

D.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee

1. The Unit head should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the unit or a closely-related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. The individuals cannot be members of the tenure committee and may be drawn from the rank of associate or full professor, teaching stream, and associate or full professor tenure stream, although the committee should include at least one tenured faculty member.

2. With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

3. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C. Using the criteria outlined in the UTM *Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*, its report should be a critical assessment of all materials, including an analysis of student course evaluation results and an evaluative summary of the classroom visit (this visit involving at least one member of the committee and made subject to the candidate's permission). If permission for this visit is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's report.

4. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement[7] which states that:

   A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, taking care to make himself or herself accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments,

---

[6] School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision;*
https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf
[7] Memorandum of Agreement, 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf

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.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved competence or excellence in teaching using the criteria set out in policy. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against the conferral of tenure.

APPENDIX 2: EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR PURPOSES OF PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Policy Reference: Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions[8]

A.   Criteria for promotion (PPP, Section 7)

"The successful candidate for promotion will be expected to have established a wide reputation in his or her field of interest, to be deeply engaged in scholarly work, and to have shown himself or herself to be an **effective teacher**. These are the main criteria. However, either excellent teaching alone or excellent scholarship alone, sustained over many years, could also in itself justify eventual promotion to the rank of Professor."

B.   Attributes of teaching for promotion (PPP, Section 12a)

"Teaching includes lecturing, activity in seminars and tutorials, individual and group discussion, laboratory teaching, and any other means by which students derive educational benefit. Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated by the degree to which the candidate for promotion is able to stimulate and challenge the intellectual ability of students, to communicate academic material effectively, and to maintain a mastery of his or her subject areas. It also involves maintaining accessibility to students, and the ability to influence the intellectual and scholarly development of students."

C.   Teaching Portfolio (*UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*)

It is the responsibility of the each faculty member to maintain a teaching portfolio, in accordance with *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*.   The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the Unit head at the beginning of the promotions process and comprise one of the elements for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

D.   Information to be solicited/provided by the Department, Centre or Institute

1.   Copies of UTM's student course evaluations. Where a candidate has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, student course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Unit head and included in the candidate's teaching portfolio.

2.   Letters ~~of assessment~~ from current and former undergraduate students commenting on the candidate's:
   - Success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development
   - Ability to communicate academic material effectively
   - Mastery of the subject area
   - Success in developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
   - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
   - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
   - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
   - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

Normally, a random sample of at least~~approximately~~ 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Unit head. The Unit may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

---

[8] Policy and Procedures ~~g~~Governing ~~Promitions~~Promotion, http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppapr201980.pdf

3.   Letters from all former and current graduate students commenting on the candidate's ability in creating:
- Opportunities to involve students in the research process
- Supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision.*[9]

4.   Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses

5.   Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

5.   Course enrolment data.

6.   Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.

D.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee

1.   The Unit head should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the Unit or of a closely related program, who are in a position to the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. The individuals may be drawn from the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream or Full Professor, Teaching Stream and Associate or Full Professor, although the committee should include at least one tenured faculty member. Teaching Evaluation Committee members should not normally be members of the Promotions Committee.

2.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C.   Using the *UTM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching,* the Committee's report should be a critical assessment of all these materials, including an analysis of course evaluations results.

3.   With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

4.   The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement[10] which states that:

A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, 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.

---

[9] School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision;*
https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Documents/supervision+guidelines.pdf
[10] Memorandum of Agreement, 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf

5. Note that, for promotion on the basis of teaching alone, the Promotions Policy requires evidence of excellence 'sustained over many years' so the documentation to support such a recommendation would need to be extremely comprehensive and, in addition to superlative teaching skills, the candidate would need to meet additional criteria for excellence cited in *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*. In addition to solicitation of letters from a random sample of 200 former students, letters should be solicited from former students who are scholars in the field. Those solicited should not be current or recent colleagues of the candidate and should be asked to comment on how the candidate's teaching influenced their careers and influenced their intellectual and scholarly development.

6. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate is an effective teacher as per the criteria set out in policy, and in the case of promotion on the basis of teaching alone, a judgement of excellence in teaching must be concluded. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against promotion.

**APPENDIX 3: EVALUATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES AND
PEDAGOGICAL/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
FOR CONTINUING STATUS REVIEW**

Policy Reference: Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (June 26, 2015)[11]

A.   Criteria for continuing status (PPAA, Section VII, Part 30, x)

"A positive recommendation for continuing status will require the judgment of excellence in teaching and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.

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."

B.   Teaching Portfolio (*UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching***)**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain a teaching portfolio, in accordance with *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*.   The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the Unit head at the beginning of the continuing status review process and comprise one of the elements for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

C.   Information to be solicited/provided by the Department, Centre or Institute

1. Copies of UTM's student course evaluations. Where a candidate has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, student course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Unit head and included in the candidate's teaching portfolio.

2. Letters ~~of assessment~~ from current and former undergraduate students commenting on the candidate's:
   - Success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development
   - Ability to communicate well
   - Mastery of subject area
   - Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
   - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
   - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
   - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
   - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

   Normally, a random sample of at least~~approximately~~ 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Unit head. The Unit may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

---

[11] Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (June 26, 2015),
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppoct302003.pdf

Formatted: Indent: Left: -1.25 cm, Hanging: 1 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 cm + Indent at: 0.63 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: -1.25 cm, Hanging: 1 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 cm + Indent at: 0.63 cm

3. Formal peer evaluation (internal and external), including other departmental, divisional, or college assessments where cross-appointment is involved. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.

4. (If applicable) Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

5. Course enrolment data.

6. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.

7. In the cases of persons being newly appointed from outside the University, information from the institutions in which they have taught, with an indication of how this teaching experience compares with UTM's requirements of internal candidates for continuing status review.

For evaluation of continued future pedagogical/professional development in relation to the criteria cited above, the candidate cshould provide evidence pertaining to:

1. Participation in curricular development and any relevant work in progress and the introduction of new pedagogical techniques.

2. Ongoing pursuit of further academic qualifications.

3. Discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches.

4. Participation at, and, more important, contributions to academic conferences in sessions on pedagogical research and technique.

5.4. Teaching-related activity by the candidate outside of his/her classroom functions and responsibilities.

6.5. Professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of their subject area, provided that such professional work enhances the teaching missions of the faculty member's academic unit and UTM. Units may develop specific criteria and documentation requirements for use in the assessment of professional work in the judgment on continued future pedagogical/professional development. Such criteria should be forwarded to the Dean for his/her review.

1. **For evaluation of administrative service, the candidate should provide:**

2. Information on one's administration of large courses, program coordination, committee service, organization of labs, appointment of teaching assistants, committee work, service to the University of Toronto Faculty Association, and student counselling.

D.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee

1. The Unit head should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the Unit or a closely related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and

rigorously.

2. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C. Using the *UTM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching,* the Committee's report should be a critical assessment of all these materials, including an analysis of course evaluations results.

3. With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or both members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom on at least two separate occasions. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

4. The success of the candidate's supervision of undergraduate or graduate students, where appropriate, should be reviewed explicitly.

5. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement[12] which states that:

    A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, 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.

6. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved excellence in teaching and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development ~~in teaching~~ as set out in policy. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against continuing status.

E.   The Selection and Role of the Referees

1. As per policy (PPAA, 2015, Section VII, Part 30, x) "Written specialist assessments of the candidate's teaching and pedagogical/professional activities should also be obtained from outside the University; the candidate should be invited to nominate several external referees, and the division head or chair should solicit letters of reference from at least one of them and from one or more additional specialists chosen by himself or herself. These referees should be invited to assess the candidate's work against the Divisional Guidelines for the granting of continuing status and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellence in teaching and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development."

2. Referees are expected to assess the candidate's work against the Divisional Guidelines for the granting of continuing status and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellence in teaching and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.

3. Referees are not to make a recommendation either for or against the granting of continuing status.

---

[12] Memorandum of Agreement, 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf

APPENDIX 4: EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR PURPOSES OF PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR, TEACHING STREAM

Policy Reference: Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion to Teaching Stream 2016[13], PPPTS)

Each year, unit heads will identify all of the Associate Professors, Teaching Stream, who are eligible to be considered for promotion to Full Professor, Teaching Stream. The names and CVs of these individuals will be forwarded to the unit level Promotions Committee for initial review. The Promotion Committee considering a teaching stream candidate will consist of at least five tenured or continuing status faculty at the rank of Professor and/or Professor, Teaching Stream, with at least one faculty member at the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream[14].

Associate Professors, Teaching Stream may request, in writing to their unit head, that they be considered for promotion in any given year. The Promotions Committee is obliged to give the candidate detailed consideration along with any other candidates under consideration.

A.   Criteria for promotion (PPPTS, 2016, part 6)

"Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream will be granted on the basis of excellent teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years, outlined more fully below in paragraphs 8, 9, and 10 and recommendation on their assessment are set forth in paragraph 11. Administrative or other service to the University and related activities will be taken into account in assessing candidates for promotion, but given less weight than the main criteria: promotion will not be based primarily on such service."

B.   Teaching Portfolio (*UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching***)**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain a teaching portfolio, in accordance with *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*.   The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the Chair at the beginning of the review process and comprise one of the elements for the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

C.   Information to be solicited/provided by the Department, Centre or Institute

~~5.~~1.   Copies of UTM's student course evaluations. Where a candidate has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, student course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Chair and included in the candidate's teaching portfolio.

~~6.~~2.   Letters ~~of assessment~~ from current and former undergraduate students commenting on the candidate's:
- Success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development
- Ability to communicate well
- Mastery of subject area
- Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
- Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
- Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
- Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
- Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

---

[13] Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion to Teaching Stream 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.lamp4.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/p0105-papfgp-2016-2017pol.pdf
[14] Until a sufficient number of teaching stream faculty have attained this rank, this requirement shall be waived and the full committee shall be constituted by five tenured faculty at the rank of Professor.

Formatted: Indent: Left: -1.25 cm, Hanging: 1 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 cm + Indent at: 0.63 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: -1.25 cm, Hanging: 1 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 cm + Indent at: 0.63 cm

Normally, a random sample of at leastapproximately 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Unit head. The Unit may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

3.   Formal peer evaluation (internal and external), including other departmental, divisional, or college assessments where cross-appointment is involved. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.

4.   (If applicable) Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

5.   Course enrolment data.

6.   Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.

7.   In the cases of persons being newly appointed from outside the University, information from the institutions in which they have taught, with an indication of how this teaching experience compares with UTM's requirements of internal candidates for review.

For evaluation of educational leadership and/or achievement in relation to the criteria cited above , the candidate shcould provide evidence of any teaching-related activities that show significant impact in the following:

Appendix 4: Evaluation of Teaching for Purposes of Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

1. Enhanced student learning
1.2. ~~through c~~Creation and/or development of models of effective teaching.

3. ~~Enhanced student learning through~~

2. ~~e~~Engagement in the scholarly conversation via pedagogical scholarship or ~~c~~.
3.

~~C~~reative professional activity.

4. Significant changes in policy related to teaching as a profession

5. Technological or other advances in the delivery of education in a discipline or profession.

For evaluation of continued future pedagogical/professional development in relation to the criteria cited above, the candidate ~~c~~should provide evidence pertaining to any of the following activities:

1. Participation in curricular development and any relevant work in progress and the introduction of new pedagogical techniques.

2. Ongoing pursuit of further academic qualifications.

3. Discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches.

4. Participation at and ~~, more important,~~ contributions to academic conferences in sessions on pedagogical research and technique.

5. Teaching-related activity by the candidate outside of his/her classroom functions and responsibilities.

6. Professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of their subject area~~, provided that such professional work enhances the teaching missions of the faculty member's academic unit and UTM. Departments may develop specific criteria and documentation requirements for use in the assessment of professional work in the judgment on continued future pedagogical/professional development. Such criteria should be forwarded to the Dean for review~~.

3. **For evaluation of administrative service, the candidate should provide:**

4. Information on administration of large courses, program coordination, committee service, organization of labs, appointment of teaching assistants, committee work, service to the University of Toronto Faculty Association, and student counselling.

D. **The Teaching Evaluation Committee**

7.1. The Unit head should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the unit or a closely related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously.

8.2.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C.   Using the *UTM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching,* the Committee's report should be a critical assessment of all these materials, including an analysis of course evaluations results.

9.3.   With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or both members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom on at least two separate occasions. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

10.4.   The success of the candidate's supervision of undergraduate or graduate students, where appropriate, should be reviewed explicitly.

11.5.   The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement[15] which states that:

A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, 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.

12.6.   The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved excellence in teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years as set out in policy.   Note that the committee should not recommend for or against promotion.

E.   **The Selection and Role of the Referees**

1.   As per policy letters must be solicited from internal and external assessors as per policy (PPPTS, 2016, Part 11)   "Confidential written assessments of the candidate's teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, should be obtained from specialists in the candidate's field from outside the University and whenever possible from inside the University. When a teaching stream faculty member is or recently has been cross- appointed to another division, assessments should be sought from the other division. The candidate will be invited to nominate several external referees. The Dean or Chair and the Promotions Committee (see paragraph 20) will whenever possible add to the list of referees. The Dean or Chair will solicit letters from at least three external referees and where possible these should include at least one referee suggested by the candidate and one referee suggested by the Promotions Committee. Where the Chair solicits the letters, the referee should send a copy of the response to the Dean. These referees should be invited to assess the candidate's work against the Divisional Guidelines and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellent teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing

---

[15] Memorandum of Agreement, 2016;
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/memoagree.pdf

pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years. All referees' letters will be transmitted to the Promotions Committee and held in confidence by its members."

2.   Referees are expected to assess the candidate's work against the Divisional Guidelines for the granting of promotion and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellence in teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development.

3.   Referees are not to make a recommendation either for or against the granting of promotion.