

**FOR RECOMMENDATION****PUBLIC****OPEN SESSION**

**TO:** Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

**SPONSOR:** Sioban Nelson, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs  
**CONTACT INFO:** (416) 978-3742, vp.fal@utoronto.ca,

**PRESENTER:** Sioban Nelson, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs  
**CONTACT INFO:** (416) 978-3742, vp.fal@utoronto.ca

**DATE:** February 14, 2018 for February 27, 2018

**AGENDA ITEM:** 4

**ITEM IDENTIFICATION:**

Revised Divisional Teaching Evaluation Guidelines for the Faculty of Arts and Science:  
“Guidelines and Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching Stream Faculty (for Probationary, Continuing Status and Promotion Reviews)”

**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. **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs [for approval] (February 27, 2018)**
2. Academic Board [for information] (March 15, 2018)

**PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:****HIGHLIGHTS:**

The attached are the newly revised divisional teaching evaluation guidelines for teaching stream faculty in the Faculty of Arts and Science. (The Faculty also has a separate document for tenure stream faculty, the “Faculty of Arts and Science, Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching in Tenure and Promotion Decisions.”) This is one of a series of revised guidelines that are being or will be brought forward for approval by AP&P following local divisional approval.

These revisions are part of a University-wide initiative to bring divisional teaching evaluation guidelines into line with recent changes to the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* [PPAA] and the approval of the new *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream* [PPPTS].

In December 2014, the Special Joint Advisory Committee negotiations between the University of Toronto administration and the University of Toronto Faculty Association resulted in agreement on a series of changes in principle in respect to teaching stream faculty (Approved February 26, 2015). Revisions to the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* [PPAA] were approved in June 2015 by Governing Council. These included a number of changes including the introduction of professorial ranks and titles for faculty in the teaching stream.

The agreement in principle achieved through the SJAC process also included agreement that promotion from Associate Professor, Teaching Stream to Professor, Teaching Stream “shall be based on excellent teaching, educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years.” The new PPPTS (approved December 16, 2016) enshrined this in policy.

In order to be implemented, the new policy relies on divisional teaching evaluation guidelines - like the PPAA (which governs the appointment and tenure review or continuing status review of faculty with continuing appointments in the tenure and teaching stream) and the Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions [PPP] (which governs the promotion of tenure stream faculty). As Vivek Goel explained in PDAD&C memo #134, the University's "Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions" provide a framework for the development by each division of the approved divisional guidelines for the evaluation of teaching. The “approved divisional guidelines have the force of policy.”

These divisional guidelines:

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

The revisions being made to divisional teaching guidelines by all divisions at this time include changes to bring them in line with recent changes as a result of the SJAC process to reflect

- Changes to the existing PPAA including:
  - New professorial rank for the teaching stream,
  - Introduction of mandatory probationary review
  - Change in terminology where teaching stream faculty now come forward for “continuing status review” rather than “promotion”
  - New language clarifying the criteria for continuing status
  - New language clarifying the scope of what is included under scholarship
  - The continuing status dossier must include “Written specialist assessments of the candidate's teaching and pedagogical/professional activities .... from outside the University.”

- Approval of the new *Policy and Procedures on Promotion in the Teaching Stream, 2016* [PPPTS]

In the Faculty of Arts and Science, the guidelines for the evaluation of teaching relevant to teaching stream faculty were last updated November 2016. In addition to the specific changes noted above, the Faculty of Arts and Science expanded the scope of their previous document to address all facets of the review process for teaching stream faculty.

The process by which divisional guidelines were revised involved a highly consultative process. Within the Faculty of Arts and Science, an advisory committee was formed which comprised both tenure stream and teaching stream faculty. Co-chaired by the Vice Dean, Teaching & Learning and the Vice-Dean, Faculty & Academic Life with support from Director, HR and Director, Teaching Support & Faculty Development, this committee prepared a number of iterations of the revised document. These revisions were subject to extensive consultation with:

- the Dean and Vice-Deans
- Chairs and Program Directors through CPAD meeting (Fall 2017)
- all teaching stream faculty in A&S. Faculty were sent a copy directly via email and given a chance to comment and/or to attend one of two information sessions (November 2017)

Following Provostial approval, the final revised document was taken forward to and approved by the Faculty of Arts and Science Faculty Council on December 13, 2017.

Subsequent to approval by the Faculty of Arts and Science Council, 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 did not alter the expectations, requirements or processes laid out in the original revised document as approved by the FAS Council on December 13, 2017. As a result, the Agenda Committee of the FAS Council felt that the revisions could appropriately be reviewed and approved at the level of the Agenda Committee. This was done February 16, 2018. It is anticipated that the revised copy will be taken forward for information to the FAS Council on March 21, following approval by AP&P.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

None

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Be it Resolved:

THAT the revised “Guidelines and Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching Stream Faculty (for Probationary, Continuing Status and Promotion Reviews)” brought forward from the Faculty of Arts and Science as attached, be approved effective immediately.

---

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:**

Faculty of Arts and Science

- “Guidelines and Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching Stream Faculty (for Probationary, Continuing Status and Promotion Reviews)”
- previous version being replaced.



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

**Faculty of Arts & Science**  
**Guidelines and Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching Stream Faculty**  
**(for Probationary, Continuing Status and Promotion Reviews)**

Policy References: [Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments](#) (26 June 2015)  
[Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream](#)  
(16 December 2016)

**Section 1: Introduction**

According to the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* (PPAA), the expectation of faculty members in the teaching stream is that they bring a dimension of teaching excellence and educational innovation that enhances undergraduate or graduate education and adds significantly to the quality of the student experience (PPAA, VII, 30(i)a). In the Faculty of Arts & Science, faculty members in the teaching stream bring together expert knowledge in their field and exemplary practices in university teaching. Their role is to serve as integral members of the Faculty of Arts & Science, developing, delivering and reimagining courses; identifying, devising and testing effective teaching strategies and sharing their experiences with colleagues; serving as mentors and leaders for teaching; and demonstrating, in a range of innovative and creative ways, their commitment to student learning.

Given this central and multi-faceted role within the Faculty, “teaching” for teaching stream faculty incorporates all activities from which students derive a direct or indirect educational benefit. This includes, for example, in-class and online teaching; lab and practice-based teaching; coordination of multi-section courses; individual and group student mentoring and advising; course and curriculum development; undergraduate and graduate supervision; support for the teaching development of others through mentorship and other forms of educational leadership and achievement; pedagogical scholarship; discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches; and the exploration or development of new teaching approaches.

**Section 2: Probationary Review**

Assistant Professors, Teaching Stream should undergo a Probationary Review no earlier than May 1 of the third year of their contract. The Probationary Review is a mechanism to assess a faculty member’s performance and determine whether or not they will receive a second probationary appointment. It is also an opportunity to provide feedback on performance and, more specifically, on areas for improvement. Following a successful review, a candidate will be granted a renewal of their contract for a period of two years.

**A. Criteria to Assess Performance for the Probationary Review**

The Probationary Review Committee should consider two questions:

i) Has the appointee's performance been sufficiently satisfactory for a second probationary appointment to be recommended?

ii) If reappointment is recommended, what counselling should be given to the appointee to assist them to improve areas of weakness and maintain areas of strength?

In addressing the second question (ii), the Committee should provide direction regarding areas on which the candidate should focus in preparation for the Continuing Status Review. Direct reference to the assessment criteria for the Continuing Status Review may be appropriate to help guide the candidate.

## **B. Assembling the Documentation for the Probationary Review**

To address the questions noted above, the following documentation should be provided to the Probationary Review Committee:

*From the candidate:*

1. Up-to-date CV

Preparation of the CV in the approved A&S format shall be the responsibility of the candidate with appropriate assistance and advice from the academic unit head. The CV shall include a list of all courses taught since initial appointment or throughout the faculty member's entire career, and a list of all undergraduate and/or graduate students for whom the candidate has been a supervisor or a supervisory committee member.<sup>1</sup>

2. Teaching dossier

The candidate should prepare a dossier that focuses on activities and contributions since the time of initial appointment. The dossier normally will not exceed 60 pages in total and should include:

*Teaching contributions:*

- a) A statement of teaching philosophy that details how particular pedagogical approaches/strategies are addressing the candidate's goals. (1-2 pages)
- b) A list of courses taught. This may take the form of a table and should include the course code, name, level, and number of students. (1 page)
- c) Representative course outlines and materials, reading lists, assignments, etc. (up to 40 pages)
- d) A statement about the course evaluations that reflects on how the candidate has responded to student feedback in relation to course design, teaching approaches, etc. (1 page)
- e) Where appropriate, a list of undergraduate and graduate students for whom the candidate has been the primary supervisor, a second reader or committee member.
- f) A description of any course/curriculum development efforts and/or plans, for example the revision of existing courses or the development of new courses. (1-2 pages)

The dossier may also include evidence in the following areas:

---

<sup>1</sup> As per the School of Graduate Studies Graduate Faculty Membership Eligibility Guidelines, as Associate Members, teaching stream faculty may serve as a member of a thesis supervisory committee and as a sole/major supervisor of a master's thesis but may not serve as the sole/major supervisor for a doctoral thesis. For additional details see: <http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/facultyandstaff/Pages/GFM-Eligibility.aspx>

- a) *Innovative teaching initiatives* (1-3 pages)  
A description of any teaching initiatives undertaken or planned by the candidate. For example, initiatives relating to teaching methods and materials, application and/or receipt of instructional development grants.
- b) *Educational leadership and/or achievement* (1-2 pages)  
A description of any activities and/or plans for contributions in this area. For example, presentations at pedagogical conferences, publications on teaching, community outreach, engagement with professional teaching and learning organizations/centres.
- c) *Pedagogical/professional development* (1-2 pages)  
A list of any pedagogical/professional development activities undertaken with specific reference to any efforts made to improve teaching skills. A statement about the candidate's pedagogical/professional development goals and plans.

*From the academic unit head:*

1. Letters from students  
Normally, a representative sample of approximately 200 of the candidate's students should be solicited by the academic unit head for feedback, to be addressed in writing to the unit head. Letters may take the form of emails, be sent via email or received in hard copy.
2. Feedback from colleagues  
Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters regarding the candidate's teaching should be solicited from colleagues in those courses. Letters may also be solicited from colleagues who have collaborated with the candidate on pedagogical initiatives or scholarship.
3. Course evaluation reports  
Summary reports for all courses taught by the candidate since their initial appointment should be provided to the committee. The reports should include the quantitative data for all institutional questions, including comparative departmental data. Additionally, all qualitative comments from two or three courses that reflect the various types of teaching in which the candidate engages (e.g. large lecture and a small seminar) should be provided.

### **C. Probationary Review Committee**

*Composition of the Committee*

The Probationary Review Committee is appointed by the academic unit head, and includes:

- A minimum of two faculty members with tenure or continuing status from the academic unit who hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor. Normally, both the teaching stream and the tenure stream should be represented in the membership. If there are no Associate or Full Professors, Teaching Stream in the unit, a representative from a cognate unit may be included.
- One of the members of the Probationary Review Committee will serve as its chair.
- If the candidate has a budgetary cross-appointment, the Committee should be jointly appointed by the respective academic unit heads.
- If the candidate teaches graduate courses or has an appointment to a graduate unit, the head of the graduate unit or their delegate may participate in the Committee or provide input.

### *Responsibilities of the Committee*

The Probationary Review Committee will consider the two questions listed above in Section 2.A. To accomplish this, they are responsible for:

1. Reviewing all of the materials submitted by the candidate and the unit.
2. For candidates whose appointment includes classroom teaching on a regular basis, conducting classroom visits or other teaching observations. Normally, two such visits will be carried out. These visits should allow committee members to observe classes that reflect the various types of teaching in which the candidate engages (e.g. a large lecture and a small seminar). The candidate should be consulted in advance to identify appropriate times for these visits.
3. Preparing a report that addresses the questions noted in Section 2.A above and synthesizes the Committee's assessment of the materials provided for the review (including the classroom visits/teaching observations and course evaluations). The report should cite evidence in support of the Committee's recommendations and the rationale for their recommendation should be given based on the criteria for the review. The report should also indicate any counselling the Committee recommends be given to the candidate.

### *Committee Recommendations*

After receiving the Probationary Review Committee's report and recommendation, the academic unit head should notify the candidate in writing no later than December 31 that their contract will be renewed for another two years, or that their contract will not be renewed and will end on the following June 30.

In either case, the rationale for the recommendation should be given based on 2.A(i) above. Evidence in support of the recommendation should be cited. If the contract is being extended, the academic unit head should carefully review the counselling or advice that the committee is recommending the faculty member be given [i.e., 2.A(ii) above] and add their comments or suggestions to ensure that the candidate receives the best advice the academic unit can provide. Where it might be helpful, excerpts from the Probationary Review Committee's report may be included in the letter to the candidate. If the counselling recommended involves follow-up, it is the responsibility of the academic unit head to see that this is done.

<b>Section 3: Continuing Status Review and Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream</b>
--

Assistant Professors, Teaching Stream should receive notification of their Continuing Status Review no later than May 1 of their fifth year. The purpose of the Continuing Status Review is to assess a faculty member's performance and determine whether or not they will receive continuing status and promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream.

#### **A. Criteria to Assess Performance for the Continuing Status Review**

As per the PPAA (VII, 30(x) a-b), 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.

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

### ***Excellence in Teaching***

In the Faculty of Arts & Science, it is expected that all faculty demonstrate fundamental teaching skills which include: the ability to successfully stimulate and challenge students and promote their intellectual and scholarly development; strong communication skills; success in encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject matter; and, success in using meaningful methods of assessment that reflect and contribute to student learning. It is also expected that all faculty maintain a thorough and up-to-date understanding of their subject matter and integrate this into their courses accordingly.

Excellence in teaching, which is the standard of excellence required for all teaching stream faculty, is understood to go beyond the demonstration of fundamental teaching skills. For a judgment of excellence, candidates must demonstrate a combination of:

- excellent teaching skills,
- innovative teaching initiatives, and
- creative educational leadership and/or achievement.

A recommendation of excellence in teaching will normally be based on evidence of excellence across multiple criteria. Note that the precise activities and methods through which faculty members demonstrate their contributions in each of these areas may differ by disciplinary context. To demonstrate excellence in teaching, Table 1 below provides an overview of the types of contributions one might see in a candidate's dossier.

<b>Table 1: Excellence in Teaching</b>	
<b>Area of contribution</b>	May be demonstrated through....
<b>Excellent Teaching Skills</b>	<p>Excellent teaching skills must be exhibited in a consistent and ongoing manner to promote student learning. These skills may be demonstrated through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary in-class or online teaching practices</li> <li>• Rigorous and insightful use of an evidence-informed approach in the design of learning activities, assignments, courses or curriculum that motivate student learning</li> <li>• Actively integrating one's own research and/or scholarship into teaching practice and curriculum</li> <li>• Use of professional expertise and experience to deepen student understanding and enrich the application of theory</li> <li>• Excellent coordination and/or management of courses and/or teaching assistants that has a positive impact on the student learning experience</li> <li>• Creation of opportunities that involve undergraduate and/or graduate students in the research process (e.g. presenting or publishing with students, mentoring/coaching students)</li> <li>• Successful supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate students, as evidenced by the completion of theses/dissertations or other significant research projects</li> <li>• Recognition of teaching through nomination for or receipt of awards/honours</li> </ul>
<b>Innovative Teaching Initiatives</b>	<p>Innovative teaching initiatives are evidenced by significant and ongoing contributions to course, curriculum or program development. This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of new courses/curricula or reform of courses/curricula</li> <li>• Successful innovations in the teaching domain, including the creation of new, innovative and exemplary teaching processes, materials, tools or forms of assessment</li> </ul>

**Table 1: Excellence in Teaching**

Area of contribution	May be demonstrated through....
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Development of unique learning experiences for students (e.g. career or community-engaged learning opportunities)</li> <li>• Significant contribution to the technological enrichment of teaching and/or courses (e.g. through the development or creative application of effective new technology or media)</li> <li>• Leveraging of grants or funds to support the development and implementation of pedagogical initiatives</li> <li>• Conducting pilots of new teaching methods or curricular content</li> <li>• Creation of major new initiatives to support teaching and/or learning</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Creative Educational Leadership and/or Achievement</b></p>	<p>Creative educational leadership and/or achievement are evidenced by contributions that have a significant impact beyond the classroom. These may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant contributions to pedagogical development or pedagogical change in a discipline or broader educational context. For example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Introduction of new pedagogical techniques</li> <li>○ Development of educational materials (e.g. textbooks, teaching guides)</li> <li>○ Production of technological tools or multi-media resources that enrich teaching and learning</li> <li>○ Invitations to serve as curriculum or program evaluator for another academic unit or institution</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Oversight of major new initiatives to support teaching and/or learning</li> <li>• Active and significant engagement in the professional development of others. For example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Delivering workshops, seminars or presentations on teaching and learning</li> <li>○ Acting as an active and engaged teaching mentor to colleagues</li> <li>○ Providing mentorship and establishing best practices in the management and leadership of teaching assistants and instructional team members</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Significant engagement in professional teaching and learning organizations/associations or work with teaching centres. For example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Serving as a journal reviewer or editor of a pedagogical publication or as a proposal referee for pedagogical conferences.</li> <li>○ Serving in a leadership role in professional teaching and learning organizations/associations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Significant engagement in teaching-related activity outside of one's classroom functions and responsibilities. For example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Outreach activities, work with community organizations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Significant engagement in professional organizations and the application of this knowledge to teaching and the curriculum in one's own unit or beyond</li> <li>• Organization of conferences/symposia focused on teaching and learning</li> <li>• Engagement with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). For example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Conducting research on teaching and/or learning that has potential for impact beyond a single classroom</li> <li>○ Dissemination of one's own pedagogical research (e.g. through scholarly articles or educational resources, presentations at conferences, workshops, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

### ***Demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development***

Pedagogical and professional development will take many forms. For the Continuing Status Review, candidates should provide evidence of demonstrated and ongoing development, some of which may be to address areas for improvement, others to expand or enhance their skills and knowledge. In some cases, it may involve building and sharing their expertise in a particular area. As noted below, the candidate's dossier should include a professional development plan that reflects their ongoing and regular reflection on their teaching practices.

Teaching stream faculty may demonstrate pedagogical/professional development activities in a variety of ways, for example, through:

- Discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches.
- Keeping abreast of current pedagogical research in their field.
- Participation at, and contributions to, academic conferences, where sessions on pedagogical research and techniques are prominent.
- Professional work that allows them to maintain a mastery of their subject area, provided that such professional work enhances directly the teaching mission of the faculty member's academic unit and the Faculty of Arts & Science.
- Participation in professional development activities such as workshops, courses or seminars on teaching and learning that furthers their expertise in a particular pedagogical area and allows them to refine and enhance their teaching practices.
- Responding to feedback (from students, colleagues, and/or mentors) on their teaching through the development of pedagogical/professional goals.
- Ongoing pursuit of further academic qualifications relevant to their position.

### **B. Assembling the Documentation for the Continuing Status Review**

Documentation for the committee will come from multiple sources including the candidate, students, and peers. Together, these materials will enable a holistic assessment of the candidate's teaching excellence (as demonstrated through excellent teaching skills, innovative teaching initiatives, and creative educational leadership/achievement) and demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.

Candidates (through the dossier) must describe how their teaching and pedagogical/professional development meet the assessment criteria. Evidence in the dossier, and that collected by the academic unit head, should reflect the argument the candidate has made about their teaching contributions so that the committee can make a holistic assessment of the candidate.

*Materials to be supplied by the candidate:*

Following consultation with the unit head, the candidate is responsible for providing the following:

1. Up-to-date CV  
Preparation of the CV in the approved A&S format shall be the responsibility of the candidate with appropriate assistance and advice from the unit head. The CV shall include a list of all courses taught in the last five years or throughout the faculty member's entire career and a list of all graduate or undergraduate students for whom the candidate has been a supervisor or a supervisory committee member.
2. Teaching dossier  
The teaching dossier should provide evidence relating to the criteria stated above. Specifically, it should indicate clearly the areas where the candidate has made significant

contributions and provide a description of these contributions along with supporting evidence. See Table 1 in Section 3.A. above for an overview of the types of contributions that might be captured in a dossier.

To address criterion (a) “excellence in teaching”, candidates may wish to provide evidence in their teaching dossier in the following areas:

*Excellent teaching skills:*

- a) A statement of teaching philosophy that details how particular pedagogical approaches/strategies are addressing the candidate’s goals.
- b) A list of courses taught/coordinated. This may take the form of a table and should include the course code, name, level, and number of students.
- c) Where appropriate, a list of undergraduate and graduate students for whom the candidate has been the primary supervisor, a second reader or committee member.
- d) Representative course outlines and materials, reading lists, and assignments, etc.
- e) A description of revisions to existing courses or the development of new courses. This should include a rationale for the changes made or the gap filled by a new course.
- f) A statement about the course evaluations that reflects on how the candidate has responded to student feedback in relation to course design, teaching approaches, etc.
- g) Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence.

*Innovative teaching initiatives:*

- a) An introductory narrative that summarizes the innovative teaching initiatives undertaken by the candidate. This statement should serve as a means of contextualizing the evidence presented in this area.
- b) Documentation of innovative teaching initiatives that reflect significant ongoing contributions to course, curriculum or program development. As noted in Table 1 in Section 3.A, these may include activities related to the administrative, organizational and developmental aspects of education.
- c) Representative materials to illustrate contributions relating to innovative teaching initiatives. This may include descriptions of initiatives, reports, relevant course materials, descriptions of funded projects, etc.

*Creative educational leadership and/or achievement:*

- a) An introductory narrative that summarizes the educational leadership and/or achievement undertaken by the candidate. This statement should serve as a means of contextualizing the evidence presented in this area.
- b) Documentation of creative educational leadership/achievement contributions that have a significant impact beyond the classroom. This may include the types of activities outlined in Table 1 in Section 3.A above.
- c) Representative materials to demonstrate contributions in creative educational leadership and/or achievement. This may include a list of pedagogical publications/presentations, samples of pedagogical scholarship, descriptions of achievements, reports, etc.

To address criterion (b) “evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical and/or professional development”, candidates may wish to provide evidence such as:

- a) A statement about the candidate’s pedagogical/professional development goals and the impact that any particular activities have had on their teaching practice.
- b) Documentation of pedagogical/professional development efforts (through both

formal and informal means). Such efforts may be demonstrated in a variety of ways (see Section 3.A for some examples).

3. Names of up to four potential assessors who are competent to assess the candidate's teaching (excellent teaching skills, innovative teaching initiatives, and creative educational leadership/achievement) and continuing future pedagogical/professional development. Former supervisors, co-instructors, co-authors and former students should not act as external assessors.

*Documentation to be collected by the academic unit head:*

1. Course evaluations

Copies of student course evaluations for the candidate's entire career at the University should be collected for the purpose of the Continuing Status Review. This should include evaluations of any courses in the Faculty of Arts & Science as well as those taught in other academic divisions within the University of Toronto. A comprehensive summary of all teaching evaluations should be prepared by the Teaching Evaluation Committee (see below).

2. Letters from external assessors

A minimum of four letters of appraisal should be solicited by the academic unit head. Of these, at least one letter will be from an assessor selected from the candidate's list and two to three letters will be from assessors chosen by the unit head. Assessors should be faculty members from external institutions with excellent undergraduate programs, who are either tenured or hold appointments that are similar to a teaching stream appointment with continuing status. Where appropriate, one external assessor may be an expert in the field from the external non-academic community. Former supervisors, co-instructors, co-authors and former students should not act as external assessors.

In addition to these four letters of appraisal, a principal external assessor from another academic institution that has excellent undergraduate programs in the same or similar discipline will be chosen by the academic unit head to undertake a review of the candidate. The principal external assessor, with advance notice and permission of the candidate, must observe the candidate in the classroom. (Note: If necessary, a recording or live stream of the class may be used.) The principal external assessor should have access to the candidate's teaching dossier and other materials collected for the teaching evaluation committee, with the exception of the appraisals from the other external assessors which will remain confidential to the committee.

Assessors should be invited to assess the candidate's work against these guidelines for the granting of continuing status and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellence in teaching (excellent teaching skills, innovative teaching initiatives, and creative educational leadership/achievement) and evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development. Assessors should not be asked to make a recommendation either for or against continuing status.

The Continuing Status Review dossier should include a separate section listing the name, title, and institution/organization of each assessor and a brief statement on the assessor's expertise and why they were chosen. All assessors should be sent a copy of the relevant section of the Faculty of Arts & Science's *Guidelines and Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching Stream Faculty*.

3. Letters from current and former undergraduate and/or graduate students  
Normally, a representative sample of approximately 200 students should be solicited for feedback, to be addressed, in writing, to the unit head. Students should be asked to comment on:
  - the candidate's ability to stimulate and challenge their intellectual curiosity
  - the candidate's ability to create an environment that was conducive to their learning (as evidenced by the in-class experience, assessments and other course materials)
  - any out-of-class activities that contributed to their learning
  - and, where appropriate, comment on the candidate's effectiveness as a supervisor of undergraduate or graduate student research.
  
4. Letters from co-instructors  
Where the candidate has co-taught courses, letters should be solicited from colleagues in those courses. These letters should speak to:
  - the candidate's teaching skills, and,
  - the candidate's pedagogical contributions to the course, relating to course and/or assignment design, course management, mentorship of teaching assistants, etc.
  
5. Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee  
The unit head will establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee and request a report on their assessment of the candidate (see below). A copy of this report will be provided to the Continuing Status Review Committee.
  
6. Where the amount of teaching varies from the norms of the unit for teaching stream appointments, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained.

### **C. The Continuing Status Review Committee**

The candidate's performance will be assessed by a Continuing Status Review Committee struck for this purpose by the academic unit head. Additionally, the unit head will establish a separate Teaching Evaluation Committee.

#### *Continuing Status Review Committee Composition*

The Continuing Status Review Committee will have at least six (and no more than seven) members, including:

- two faculty members from the teaching stream from the unit or a cognate area,
- two faculty members from the tenure stream from the unit or a cognate area,
- the head of the academic unit (who will normally be the chair of the committee),
- the head of the academic unit (or their representative) to which the candidate is cross-appointed, as appropriate,
- the Dean or their designate.

If the candidate is actively involved in graduate teaching then the chair of the graduate unit in which the candidate teaches should be one of the faculty members on the Committee.

All members of the committee must hold continuing status or tenure. Where budgetary cross-appointments exist, the primary unit is responsible for establishing the committee and conducting the review; however, this should be done in collaboration with the other unit. The unit head recommends the membership of the Continuing Status Review Committee to the Dean for approval and requests the name of the decanal representative.

### *Teaching Evaluation Committee*

The Teaching Evaluation Committee should include a minimum of two faculty members - one from the teaching stream and one from the tenure stream (both of whom hold continuing status or tenure). Ideally, both faculty members should come from the candidate's unit. There should be no overlap of membership on the Continuing Status Review Committee and the Teaching Evaluation Committee.

### *Responsibilities of the Committees:*

The Continuing Status Review Committee will be responsible for:

1. Reviewing all of the materials submitted by the candidate and the academic unit head.
2. Reviewing the report submitted by the Teaching Evaluation Committee (see below).
3. Preparing a thorough report on their critical assessment of all the submitted materials and the Teaching Evaluation Committee report. This report should speak specifically to the criteria outlined above and provide an assessment as to whether or not the candidate meets the criteria<sup>2</sup>

The Teaching Evaluation Committee will be responsible for:

1. For candidates whose appointment includes classroom teaching on a regular basis, conducting classroom visits or other teaching observations. Normally, at least two such visits will be carried out. These visits should allow the committee to observe classes that reflect various types of teaching in which the candidate engages (e.g. a large lecture and a small seminar). The candidate should be consulted in advance to determine which class sessions would be most suitable and to identify appropriate times for these visits.
2. Conducting a thorough review of the candidate's teaching dossier and the feedback collected from students, including letters and course evaluations.
3. Preparing a summary report for the Continuing Status Review Committee that provides a critical assessment of the teaching dossier, the classroom visits/observations and the student feedback (course evaluations and letters) with reference to the criteria for excellence in teaching (excellent teaching skills, innovative teaching initiatives, and creative educational leadership/achievement) and continuing future pedagogical/professional development. The committee's report should not make a recommendation either for or against continuing status.

The Teaching Evaluation Committee shall be provided with copies of all relevant materials, including the candidate's teaching dossier, copies of the syllabi for the courses that they observe, course evaluation reports, and letters solicited from students. Reviews provided by external assessors will not be shared with the Teaching Evaluation Committee.

### *Committee Deliberations and Recommendations*

A written summary of the evidence, without identifying individuals or institutions, shall be provided to the candidate at the time the dossier is submitted to the Continuing Status Review Committee, normally at least one week prior to the meeting of the Committee. The academic unit

---

<sup>2</sup> The report of the committee should also take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement 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".

head shall ask the candidate in writing if they wish to make a written and/or oral submission to the Continuing Status Committee.

All meetings of the Continuing Status Review Committee are held in person and *in camera*. The Committee *quorum* is the full membership. The Committee will make its decision solely on the basis of the evidence before it. A recommendation to grant or deny continuing status must be approved by at least four of the six members of the committee, or by at least five of seven members of an expanded committee.

In the event of a proposed negative recommendation, the academic unit head shall write to the faculty member with a statement of reasons for the proposed decision and with an invitation to respond either orally or in writing within 15 days.

The Continuing Status Review Committee must meet to make its final decision. The Committee shall adopt a statement of reasons for the decision which, along with the summary of the evidence, shall be sent to the Dean. The Dean will forward the recommendation to the Vice-President and Provost for approval. Approvals of continuing status and promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream are forwarded to Academic Board for information.

#### **Section 4: Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream**

Each year, the academic unit head will place before the Departmental Promotions Committee for preliminary consideration the names of all Associate Professors, Teaching Stream in the academic unit, together with their CVs. The Promotions Committee will advise the academic unit head which faculty members should be invited to receive more detailed consideration for promotion.

Associate Professors, Teaching Stream may request that they be considered for promotion in any given year. Such requests are to be made in writing to the academic unit head on or before October 15. In this case, the Promotions Committee is obliged to give the faculty member detailed consideration along with any other candidates under consideration.

##### **A. Criteria to Assess Performance for Promotion**

As outlined in the *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream (PPPTS)*, 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 (PPPTS, 6).

At this stage there is an expectation that the candidate's contributions will be more significant. For example, since their Continuing Status Review, a candidate's teaching excellence may have been recognized by an institutional or external teaching award, one of their teaching initiatives may have been adopted by another institution, or they may have taken on higher level leadership roles within or outside the institution and have had a significant impact on teaching and learning as a result.

Administrative or other service to the University and related activities will also 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.



When a candidate for promotion is or has been cross-appointed, assessments will be sought from all of the units and divisions in which the candidate has served and should be taken fully into account by the Promotions Committee.

In assessing a candidate's teaching, the Promotions Committee should consider the extent to which:

- The candidate has demonstrated excellent teaching, sustained over many years.
- The candidate's contributions have had a significant impact on the unit, division, and/or institution.
- The candidate's educational leadership/achievement has had an impact outside the institution and/or is recognized externally (locally, provincially, nationally and/or internationally).

### ***Excellent Teaching***

For the purposes of the promotion review, in the Faculty of Arts & Science excellent teaching is demonstrated through a combination of:

- excellent teaching skills, and
- innovative teaching initiatives, and
- creative educational leadership and/or achievement.

The range of contributions a candidate may make in each of these areas is outlined in Table 1 in Section 3A above.

### ***Pedagogical and/or Professional Development***

A candidate's ongoing pedagogical/professional development may take the same forms as those outlined in Section 3.A above; however, as with teaching, there is an expectation that such development would be sustained over many years and indicate a strong self-reflective and responsive approach to their pedagogical/professional development goals and plans. The activities outlined in this area should highlight the candidate's ongoing development but should also indicate a significantly more advanced level of development since the candidate achieved continuing status.

### ***Educational Leadership and/or Achievement***

Educational leadership and/or achievement may take the same forms as those outlined in Table 1 in Section 3.A above. As per the PPPTS, such activities "show significant impact in a variety of ways, for example: through enhanced student learning; through creation and/or development of models of effective teaching; through engagement in the scholarly conversation via pedagogical scholarship, or creative professional activity; through significant changes in policy related to teaching as a profession; through technological advances in the delivery of education in a discipline or profession" (PPPTS, p. 4 (9)).

### ***Service to the University and Similar Activities***

Service to the University means primarily administrative or committee work within the University. Consideration will also be given to activities outside the University which further the scholarly and educational goals of the University. Such activities might include service to professional societies directly related to the candidate's discipline, continuing educational activities, work with professional, technical or scholarly organizations or scholarly publications, and membership on or service to governmental committees and commissions. Outside activities are not meant to include general service to the community unrelated to the candidate's scholarly or teaching activities however praiseworthy such service may be.

When appropriate, written assessments of the candidate's service to the University and to learned societies or professional associations which relate to the candidate's academic discipline and scholarly or professional activities will be prepared and presented to the Promotions Committee.

## **B. Assembling the Documentation for Promotion**

The fullest possible documentation should be made available to the Promotions Committee so that each candidate is given detailed consideration. Assembling documents is the responsibility of the academic unit head. The candidate will receive appropriate assistance from the academic unit head in preparing their dossier and other relevant materials.

*Materials to be supplied by the candidate:*

### 1. Up-to-date CV which includes:

- The academic history of the candidate giving a list of all teaching appointments held, other relevant experience and achievements, and a list of all research or other contracts and grants obtained during the preceding five years, at a minimum.
- A list of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative professional work. This could include textbooks, scholarly papers/articles, and reviews, or presentations at meetings and symposia.
- A list of creative professional activities including one or more of the following: professional innovation; exemplary professional practice; contributions to the development of the profession/discipline.
- A list of all courses taught by the candidate during at least the preceding five years. If the candidate has had major responsibility for the design of a course, this should be stated. A list of students whose research work has been supervised should be included, together with their project or thesis topics and the dates of the period of supervision.
- 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. The list should indicate in each case the period of service and the nature of the candidate's participation.

### 2. Teaching dossier

The teaching dossier should provide evidence relating to the criteria stated above. Specifically, it should indicate clearly the areas where the candidate has made significant contributions and provide a description of these contributions along with supporting evidence. The contents of the dossier should include those items listed above in Section 3.B.2 with a particular focus on *at least the preceding five years*. The dossier may also include, as appropriate, any of the following:

- A list of students whose research work has been supervised should be included, together with their thesis topics and the dates of the period of supervision.
- Documentation may include, but is not limited to, publications in a variety of media including but not limited to, scholarly and professional journals, non-peer-reviewed or lay publications, books, CDs, online publications, invited lectures and presentations given at conferences, design of and contribution to academic websites, examples of professional work, and any other evidence of professional development.

3. Names of external assessors

Names of up to four potential external assessors who are competent to assess the candidate's teaching (excellent teaching skills, innovative teaching initiatives, and, creative educational leadership/achievement) and pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years. Former supervisors, co-instructors, co-authors and former students should not act as external assessors.

*Documentation to be collected by the academic unit*

1. Course evaluations

Copies of the candidates' course evaluations should be collected for the purpose of the Promotion Review. Normally, this will include all evaluations since the time of the candidate's Continuing Status Review and for a minimum period of five years. A comprehensive summary of all teaching evaluations should be prepared by the Teaching Evaluation Committee (see below).

2. Letters from external assessors

Although the *PPPTS* states that the academic unit head should solicit letters from at least three external referees, a well-assembled dossier will include **at least five referees' letters** for each candidate. Where possible these should include at least one referee suggested by the candidate. Referees should be asked to send a copy of the response to the Dean. Assessors should be faculty members from external institutions with excellent undergraduate programs, who hold the rank of Full Professor and at least one assessor should have an appointment that is in or is similar to a teaching stream appointment. Where appropriate, one external assessor may be an expert in the field from the external non-academic community.

Assessors should be invited to assess the candidate's work against these guidelines for the granting of Promotion to Full Professor, Teaching Stream and advise whether or not the candidate's work demonstrates the achievement of excellent teaching (as demonstrated through excellent teaching skills, excellence in innovative teaching initiatives, and excellence in creative educational leadership/achievement), evidence of educational leadership and/or achievement, and evidence of demonstrated and ongoing pedagogical/professional development, sustained over many years. Assessors should not be asked to make a recommendation either for or against promotion.

The promotion dossier should include a separate section listing the name, title, and institution/organization of each assessor and a brief statement on the assessor's expertise and why they were chosen. All assessors should be sent a copy of the relevant section of the Faculty of Arts & Science's *Guidelines and Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching Stream Faculty*.

4. Letters from current and former undergraduate and/or graduate students

Normally, a random sample of approximately 200 students should be solicited for feedback, to be addressed, in writing, to the unit head. Students should be asked to comment on:

- the candidate's ability to stimulate and challenge their intellectual curiosity
- the candidate's ability to create an environment that was conducive to their learning (as evidenced by the in-class experience, assessments and other course materials)
- particular teaching approaches used by the candidate that contributed to their learning
- and, where appropriate, comment on the candidate's effectiveness as a supervisor of

undergraduate, graduate, or professional masters student research.

5. Letters from co-instructors

Where the candidate has co-taught courses, letters should be solicited from colleagues in those courses. These letters should speak to:

- the candidate's teaching skills, and,
- the candidate's pedagogical contributions to the course, relating to course and/or assignment design, course management, mentorship of teaching assistants, etc.

### **C. Promotion Committees**

#### *Composition of the Committees*

There will normally be a single departmental Promotions Committee, chaired by the head of the academic unit, to review candidates for promotion in the teaching stream and in the tenure stream. The membership of the Promotions Committee considering a teaching stream candidate will consist of at least five faculty members who hold tenure or continuing status at the rank of Professor, and/or Professor, Teaching Stream, with at least one faculty member at the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream (PPPTS, 17).<sup>3</sup>

The membership of the Promotions Committee will be made known to the teaching stream faculty members of the unit and where possible should change in membership over the years.

The Teaching Evaluation Committee should include at a minimum two faculty members - one from the teaching stream and one from the tenure stream (both of whom are Full Professors). Normally, both faculty members should come from the candidate's unit. There should be no overlap of membership on the Promotions Committee and the internal Teaching Evaluation Committee. More than one Teaching Evaluation Committee may be established where multiple candidates are being considered for promotion.

#### *Responsibilities of the Committees*

The Promotions Committee is responsible for:

1. Reviewing all of the materials submitted for each candidate identified for consideration.
2. Preparing a thorough report with a recommendation regarding each candidate's promotion. The report should speak specifically to the criteria outlined above and reflect both adverse and positive statements appearing in the accompanying documentation.
3. Preparing a promotion dossier, which will be forwarded to the Tri-Campus Decanal Promotions Committee, and includes:
  - a. Chair's Report
  - b. Candidate's CV
  - c. Internal assessments
  - d. External assessments
  - e. Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee
  - f. Copies of course evaluations for the past five years
  - g. Letters from current and former undergraduate and graduate students

---

<sup>3</sup> Until a sufficient number of teaching stream faculty members have attained this rank in the unit or cognate unit, this requirement shall be waived and the full committee shall be constituted by five tenured faculty at the rank of Professor (PPPTS, p.7).

The Teaching Evaluation Committee is responsible for:

1. Conducting classroom visits or other teaching observations (when the candidate's appointment includes classroom teaching on a regular basis). Normally, at least two such visits will be carried out. These visits should allow the committee to observe classes that reflect the various types of teaching in which the candidate engages (e.g. a large lecture and a small seminar). The candidate should be consulted in advance to determine which class sessions would be most suitable and to identify appropriate times for these visits.
2. Conducting a thorough review of the candidate's teaching dossier, the feedback collected from students, including letters and course evaluations.
3. Preparing a summary report for the Promotions Committee that provides an assessment of the teaching dossier, the classroom visits/observations and the student feedback (course evaluations and letters) with reference to the criteria outlined above and provide an assessment as to whether or not the candidate meets the criteria.

The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be provided with copies of all relevant materials, including the candidate's teaching dossier, copies of the syllabi for the courses that they observe, course evaluation reports, and letters solicited from students. Letters of appraisal provided by external assessors will not be shared with the Teaching Evaluation Committee.

#### *Committee Recommendations*

The Committee recommends candidates for promotion to the unit head, who is responsible for making recommendations to the Dean.

## FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

### GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES AND PEDAGOGICAL/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CONTINUING STATUS REVIEW AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, TEACHING STREAM

*Policy Reference:* Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (PPAA), Section VII.30, Teaching Stream Appointments

#### **A. Introduction**

Teaching stream faculty undertake a broad range of activities that contribute to teaching effectiveness in the Faculty of Arts & Science. In some departments, the duties of teaching stream faculty centre exclusively on classroom teaching and directly related administrative duties (including service on departmental committees, course and courseware development and individual student counselling). Teaching stream faculty in other departments organize and lead individual or teams of undergraduates in research projects as a means to enrich undergraduate education. Some teaching stream staff are directly responsible for the administration of one or more large undergraduate courses (often with several sections) or for the co-ordination of undergraduate programs at both the departmental level and in college-based programs. Other administrative duties include, but are not limited to, organizing labs, hiring teaching assistants and oversight of web-based delivery of teaching programs. In addition to duties related to the delivery of undergraduate courses and programs, teaching stream faculty may be responsible for developing course content, including the creation of courseware, multi-media applications and assignments. A summary of these activities, as found in the *PPAA, Section VII.30(i)*, is as follows:

The ranks of Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream (Conditional); Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream; Associate Professor, Teaching Stream; and Professor, Teaching Stream are to be held by faculty members whose duties normally consist of teaching students who are in degree programs or the Transitional Year Programme, and other professional and administrative activities related to teaching. Faculty members in the Teaching Stream may have direct responsibility for the administration of one or more large undergraduate courses or for the co-ordination of undergraduate programs at both the department level and in College-based programs. The expectation of faculty members in the teaching stream is that they bring a dimension of teaching excellence and education innovation that enhances undergraduate or graduate education and adds significantly to the quality of the student experience. Where the position requires graduate teaching, an appointment to a University graduate department will also be made. Other cross-appointments to departments on other campuses may also be made, with or without salary, where appropriate.

#### **B. Criteria to Assess Performance**

The *PPAA, Section VII.30(vi)* outlines the criteria to be used to assess performance for the purpose of review for continuing status as follows:

Performance will be assessed on teaching effectiveness and pedagogical/professional development related to teaching duties in accordance with approved divisional guidelines on the assessment of teaching. Administrative service will be considered, where such service is related to teaching or to curricular and professional development.

A positive recommendation for continuing status requires the judgement of excellence in teaching and evidence of continued future pedagogical/professional development.

Teaching stream faculty, through a combination of experience, professionalism and dedication to pedagogy, bring a dimension of teaching excellence that enhances undergraduate education and adds immeasurably to the quality of the undergraduate experience. The judgement of excellence in teaching should be based on the demonstrated ability of the teaching stream faculty member to directly enhance and enrich undergraduate education and experience.

With such a broad array of duties as described above, the emphasis on the assessment of performance may vary by department or academic unit within the Faculty. For example, in some cases the judgement of excellence in teaching will be made based on classroom, laboratory or studio performance alone. (For the purpose of this document classroom performance includes the development of web based curriculum and individual instruction in writing centres.) In others, administration of degree programs, where such service is directly related to the delivery of teaching and development of curriculum and programming will have significant weight. However, administrative service alone should not be sufficient for a recommendation for continuing status. In all cases, excellence in the classroom, laboratory or studio must be clearly established.

### Competence in Teaching

The minimum standards required of all faculty members for an evaluation of competence in teaching requires demonstration of:

1. success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development;
2. strong communication skills;
3. success in developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field;
4. success in encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning;
5. active engagement with students' learning progress and accessibility to students;
6. promotion of academic integrity and adherence to grading standards of the division and, as appropriate, the ethical standards of profession;

7. where appropriate, creation of opportunities which involve students in the research process;
8. where appropriate, 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.

### Excellence in Teaching

For a successful continuing status review and promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream, the level of involvement in teaching will go well beyond that of competence. Evaluation of excellence in teaching requires, in addition to the criteria for competence, demonstration of some combination of the following:

1. superlative teaching skills;
2. creative educational leadership and/or achievement;
3. successful innovations in the teaching domain, including the creation of new and innovative teaching processes, materials 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 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.

### Pedagogical/Professional Development

Evidence of continued future pedagogical/professional development may be demonstrated in a variety of ways. Some examples include:

1. curricular development and any relevant work in progress and the introduction of new pedagogical techniques;
2. the ongoing pursuit of further academic qualifications;
3. participation at and contributions to academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent;



4. teaching-related activity by the candidate outside of his or her classroom functions and responsibilities; and
5. professional work that allows the faculty member to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area, provided that such professional work enhances directly the teaching mission of the faculty member's academic unit and the Faculty of Arts & Science.

Departments may develop specific criteria and documentation requirements for use in the assessment of professional work in the judgement of continued future pedagogical/professional development. Such criteria should be forwarded to the Dean for review.

### Administrative Service

Under the *PPAA*, administrative service where such service is related to teaching or to curricular and professional development is one of the criteria to be considered to assess performance for the purpose of review for continuing status. As stated above, these duties can include the co-ordination of undergraduate programs and administration of large undergraduate courses, organizing labs, hiring Teaching Assistants, and student counselling. Effective service in academic administration can be considered also as evidence of pedagogical/professional development related to teaching duties.

## **C. Assembling the Documentation**

### Information to be supplied by the candidate

1. Up-to-date CV. Preparation of the CV in the approved A&S format shall be the responsibility of the candidate with appropriate assistance and advice from the department head. The CV shall include a list of all courses taught in the last five years or throughout the faculty member's entire career and a list of all graduate or undergraduate students for whom the candidate has been a supervisor or a supervisory committee member.
2. Teaching portfolio. The teaching portfolio should include as appropriate:
  - A statement of teaching philosophy and plans for developing teaching skills.
  - Representative course outlines, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship.
  - New course proposals.
  - Digests of annual student evaluations and letters or testimonials from students regarding teaching performance.
  - Where appropriate, a list of undergraduate and professional masters students for whom the candidate has been the primary supervisor, a second reader or committee member.

- Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents.
  - Documentation of efforts made (through both formal and informal means) to improve teaching skills or course design and a description of the outcomes.
  - Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence.
  - Documentation of 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.
  - Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in the area of pedagogical design.
  - Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching or community outreach and service through teaching functions, such as presentations at pedagogical conferences or publications on teaching service to professional bodies or organizations through any method that can be described as instructional.
3. Names of up to four assessors who are competent to assess the candidate's teaching and evidence of pedagogical/professional development. Assessors should be drawn from other academic institutions; assessors should hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor, Tenure Stream or Teaching Stream or similar rank. Where appropriate, one may be an expert in the field from the external community. The list should include a brief statement of each assessor's expertise as related to the continuing status review.

Documentation to be collected by the Chair

1. Copies of teaching evaluations for the candidate's entire career at the University should be included in the continuing status dossier. Where a candidate for continuing status is, or has been teaching at the University of Toronto at Mississauga or Scarborough, course evaluations from the respective campus should be obtained by the Chair. A comprehensive summary of all teaching evaluations should be prepared by the Teaching Evaluation Committee.
2. A minimum of four letters of appraisal will be included in the continuing status dossier. There should be at least one letter from an assessor selected from the candidate's list and two to three letters from assessors chosen by the Chair. At least one of these four appraisals should be prepared by a faculty member whose appointment is in or is similar to a teaching stream appointment. In addition to these four appraisers, a principal external assessor from another academic institution that has excellent undergraduate programs in the same or similar discipline will be chosen by the Chair to undertake a review of the candidate. The principal external assessor, with advance notice and permission of the candidate, shall observe the candidate in the classroom. Appraisals from assessors from the

external community who are experts in their field may also be solicited for comment on the candidate's professional work or contributions to the profession. Assessors will be asked to comment on the quality of the candidate's teaching, administrative service and professional work, as they relate to teaching effectiveness and pedagogical/professional development.

3. Letters from current and former undergraduate students commenting on the candidate's ability to stimulate and challenge the student's intellectual curiosity and on his/her mastery of the subject area and, where appropriate, his or her effectiveness as a supervisor of undergraduate or professional masters student research. Normally, a random sample of approximately 200 students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Chair.
4. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching competence of the candidate should be solicited from colleagues in those courses.
5. Where the amount of teaching varies from the norms of the department for teaching stream appointments, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained.

#### **D. The Teaching Evaluation Committee**

1. The Teaching Evaluation Committee's report on the candidate's teaching effectiveness should be a critical assessment of all the material available in support of teaching effectiveness. It should take into account course materials for all courses the candidate has taught and any other documentation, which the candidate wishes to have taken into account. The success of the candidate's supervision of undergraduate or professional masters students, where appropriate, should be reviewed explicitly. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should not be given the letters from external assessors.
2. Note should also be taken of any awards received by the candidate for teaching performance, along with an explanation of the significance of each award.
3. Any evidence of the impact of the candidate's teaching on the discipline or profession, or of how his or her teaching is creative should be indicated. Possible examples of how teaching ability might be demonstrated are: (a) major contributions to the curriculum, (b) evidence of impact on how the subject is taught, (c) contributions to journals devoted to teaching, (d) publications such as text books and multi-media and web-based applications.
4. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should also take into account Article 5 of the *Memorandum of Agreement* 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.

5. One or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee, with advance notice and permission of the candidate, shall observe the candidate in the classroom. If such permission to observe the class is refused by the candidate, this should be noted in the committee's report.
  
6. The Teaching Evaluation Committee's report on the evidence of the candidate's continued future pedagogical/professional development should take into consideration the criteria found in Section B above. As in noted in Section B, departments may develop specific criteria and documentation requirements for use in the assessment of professional work in the judgement on continued future pedagogical/professional development. Such criteria should be forwarded to the Dean for review.