

**FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE  
GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING IN  
TENURE AND PROMOTION DECISIONS**

**A. Annual Evaluations**

Annual evaluations by students of teaching effectiveness are required for all courses. The Faculty of Arts and Science requires that student evaluation forms be completed in all courses taught by Arts and Science faculty members.

Where a candidate for tenure or promotion is, or has been teaching at UTM or UTSC, course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Chair and included in the candidate's dossier.

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

Each faculty member should maintain a Teaching Portfolio, or dossier, which should be updated annually and serve as a foundation for the documents that will be required for tenure and promotion. The general advice that should be given to all faculty is to keep any document that reflects success, experimentation and innovation in teaching.

The material in the teaching Portfolio should include, as appropriate:

1. The faculty member's curriculum vitae in the Arts and Science approved format (attached) which shall include: in the case of tenure, all courses taught, and in the case of promotion, all courses taught in the last five years. In addition, the curriculum vitae must include a complete list of graduate students for whom the candidate has been the principal supervisor at both the masters and doctoral levels.
2. A statement of teaching philosophy and plans for developing teaching skills.
3. Representative course outlines, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, and teaching assessment activities.
4. New course proposals.
5. Digests of annual student evaluations and letters or testimonials from students regarding teaching performance.
6. Applications for instructional development grants or similar documents.
7. Documentation on efforts made (through both formal and informal means) to improve teaching skills or course design and a description of the outcomes.
8. Awards or nominations for awards for teaching excellence.

9. 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.
10. Examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in the area of pedagogical design.
11. Evidence of professional contributions in the general area of teaching, 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.
12. Community outreach and service through teaching functions.

**C. Information to be Solicited/Provided by the Department, Centre or Institute**

1. All available teaching evaluations.
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;
  - developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field;
  - encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning or other appropriate methods;
  - creating opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process.

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

Normally, a random sample of approximately 100 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Chair. Students may be contacted by email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate. E-mail addresses are available through *ROSI Express*.

3. Letters from former and current graduate students commenting on the creation of:
  - opportunities to involve students in the research process, and
  - 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. 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 competence of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.
5. Evidence 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; including evidence of demand for elective/senior courses.
7. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.
8. Information on how much teaching the candidate has done at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Where the amount of teaching varies from the norms of the department, the extent of the difference and the reasons for it should be explained.
9. In cases of persons who are 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 our requirements of internal candidates.

**D. The Teaching Evaluation Committee**

1. The Chair will establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee to prepare a written assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.
2. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must consist of at least two members who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. In the case of a Tenure Committee, the Chair or any member of the Committee may not be a member of the Teaching Evaluation Committee. The Chair or any member of the departmental Promotions Committee should not be a member of the teaching evaluation committee. However, in exceptional circumstances, and with the permission of the Dean, a member of the departmental Promotion Committee may serve on the Teaching Evaluation Committee.
3. The Teaching Evaluation Committee will be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review and all the information described in section B and C above.
4. The Teaching Evaluation Committee's Report should be a critical assessment of all the material available as above and any other documentation that the candidate wishes to have taken into account in support of its recommendations regarding teaching effectiveness.

5. The success of the candidate's supervision of graduate students should be reviewed explicitly.
6. Any evidence of the impact of the candidate's teaching on the discipline or profession, or of how his/her teaching is creative must be indicated. Possible examples of how teaching ability might be demonstrated are:
  - a) successful innovations in the teaching domain, including the creation of new and innovative teaching processes, materials and forms of evaluation;
  - b) significant contribution to the technological enrichment of teaching;
  - c) development of significant new courses and/or reform of the curricula; and
  - d) publication of innovative textbooks, websites or other online material and/or teaching guides.
7. The Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must 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.*

8. One or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee **must observe the candidate in the classroom**. If such permission for this is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.
9. A comprehensive summary of all teaching evaluations should be prepared by the Teaching Evaluation Committee and included in the teaching dossier. In promotions cases, copies of teaching evaluations for at least the most recent five-year period should be included in the dossier.
10. In cases where there are shortcomings in the candidate's teaching, the Tenure or the Promotion Committee should discuss and review the case and determine whether or not a judgement of competence can be reached. The members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee may be invited to a special meeting of the Promotion Committee at the Promotion Committees' discretion. Where shortcomings are resolved in the candidate's favour by the Tenure or the Promotions Committee, the basis of the resolution must be stated in the Teaching Evaluation Committee's Report.

#### **E. Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**

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 students. The guidelines for tenure 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.

#### **F. Competence in Teaching**

The minimum standards required of all faculty members and which must be demonstrated in the granting of tenure or promotion are as follows:

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
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. creation of opportunities that involve students in the research process
8. 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.*

#### **G. Excellence in Teaching**

For tenure cases that are to be based on excellence in teaching and for promotion cases based on excellent teaching alone sustained over many years, the standard of teaching will go well beyond that of competence. In cases where the Teaching Evaluation Committee is of the view that the candidate has demonstrated excellence in teaching over the pre-tenure period or in the case of promotion to excellence in teaching sustained over many years, the grounds for this view must be stated in the Teaching Evaluation Committee's Report. 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
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, 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 to provide opportunities for them to learn, for example, through discovery-based or other appropriate methods.
8. significant contribution to pedagogical changes in the discipline.

**H. Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor Being Put Forward on the Basis of “Excellent Teaching Alone” (Sustained Over a Long Period of Time)**

1. To be promoted on the basis of “excellent teaching alone” the candidate must be evaluated as having demonstrated excellence in more than classroom teaching (see descriptions of competence and excellence in sections F and G).
2. Copies of teaching evaluations for the candidate's entire career at the University should be included in the dossier.
3. More than the usual number of letters from students should be obtained. Comments should be solicited from a random sample of no fewer than **200** present and former students, distributed across the candidate's normal pattern of teaching.
4. 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. Individuals should be asked to comment on how the candidate's teaching influenced their careers and their intellectual and scholarly development.