

Key Pieces of Information for All Reviews.....	3.....
The Teaching Portfolio.....	3.....
Course Evaluations.....	4.....
Student Supervision.....	4.....
Peer Review.....	5.....
Written Assessments of Students	

Introduction

The OISE Divisional Teaching Guidelines are primarily intended to set out, as required under University policy, how teaching is to be assessed in evaluating individual faculty members. Such evaluation is conducted in several contexts: (1) for all tenured and teaching stream faculty, for annual PTR/Merit decisions; (2) for tenure stream faculty, for the interim review, the review for tenure (and usually at the same time for promotion to Associate Professor), and the review for promotion to Professor; and (3) for teaching stream faculty, for the probationary review, the continuing status review (and usually at the same time for promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream), and the review for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream. The key University of Toronto policies relating to the various reviews are:

- Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments (this interim review and the tenure review for tenure stream faculty, and the probationary review and the continuing status review for teaching stream faculty);
- Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions (for promotion to the rank of Professor for tenure stream faculty); and
- Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream (for promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream for teaching stream faculty).

Printed on 01/10/2014 at 10:04 AM. For more information, please contact the OISE Office of Academic Affairs at (416) 978-2000 or (416) 978-2001.

Supervision (including involvement in the research process); Integration of Teaching and Scholarship; and Leadership in Teaching.

Sources of Information on Teaching Effectiveness

Regular information gathering on teaching performance is required for a variety of reviews and as an important element of professional development. The basic elements gathered throughout a faculty member's career are the teaching portfolio, course evaluations, and data on graduate supervision and/or practicum supervision. These are key elements of the information required for the interim review, probationary review, continuing status review, tenure review, and promotion review, at which time information is also necessary (e.g. peer reviews, written assessments from specialists outside the university, written assessments from students).

Key Pieces of Information for All Reviews

The Teaching Portfolio

Each faculty member should maintain a teaching portfolio. File: C:\Users\jmc\Documents\2016-17\JTBec04 Tc 0.004

- evidence of professional contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning (e.g. presentations or publications on teaching)
- communication by peers who have shared teaching or supervisory responsibilities with the candidate; evaluations or testimonials by those attending or sponsoring workshops, lectures, non-OISE courses
- service to professional bodies or organizations through any method that can be described as instructional
- community contributions including outreach and service through teaching functions
- one-on-one supervision of students

It is recommended that faculty include numerical and comparative data whenever possible. Examples of comparative data that are relevant for the teaching portfolio include, but are not limited to, reviews of books, software and other materials related to teaching; numbers of invited workshops etc. Many of the activities of faculty members are equally applicable to the teaching and research portfolios. It is the judgment of individual faculty members to decide how best to handle their case, but it is understood that sometimes 'overlap' activities will be described in both portfolios.

Course Evaluations

Student course evaluations are seen as one component of the process of assessing teaching practice. In order not to disadvantage our faculty at the time of tenure and promotion, and in situations where they are being nominated for teaching awards it is important to have a small number of items that are collected as part of the process. To ensure that the process is fair and equitable, it is recommended that the number of evaluations be limited to a maximum of 10 per course per year.

Peer Review

At the University of Toronto, summative peer reviews of teaching are required for interim, probationary, tenure continuing status, and promotion reviews. In the case of continuing status and promotion reviews in the teaching stream, peer review must include written specialist assessments of teaching from outside the University. Faculty members are also encouraged early in their teaching careers to seek formative peer review as part of the mentorship process or through the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation.

Peer review typically involves two types of activities: documentary evaluation and observational evaluations. Documentary evaluations entail examination of written materials including current course outlines, evidence on extensive course revisions or development of new courses, contributions to program or departmental curriculum, and exploration of a range of course delivery options. Observational evaluations should include a brief interview with the candidate to understand their teaching goals for the class followed by classroom observation. Departments are asked to provide their faculty with guidelines for the conduct of peer reviews.

Written Assessments of Students with Completed Course Work & Graduates

For purposes of the University of Toronto (U-T) and the Ontario Education Quality Improvement Board (OEQIB) requirements, all programs must have a process in place to collect and analyze student feedback on teaching and learning experiences. This process should be implemented for all programs and should be designed to collect and analyze student feedback on teaching and learning experiences. The process should be designed to collect and analyze student feedback on teaching and learning experiences. The process should be designed to collect and analyze student feedback on teaching and learning experiences.

Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream are expected to review the candidate's teaching portfolio in addition to the scholarly or professional achievements. The goals of the interim/probationary review are to determine whether performance has been sufficiently satisfactory to merit a second probationary appointment, and to provide advice in improving areas of weakness and maintaining areas of strength for the subsequent tenure review/continuing status review.

Interim/probationary review committees are provided with summaries of closed-ended course evaluations for all courses taught to date as well as summary data for the department and division. Where it is possible, signed opinions of individual students regarding the candidate's teaching and supervisory work should be collected by Department Chairs. The review should include a classroom visit or other teaching observation.

Written comments from other department members should also be solicited. In the case of tenure stream interim reviews, these colleagues should be formally or informally acquainted with the faculty member's teaching or research. In the case of teaching stream probationary reviews, these colleagues should be formally or informally acquainted with the faculty member's teaching or pedagogical/professional activity.

In addition to Teaching Practice, candidates for interim or probationary review are asked to describe other teaching-related activities, as detailed under "Criteria for the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness," below. Student Supervision activities should include the number of students and the frequency of meeting. Faculty may also report information on the Integration of Teaching and Scholarship and Leadership in Teaching as appropriate.

Under these headings, teaching stream faculty members undergoing probationary review should provide an account of any pedagogical/professional activity completed or undertaken since the time of appointment, though lack of substantial achievement in these areas since appointment should not, in itself, be a cause for nonrenewal of contract.

-2) To: (S) (B) (P) (M) (T) (E) Professor (C) (A) Continuing (V) (E) 4 o3 t ntinn

- Signed written evaluations on the candidate's teaching and supervisory work as a sample of students who have completed their courses (for comments on class teaching) and students who have completed their degree (for comments on supervision). A reasonably broad representative sample of students will be contacted by the Department Chair.
- Formal peer evaluation including classroom

Criteria for the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

The University policies governing interim, probationary, continuing status, tenure and promotion reviews prescribe in detail the procedures to be followed in the evaluation of teaching activities. The Provostial Guidelines additionally specify criteria to be used in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. We have grouped these criteria into four broad areas: Teaching Practice; Student Supervision (including Involvement in the Research Process); Integration of Teaching and Scholarship; and Leadership in Teaching. The areas are broadly construed in order to encompass

Criteria and Examples of Indicators

Teaching Practice

Student Supervision
(including involvement in the
research process)

Integration of Teaching and
Scholarship

Teaching Effectiveness and Exemplary Practice

For certain reviews, as described below, University policy requires that an overall judgment regarding the excellence or competence, or simply the excellence, of a faculty member's teaching be made. The Provostial Guidelines specify basic criteria for making evaluations of competence or excellence in teaching. At OISE, an overall judgment of excellence or competence in teaching is based on the degree to which a faculty member has demonstrated "effectiveness" or "exemplary practice" in the four broad areas outlined above, according to the different expectations of each type of review. Attempts made to operationalize 'effectiveness' or 'exemplary practice' in this document as such operationalization will vary across departments and disciplines. It is expected that Department Chairs will work with candidates to help them frame their teaching activities into these four broad areas and that departments will develop resources that will describe the ways in which

The requirements for a judgment of competence in a decision concerning tenure and a judgment concerning effective teaching in a decision concerning promotion to the rank of Professor are the same: demonstrated effectiveness in Teaching Practice and in one of the other three criteria. This is the minimum teaching standard required for a positive recommendation for tenure or for promotion to the rank of Professor, provided other criteria defined by the relevant policies are met.

The requirements for a judgment of excellence in teaching in decisions concerning promotion to the rank of Professor are greater than the requirements for a judgment of excellence in teaching in decisions concerning tenure. A recommendation for tenure on the grounds of excellence in teaching (in addition to other criteria specified in the Policy) requires the demonstration of exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and in one of the other three criteria. A recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor on the grounds of excellent teaching alone... sustained over many years usually involve the demonstration of exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and two of the other criterion areas. In exceptional circumstances, however, exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and one other criterion area, that go far beyond the usual expectation for exemplary practice in those areas, may be sufficient to meet expectations for a judgment of excellent teaching in a decision concerning promotion to the rank of Professor.

Teaching Stream Application of Criteria for Decisions of Continuing Status & Decisions of Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

According to the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments, a positive recommendation for continuing status in the teaching stream requires “the judgment of excellence in teaching evidence of demonstrated and continuing future pedagogical/professional development.” These OISE Guidelines clarify expectations for making a judgment of excellence in teaching in continuing status reviews.

In the case of promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream, the Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream states that: “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.” These OISE Guidelines clarify expectations for what constitutes ‘excellent teaching’ in a review for promotion. jud2 (i)-2me-15 (y)22 (81

continuing status (and normally, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream), provided other criteria defined by the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments are met.

The requirements for a judgment of excellent teaching in decisions concerning promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream are greater than the requirements for a judgment of excellence in teaching the continuing status review and equivalent to those required for a judgment of excellent teaching in a review for promotion to the rank of Professor in the tenure stream. That is, it will usually require the demonstration of exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and two of the other criterion areas. In exceptional circumstances, exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and one other criterion area, that go far beyond the usual expectation for exemplary practice in those areas, may be sufficient to meet expectations for a judgment of excellent teaching in a decision concerning promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream. However, unlike a promotion review in the tenure stream, excellent teaching is the minimum teaching standard required for a positive recommendation for promotion in the teaching stream, provided other criteria defined by the Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream are met.

Educational Leadership & Pedagogical/Professional Development in the Teaching Stream

Besides the requirements for a judgment of teaching excellence in teaching stream promotion and continuing status reviews, University policy requires “evidence of demonstrated continuing future pedagogical/professional development” for a positive recommendation for continuing status, and the demonstration of both educational leadership and/or achievement, and ongoing pedagogical/professional development for a positive recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream.

Both the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments and the Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream state that “continuing future pedagogical/professional development” can be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including:

- discipline-based scholarship in relation to, or relevant to, the field in which the faculty member teaches;

continuing status decision, and teaching stream promotion committees should consider the evidence for both ongoing pedagogical/professional development and educational leadership as part of the case

- Ensuring all faculty are aware of relevant university policies on teaching and evaluation of teaching
- Providing “best practices” guidelines for building and organizing teaching portfolios
- Develop common core items for course evaluations and provide guidelines for contextualized interpretation of course evaluation data