

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA**  
**GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

This document sets out the guidelines for the evaluation of teaching at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Following the *Proxstial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions*, UTM's guidelines articulate general principles for the process and constituents of evaluation of teaching in our academic community, as well as criteria for arriving at judgments of competence and excellence in teaching. There are three administrative appendices to this document, to be used for the evaluation of teaching for the purposes of: (i) promotion to Full Professor; ii) for promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer; and iii) and in tenure review.

**A. The Teaching Portfolio**

Each tenure-stream and teaching-stream faculty member should maintain a Teaching Portfolio or dossier which should be updated annually. The general advice that should be given to all faculty, especially junior faculty, is to keep any document that is relevant to their teaching progress and achievements.

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

1. The faculty member's curriculum vitae, containing a list of all courses taught and, if applicable, a complete list of undergraduate and graduate students for whom the candidate has been the principal supervisor and/or a member of the supervisory committee
2. A statement of teaching philosophy
3. Representative course outlines, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, and teaching assessment activities, including examples of efforts to promote students' understanding of research process
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

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

## Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching

---

### B. Evaluation of Teaching

#### B(1) Competence in Teaching

The minimum standards required of all faculty members are as follows:

1. Success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development
2. Strong communication skills
3. Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
4. Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
5. Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, as well as discipline-specific skills
6. Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress
7. Promotion of academic integrity and adherence to grading standards of the division and, as appropriate, the ethical standards of profession
8. Creation of opportunities that involve students in the research process
9. For members of the graduate faculty, creation of supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*.

#### B(2) Excellence in Teaching

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

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

## Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching

---

### B(3) Evaluation of Continued Future Pedagogical/Professional Development (in accordance with Section VII.30 of the Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments)

1. Curricular development and the introduction of new pedagogical techniques, including works in progress
2. The ongoing pursuit of further academic qualifications
3. Participation at and, more important, contributions to academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent
4. Teaching-related activity by the candidate outside of his/her classroom functions and responsibilities
5. Professional work that allows the Lecturer to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area, provided that such professional work enhances directly the teaching missions of the lecturer's academic unit and UTM.

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

### C. Information Required for Evaluations

The evaluation of teaching must be as thorough as possible. The sources of information for the evaluation should include:

1. Faculty member's teaching portfolio
2. Student evaluations, as comprehensive a selection as possible
3. Formal peer evaluation (internal and external), including other departmental, divisional or college assessments where cross-appointment is involved
4. Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in undergraduate and graduate supervision
5. Copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published and student theses
6. Course enrolment data
7. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies
8. In the case of promotion to Senior Lecturer, evidence of continued future pedagogical/professional development, in accordance with criteria noted above.

## APPENDIX 1: EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR PURPOSES OF PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

### A. Annual Evaluations

The University of Toronto at Mississauga requires that student evaluation forms be completed in all courses taught by UTM faculty members. These forms are administered through the Office of the Vice-Principal (Academic).

For purposes of review for promotion to Full Professor, where a candidate has been at the St. George campus or UTSC, course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Chair and included in the candidate's dossier.

### B. Teaching Portfolio

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

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

1. 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
  - Success in developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
  - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
  - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
  - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
  - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

Normally, a random sample of approximately 100 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Chair. (Please use the Student Address Label Requests form for this purpose.) Alternatively, you may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

2. Letters from former and current graduate students commenting on the candidate's ability in creating:
  - Opportunities to involve students in the research process
  - Supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Students Guidelines for Graduate Supervision
3. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses
4. Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses.

## Appendix 1: Evaluation of Teaching for Purposes of Promotion to Full Professor

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

### D. The Teaching Evaluation Committee

1. The Chair should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the department or of a closely related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. The individuals may be drawn from the rank of senior lecturer, assistant, associate or full professor, although the committee should comprise at least one tenured faculty member. Teaching Evaluation Committee members should not normally be members of the Promotions Committee.
2. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C. Using the *UTM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*, the Committee's report should be a critical assessment of all these materials, including an analysis of course evaluations results.
3. With the permission of the candidate, one or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.

4. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement 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. Note that, for promotion on the basis of teaching alone, the Promotions Policy requires evidence of excellence 'sustained over many years' so the documentation to support such a recommendation would need to be extremely comprehensive and, in addition to superlative teaching skills, the candidate would need to meet additional criteria for excellence cited in *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*. In addition to solicitation of letters from a random sample of 100 former students, letters should be solicited from former students who are scholars in the field. Those solicited should not be current or recent colleagues of the candidate and should be asked to comment on how the candidate's teaching influenced their careers and influenced their intellectual and scholarly development.
6. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved competence, and in the case of promotion on the basis of teaching alone, excellence in teaching and the committee's grounds for its conclusion. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against promotion.

**APPENDIX 2: EVALUATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES AND  
PEDAGOGICAL/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER**

**A. Annual Evaluations**

The University of Toronto at Mississauga requires that student evaluation forms be completed in all courses taught by UTM faculty members. These forms are administered through the Office of the Vice-Principal (Academic).

Where a candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer has been teaching at the St. George campus or UISC, course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Chair and included in the candidate's dossier.

---

As part of their annual review, lecturers should be given feedback on their performance.

**B. Teaching Portfolio**

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

**C. Information provided by the Candidate:**

1. Teaching portfolio, compiled in accordance with *UTM's Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*. Because of the centrality of teaching performance and professional development to this promotion process, candidates are encouraged to ensure that this dossier is as complete as possible.
2. A statement of teaching interests and philosophy or approach to teaching
3. A list of the candidate's teaching assignments over the past four years
4. Evidence of pedagogical/professional development related to teaching effectiveness by the candidate outside of his/her classroom functions and responsibilities, including professional work. Examples of such activity could be: high school liaison, participating at science fairs, serving on relevant municipal, provincial or federal government committees, coordinating undergraduate programs, administering large undergraduate courses, organizing labs, hiring and training Teaching Assistants, overseeing web-based delivery of teaching programs, and counselling students, directing or having another significant role in drama performances, exhibiting visual art, organizing local, national, and international student conferences and competitions.
5. A list of referees who are competent to assess the candidate's teaching. One may be an expert in the field from the external community. The list should include a brief statement of each referee's expertise as related to the promotion review.

For evaluation of continued future pedagogical/professional development, the candidate should provide evidence pertaining to:

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

***Appendix 2: Evaluation of Teaching Activities and Pedagogical/Professional Development for Promotion to Senior Lecturer***

---

2. Ongoing pursuit of further academic qualifications
3. Participation at and, more important, contributions to academic conferences where sessions on pedagogical research and technique are prominent
4. Teaching-related activity by the candidate outside of his/her classroom functions and responsibilities
5. Professional work that allows the Lecturer to maintain a mastery of his or her subject area, provided that such professional work enhances directly the teaching missions of the lecturer's academic unit and UTM. Departments may develop specific criteria and documentation requirements for use in the assessment of professional work in the judgment on continued future pedagogical/professional development. Such criteria should be forwarded to the Dean for his/her review.

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

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

**D. Information to be solicited/provided by the department**

1. Copies of teaching evaluations for the last four years should be included in the dossier.
2. Letters from current and former students commenting on the candidate's:
  - Success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development
  - Success in developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
  - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
  - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
  - Creation of opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
  - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

Normally, a random sample of approximately 200 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Chair. (Please use the Student Address Label Requests form for this purpose.) Alternatively, you may contact students by E-mail, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

**In addition, the Chair should ensure the following are included in the dossier:**

1. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.
2. Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in undergraduate and professional masters student research supervision.
3. Course enrolment data

## ***Appendix 2: Evaluation of Teaching Activities and Pedagogical/Professional Development for Promotion to Senior Lecturer***

---

4. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies.
5. In the cases of persons being newly appointed from outside the University, information from the institutions in which they have taught, with an indication of how this teaching experience compares with UTM's requirements of internal candidates for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer.

### **F. The Teaching Evaluation Committee**

1. The Chair should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the department or a closely related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously.
2. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C. Using the *UTM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching* the Committee's report should be a critical assessment of all these materials, including an analysis of course evaluations results.
3. With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, one or both members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom on at least two separate occasions. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.
4. The success of the candidate's supervision of undergraduate or professional masters students, where appropriate, should be reviewed explicitly.
5. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement 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 instructors and to comply with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of his or her students.*

6. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved excellence in teaching (in accordance with UTM's *Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*) and the committee's grounds for its conclusion. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against promotion.

### **G. The Selection and Role of the Referees**

1. There should be two internal referees, with one letter of reference selected from the candidate's list and a second selected by the Chair. Although one of these referees may hold the position of senior lecturer, at least one must be a tenured professor. Both should have some familiarity with the work of the candidate, but also have a capacity to render an objective judgment of the candidate's work, based on the evidence provided.
2. In addition, the Chair should select a third appraiser at comparable rank (as noted in item 1), who is external to UTM, but not necessarily to the University, who can exercise an objective judgment about the candidate. If external to the University, it is expected that the referee will come from an academic institution that has excellent undergraduate programs in the same or similar discipline or has expertise that is very well suited to an evaluation of the work of the candidate.



*Appendix 2: Evaluation of Teaching Activities and Pedagogical/Professional Development for Promotion to Senior Lecturer*

---

3. With advance notice and the permission of the candidate, the internal referees and the external referee should observe the candidate in the classroom on at least two separate occasions. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.
4. Referees are expected to provide a critical assessment of all the material available with reference to the two criteria for promotion to senior lecturer: teaching excellence and evidence of continued future pedagogical/professional development. In addition, based on the evidence provided they are expected to provide an evaluation of the candidate's pedagogical/professional development related to teaching and administrative service, in accordance with the guidelines contained in this document.
5. Referees are not to make a recommendation either for or against promotion to Senior Lecturer.

## APPENDIX 3: EVALUATION OF TEACHING IN TENURE REVIEW

### A. Annual Evaluations

The University of Toronto at Mississauga requires that student evaluation forms be completed in all courses taught by UTM faculty members. These forms are administered through the Office of the Vice-Principal (Academic).

For purposes of a tenure review, where a candidate for tenure has been teaching at the St. George campus or UTSC, course evaluations from the respective division should be obtained by the Chair and included in the candidate's dossier.

### B. Teaching Portfolio

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

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

1. 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
  - Success in helping to develop students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
  - Success in encouraging students' understanding of a subject and sense of inquiry
  - Success in fostering skills, such as critical thinking, problem-solving and communication skills, and discipline-specific skills
  - Ability to create opportunities, where appropriate, which involve students in the research process
  - Accessibility to students and active engagement with their learning progress

Normally, a random sample of approximately 100 undergraduate students should be solicited for opinions, to be addressed, in writing, to the Chair. (Please use the Student Address Label Requests form for this purpose.) Alternatively, you may contact students by Email, provided the process is random and attempts are made to contact students from all courses taught by the candidate.

2. Letters from former and current graduate students commenting on the candidate's ability in creating:
  - Opportunities to involve students in the research process
  - Supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Students *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision*.
3. Formal peer evaluation (internal and external), including other departmental, divisional, or college assessments where cross-appointment is involved. Where the candidate has participated in shared courses, letters attesting to the teaching performance of the candidate should be obtained from colleagues in those courses.
4. Data that will enable the unit to assess candidates' success in graduate supervision, including number of students being supervised; quality of theses produced; quality of supervision; number graduated and time-to-degree and information on other efforts to foster scholarly and professional advancement of graduate

### Appendix 3: Evaluation of Teaching in Tenure Reviews

---

students. This could include copies of students' papers, especially those that have been published; and student theses

5. Course enrolment data
6. Description of innovations in teaching and contributions to curricular development, such as course development initiatives and examples of particularly effective teaching strategies
7. In the case of individuals being recommended for appointment from outside the University, information from the institutions in which they have taught that will help us to assess how their teaching experience compares with that expected of internal tenure candidates.

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

1. The Chair should establish a Teaching Evaluation Committee, consisting of two members of the department or a closely related program, who are in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching carefully and rigorously. The individuals cannot be members of the tenure committee and may be drawn from the rank of senior lecturer, assistant, associate or full professors, although the committee should comprise at least one tenured faculty member.
2. With the permission of the candidate, one or more members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee should observe the candidate in the classroom. If such permission is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's Report.
3. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should be given the candidate's Teaching Portfolio for review as well as the information described in Section C. Using the criteria outlined in the *UIM Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching*, its report should be a critical assessment of all materials, including an analysis of course evaluation results and an evaluative summary of the classroom visit (this visit involving at least one member of the committee and made subject to the candidate's permission). If permission for this visit is refused by the candidate, this fact should be reported in the Committee's report.
4. The report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee must take into account Article 5 of the Memorandum of Agreement 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. The Teaching Evaluation Committee must submit a unified, co-signed report. The report must include a judgment as to whether the candidate has achieved competence or excellence in teaching, and the committee's grounds for this conclusion. Note that the committee should not recommend for or against the conferral of tenure.