APPENDIX D: OISE GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING (OGAT)

CONTENTS

OISE GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

The new OISE 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: for all tenure-stream and teaching-stream faculty, for annual PTR/Merit decisions; for tenure-stream faculty, for the third year review, the review for tenure (and usually at the same time for promotion to Associate Professor), and the review for promotion to Professor; and for teaching-stream faculty, for the review for promotion to Senior Lecturer. The key University of Toronto policies relating to the various reviews are the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* (the third year review and the tenure review for tenure-stream faculty, and the review to Senior Lecturer for teaching-stream faculty) and the *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions* (for promotion to the rank of Professor for tenure-stream faculty).

The information collected as specified in the Guidelines will be used, not only for reviews, but also to ensure that faculty are supported in the development and enhancement of their teaching at all stages of their careers. As a consequence the division's programs will be enhanced. The Guidelines note the importance of soliciting and acting on student feedback as a means of enhancing student experience.

The new Guidelines strike a balance between commonality and individuality. Commonality is important because it allows our faculty to track their progress when they teach in different programs and departments, and to meet the expectations of other faculty in the university who review tenure and promotion files. In the new Guidelines, commonality is evident in such areas as the development and application of a set of criteria grouped into four areas (see the paragraph below and the later section on "Criteria for the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness") or the requirement to collect the same core data in course evaluations (see the later section on " Course Evaluations"). Individuality is essential as each faculty member makes his or her contribution to teaching in a unique way. Furthermore, disciplines vary in the ways in which student learning occurs as well as in the ways in which learning is assessed. Accordingly, in the new Guidelines, individuality is revealed in such areas as the contextualization of evidence on teaching evaluation data, the recognition of different perspectives on and approaches to teaching, or the various ways that faculty can be pedagogically engaged (e.g., as an instructor in initial teacher education [ITE] and/or graduate programs; as supervisor of student research; as a consultant or professional development facilitator with colleagues in academic and/or professional communities; as a leader or coordinator of ITE and/or graduate programs, courses, or components; as an author of teaching resources, etc).

The new OISE Guidelines meet the requirements of the *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions* (P&D #20, 2002-03) which state that "each division is expected to develop its own teaching effectiveness guidelines…" The new OISE Guidelines apply to both tenure and teaching-stream faculty. These Guidelines outline the key sources of information on teaching effectiveness. They provide an outline of the information requirements for third year, tenure and promotion reviews for tenure-stream faculty, and for promotion to Senior Lecturer for teaching-stream faculty, and guidance for PTR/merit reviews. They also clarify the criteria for achieving competence and excellence in teaching for tenure-stream and teaching stream faculty. These are grouped in four broad areas: Teaching Practice; Student Supervision (including involvement in the research process); Integration of Teaching and Scholarship; and Leadership in Teaching. Finally, the Guidelines provide a brief outline of the responsibilities of the departments and the division in supporting teaching

effectiveness and append the form for the common course evaluation (and an accompanying instructor course information form) to be used at OISE.

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 third year review, and for tenure and promotion reviews, at which time other information is also necessary (e.g. peer reviews, written assessments from students).

The Teaching Portfolio
Each faculty member should maintain a teaching portfolio, or dossier, which will serve as a foundation for the documents that will be required for the third year review, tenure and promotion. It can also be used as a resource in producing activity reports for annual PTR awards. The general advice that should be given to all faculty, especially junior faculty, is to keep documents that reflect success, experimentation and innovation in teaching. The value of a teaching portfolio largely depends on how reflectively and coherently it is organized. The material in the teaching portfolio will vary from individual to individual and across departments. Individual departments will vary in the weight that they give aspects of the portfolio and for this reason it is recommended that faculty seek the advice of their department chair as they prepare their teaching portfolio. Although we would expect to see the first four items listed below in any portfolio, other components may be included as relevant. Note that this list is not exhaustive.

- candidate's curriculum vitae including all courses taught
- a statement of teaching philosophy and plans for developing teaching skills
- representative course outlines, bibliographies and assignments, description of internship programs, field experiences, and teaching assessment activities
- digests of annual student evaluations
- new course proposals
- applications for instructional development grants or similar documents
- documentation on 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 concerning innovations in teaching methods and contributions to curricular development, including activities related to the administrative, organizational, and developmental aspects of education
- the use and development of technology (including on-line courses)
- documentation of evolving links between teaching and research activities or of professional development activities
- examples of efforts to mentor colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in the area of pedagogical design
- evidence of professional contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning (e.g. presentations or publications on teaching)

- communications by peers who have shared teaching or supervisory responsibilities with the candidate; evaluations or testimonials by those attending or sponsoring workshops, lectures, or 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

Most of the items listed above are included in the *Provostial Guidelines*.

It is recommended that faculty include numeric 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.

Note: Because of OISE's focus on education, 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 build 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 in 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 about all courses. As goals differ across courses and disciplines collecting information that is unique to departments and individuals is also essential. For this reason evaluations will include a minimum core of elements standardized across departments, as well as some that are unique to departments.

In courses with enrolments of five or above, a small number of core, closed-ended questions as well as one standard open-ended question will be collected. Two closed-ended questions ask for overall ratings of the instructor's performance and the value of the course. Nine other questions have been chosen to reflect competencies outlined in the *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions*. Information is also collected (from students, the instructor and ROSI) that will increase the interpretability of student ratings: whether or not the course is required; degree of challenge of the course material; and class size.

Departments and programs may decide on supplementary questions to produce a customized evaluation form for courses in their area. (A bank of additional questions will be accumulated as a resource.) Core items should be reviewed periodically by representatives across departments to ensure that items reflect the teaching goals of the university and the division. Individual faculty members may also include supplementary questions on an additional form for their own courses; however, these forms will not be processed centrally. The evaluation instrument should not exceed 25 items, in order to ensure that response rate is high. Course evaluations will be completed in class time, but not shared with faculty until final marks are submitted.

It should be noted, too, that in the elementary (Primary/Junior, Junior/Intermediate) panel of the B.Ed./Technological studies program, instructors are frequently responsible for several modules within a cohort of students, rather than delivering stand alone courses. In these instances, students use the course evaluation forms to provide holistic assessments of an instructor's performance across courses. Although this constitutes a long standing practice, interpretive guidelines will be developed that describe these different types of data.

Course evaluation data for closed-ended and open-ended questions are archived in electronic form. The course mean, median and standard deviation for closed ended questions will be provided to the individual course instructor, the Department Chair and (for Initial Teacher Education courses only) the Associate Dean, Teacher Education. Results of the course evaluations will not be made public. The mean, median and standard deviation for the whole division will also be produced to allow individual instructors to locate themselves in relation to their peers, for department chairs to provide support for teaching in their departments and for review committees to evaluate the candidate in relation to peers. Statistics can be broken down by degree program and department as requested. Summaries are made available for purposes of program planning, PTR/merit review, and for third year review, and tenure and promotion reviews as set out in the procedures for each.

Written comments by students are made available to course instructors and to the Department Chair, and are archived in electronic form within the division.

All course evaluation data are collected, archived and released in ways that maintain the anonymity of individual students. No course evaluation data are released to course instructors prior to submission of final grades.

It should be remembered that teaching evaluations, collected anonymously at the end of a course, are only one means of eliciting feedback from students on their experience of courses. Faculty are reminded that alternate methods involving written and verbal dialogue about the course goals and structure can be very effective in improving the student experience of a course.

Student Supervision
Supervision refers to meeting students on an individual basis in order to aid student learning. At OISE this will occur in a range of different learning contexts including, but not limited to, thesis supervision, committee membership, practicum supervision, individual reading courses, supervision of graduate assistants, thesis support groups and supervision of qualifying research papers. The range of activities that are relevant to student supervision include, but are not limited to, formal and informal meetings with students, arranging opportunities to support learning, writing reference letters, writing applications for financial support, working together on manuscripts, etc.

At third year, tenure and promotion reviews, faculty are asked to describe their supervision activities, their goals for these different activities and to provide indicators of success in these activities. Indicators of success will vary depending on the students, the faculty members' goals for supervision and the practices within departments/disciplines. Departments are asked to provide faculty with guidelines on the most important material to submit. Indices of success in student supervision may range from traditional indicators such as student conference presentations, publications, job opportunities and awards, to descriptive accounts of the challenges faced by individual learners and the ways in which these challenges were met.

Peer Review
At the University of Toronto, summative peer reviews of teaching are required for tenure and promotion reviews for tenure-stream faculty and for promotion of teaching-stream faculty to the rank of Senior Lecturer. Faculty members are encouraged early in their teaching careers to seek formative peer review as part of the mentorship process or through the Office of Teaching Advancement.

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, and Graduates
For purposes of decisions on tenure and promotion of tenure-stream faculty and on promotion to Senior Lecturer of teaching-stream faculty, the relevant committees are required to seek qualitative evaluations of teaching from students taught, advised, or supervised by the candidates. These assessments are collected by the Department Chair and are not available to the faculty member under review.

Faculty members do have available, on a regular basis, written comments provided as part of course evaluations or as a component of annual student progress surveys. In addition, they may periodically receive unsolicited written commentaries from students, advisees and supervisees. These may be incorporated into teaching portfolios.

Written assessments by students should cover, in addition to course instruction, practicum supervision, thesis, MRP and QRP supervisions (and participation on committees), and student advising. In particular, student evaluations may provide evidence of significant student learning.

INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR DECISIONS REGARDING PTR/MERIT, THIRD YEAR REVIEW, TENURE AND PROMOTION OF TENURE-STREAM FACULTY, AND PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER FOR TEACHING-STREAM FACULTY

PTR/Merit Review
Each year, the Provost provides specific direction for PTR/merit review procedures. Currently there are departmental differences in the precise forms and expectations for annual activity reporting, although information on teaching and student supervision is collected throughout OISE. We recommend some commonality across OISE departments through the submission of results for core items from course evaluation data and of the numbers of students supervised in each of the categories listed under Student Supervision. Faculty may also report information on Integration of Teaching and Scholarship, and on Leadership in Teaching as appropriate. These practices are already current in most OISE departments. Departments will continue to follow their own procedures for making annual PTR recommendations.

The Third Year Review for Tenure-stream Faculty

The committee conducting the third year review (which takes place at the end of the second year of an appointment as Assistant Professor) is expected to review the candidate's teaching portfolio with the goal of providing advice for the subsequent tenure review. Third year 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.

Candidates are also asked to describe their supervision activities as detailed under Student Supervision and to include the names of students and the frequency of meeting. Faculty may also report information on Integration of Teaching and Scholarship, and on Leadership in Teaching as appropriate.

Where it is possible, signed opinions of individual students regarding the candidate's teaching and supervisory work can be collected by Department Chairs.

Tenure, and Promotion to Full Professor

The evaluation of teaching for tenure (accompanied by promotion to Associate Professor) and for promotion to full professor must be as thorough as possible. The sources of information for the evaluation should include those listed below. It is recognized, however, that under the 1999 *Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching at OISE/UT* (the GET policy) less emphasis was placed on regular and common data collection procedures and the long-term retention of evidence. Limitations in the availability of data prior to 2007 should not disadvantage colleagues.

- faculty member's teaching portfolio.
- data summaries of the candidate's course evaluations for all courses taught, as well as departmental and divisional summary statistics that aid in the interpretation of the individual's scores. For tenure, these summaries should be given for all courses since the time of appointment. For promotion to Professor, dossiers should include course evaluations for every course taught by the candidate over the past five years. In the case of a candidate being put forward for promotion to Professor on the basis of excellent teaching alone, sustained over many years, evaluations should be obtained for as far back as possible.
- signed written evaluations on the candidate's teaching and supervisory work from 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 observation. The candidate should be observed by a minimum of two faculty members, and peer evaluations are submitted in confidence to the Chair.
- data that will enable the unit to assess the candidate's success in graduate and practicum supervision.
- copies of students papers/assignments, especially those that have been published; and student theses.
- course enrolment data; especially contextualized evidence of demand for elective courses.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer

The sources of information for teaching evaluation for promotion of teaching-stream faculty to Senior Lecturer should include:

- faculty member's teaching portfolio.
- data summaries of the candidate's course evaluations for all courses taught, since the time of appointment at OISE, as well as departmental and divisional summary statistics that aid in the interpretation of the individual's scores.
- signed written evaluations on the candidate's teaching and supervisory work from 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 observation. The candidate should be observed by a minimum of two faculty members, and peer evaluations are submitted in confidence to the Chair.
- data that will enable the unit to assess the candidate's success in practicum supervision.
- copies of students' papers/assignments.
- course enrolment data; especially contextualized evidence of demand for elective courses.

Note that for the Third Year Review, Tenure, Promotion to Full Professor, and Promotion to Senior Lecturer, candidates are asked to provide the committee with a context for interpreting teaching evaluation data, including the results of course assessments. Such contextualization may include, but is not limited to, the goals for individual courses, challenges faced by individual learners, course strengths and weaknesses, etc.

Wherever feasible, evidence will be submitted or gathered from more than one source (e.g., Teaching Practice includes course evaluations, peer reviews, written assessment from students with completed coursework and graduates.)

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The University policies governing reviews, tenure and promotion prescribe in detail the procedures to be followed in the evaluation of teaching activities. The *Provostial Guidelines* specified criteria for evaluating competence and excellence. 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 the variations in teaching across departments and faculty positions (encompassing both the tenure and teaching streams). For each broad area we list *possible* indicators but because of variations across disciplines our list is not exhaustive. Candidates should consider how their own experiences translate into these areas but should not be constrained by the indicators listed.

Candidates for review, tenure and/or promotion can choose which areas to address in their submission on teaching. In many cases, faculty will focus on Teaching Practice and Student Supervision. They will include evidence on Integration of Teaching and Scholarship, and on Leadership in Teaching, as applicable. Furthermore, candidates should consider how their own experiences translate into these areas but should not be constrained by the indicators listed.

For each of the four broad areas an overall judgment of competence is based on evidence that demonstrates "effectiveness". For each of the four areas an overall judgment of excellence is based on evidence that demonstrates "exemplary practice". No attempt is made to operationalize 'effectiveness' or 'exemplary practice' in this document as such operationalizations 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 effective and exemplary are operationalized within the departmental context.

TEACHING PRACTICE		
Competence	**Examples of Indicators**	**Excellence**
Evaluation of competence requires demonstration of <u>effectiveness</u> in:	stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development articulating ideas and concepts clearly 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 actively engaging with students' learning progress and accessibility to students using current scholarship and research on pedagogy to respond to the different learning styles and needs among students promoting academic integrity and adherence to grading standards of the division and, as appropriate, the ethical standards of the profession using various technology-based strategies to support the learning of students	*Evaluation of excellence requires demonstration of <u>exemplary practice</u> in:*

STUDENT SUPERVISION (INCLUDING INVOLVEMENT IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS)		
Competence	**Examples of Indicators**	**Excellence**
Evaluation of competence requires demonstration of <u>effectiveness</u> in:	providing supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies *Guidelines for Graduate Supervision* creating opportunities that involve students in the design and implementation of the research process providing support to students through coaching and mentoring in coursework and in clinical and applied settings providing supervisory conditions conducive to a student's growth in mastering the requisites of professional practice, consistent with guidelines provided by the School-University Partnerships Office	*Evaluation of excellence requires demonstration of <u>exemplary practice</u> in:*

THE INTEGRATION OF TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP		
Competence	**Examples of Indicators**	**Excellence**
Evaluation of competence requires demonstration of <u>effectiveness</u> in:	publishing refereed and/or professional papers on teaching and learning publishing textbooks and/or teaching guides producing materials, multimedia, or other technology to enrich teaching and learning engaging in inquiry and/or evaluation projects designed to improve teaching and learning developing materials and/or practices that involve students with current research issues in particular subject areas promoting timely knowledge transfer to practitioners working in clinical, educational and other areas	*Evaluation of excellence requires demonstration of <u>exemplary practice</u> in:*

LEADERSHIP IN TEACHING		
Competence	**Examples of Indicators**	**Excellence**
Evaluation of competence requires demonstration of <u>effectiveness</u> in:	developing new courses and/or reform of curricula mentoring colleagues and students on teaching coordinating programs, cohorts, options, or other program-level initiatives offering advice and/or consultation on teaching to programs or organizations outside OISE providing seminars, training, modules, programs, etc on teaching to organizations outside OISE	*Evaluation of excellence requires demonstration of <u>exemplary practice</u> in:*

Application of Criteria for Decisions of Tenure and Decisions of Promotion to Full Professor. The following table outlines two distinctions: the first between a recommendation of competence and a recommendation of excellence for both tenure decisions and decisions about promotion to the rank of Professor; and the second, between a recommendation of excellence for tenure decisions and a recommendation of excellence for decisions about promotion to Professor.

	Tenure	**Promotion to Professor**
Competence	Demonstrated effectiveness in Teaching Practice and in *one* of the other three criteria	Demonstrated effectiveness in Teaching Practice and in *one* of the other three criteria
Excellence	Demonstrated exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and in *one* of the other three criteria	Demonstrated exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and usually in *two* of the other three criteria

The requirements for a recommendation of competence are the same for tenure decisions and decisions about promotion to Professor (demonstrated effectiveness in Teaching Practice and one of the other three criteria). The requirements for a recommendation of excellence for decisions about promotion to Professor are greater than those for a recommendation of excellence for tenure decisions. Promotion to the rank of Professor on the grounds of teaching excellence will usually involve the demonstration of exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and two of the other criterion areas. In exceptional circumstances, however, exemplary activities in Teaching Practice and one other criterion area, that go far beyond expectation for exemplary practice in those areas, may be sufficient to meet expectations for Professor.

Application of the Criteria for the Decision Regarding Promotion to Senior Lecturer. In order for teaching-stream faculty members to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, they must meet the same standard as is required for a judgment of "excellence" on the part of a tenure-stream faculty member at the time of the tenure decision. That is, they must demonstrate exemplary practice in teaching practice and in at least one of the other three criteria. Note that the application of these criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer will be further developed and/or modified (e.g., adapted

for those Lecturers who work in clinical settings or in leadership positions) in the subsequent revision of the OISE *Divisional Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching Activities and Pedagogical/Professional Development for Promotion to Senior Lecturer.*

INDIVIDUAL, DEPARTMENTAL AND DIVISIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN SUPPORTING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Individual responsibilities:
- The pedagogy of teaching and learning is a field of study devoted to the analysis of how people learn. Findings from this field are essential knowledge for the teaching of all disciplines. Many junior faculty members at the time of their appointment at OISE are relatively inexperienced teachers. It is recommended that these faculty members attend a course on the pedagogy of teaching and learning in the first year of their appointment. Short courses are offered through the University's Office of Teaching Advancement; auditing of other courses offered at OISE is also possible. Courses and workshops on the pedagogy of teaching and learning are also likely to benefit senior faculty, and they too are encouraged to avail themselves of these opportunities.
- Providing the evidence outlined above for PTR, Third Year Review, Tenure and Promotion, as appropriate.

Departments are responsible for:
- Facilitating faculty members' awareness of and access to resources and services available from the Office of Teaching Advancement and other OISE and campus support services.
- Providing mentoring on teaching and supervision for pre-tenure faculty
- Developing resources that describe the ways in which criteria for tenure and promotion have been operationlized within the departmental setting
- Monitoring the preparedness of pre-tenure faculty for the third year review and tenure review.
- Establishing departmental procedures for peer classroom observation.
- Customizing course evaluation forms as needed and guidelines for interpretation of course evaluation data.
- Maintaining a secure archive of written course evaluations.

The Dean's Office is responsible for:

- Establishing the OISE Teaching Support Office.
- Maintaining an ongoing and reciprocal relationship with the Office of Teaching Advancement.
- Facilitating faculty members' awareness of and access to resources and services available from the Office of Teaching Advancement and other OISE and campus support services.
- 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.
- Maintaining a data processing facility and data archive for close-ended course evaluations.

OISE TEACHING EVALUATION FORM

Instructor's Last Name _____ **First Name** _____

Course Title _____

What program offers this course? (Circle)

Initial Teacher Education			
B.Ed./Tech. Studies	CTEP	Master of Teaching	MA-Child Study

Graduate Program in:						
Department	AECP	CTL	HDAP	SESE	TPS	Collaborative Program

Course Number:	**Term(s)** (Circle)	Sept.-Dec.	Jan.-April	May-June	July-August	Other
Section Number:						

Academic Year	20___ - 20___

Please check your response	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very good
How would you rate the overall value of the course content?					
How would you rate the overall performance of the instructor in this course?					
How would you rate the instructor in <u>each</u> of the following areas?					
Clearly communicates the learning objectives of the course.					
Is knowledgeable in the subject area.					
Presents material that is intellectually challenging					
Presents material in an organized and comprehensible manner.					
Adapts teaching methods to students' needs and backgrounds.					
Uses methods of evaluation (e.g. papers, assignments, tests) that provide a fair evaluation of student learning.					
Respects all students					

Please check your response	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very good
Stimulates and encourages the sense of inquiry amongst students					
Facilitates discussion and/or teamwork in the course.					
Department and Program-specific items					

Was this specific course required for your program? (Circle)	Yes	No

How demanding did you find this course? (Circle)	Very demanding	Somewhat demanding	Not very demanding

In what degree program are you registered? (Circle)

B.Ed./Tech. Studies	CTEP	Master of Teaching	MA-Child Study	
MEd	MA	PhD	EdD	None—special student

Please add any comments you would like to make about your experiences in this course.

Instructor Course Information Form

Instructor's Last Name _____ **First Name** _____

Course Title _____

What program offers this course? (Circle)

Initial Teacher Education			
B.Ed./Tech. Studies	CTEP	Master of Teaching	MA-Child Study

Graduate Program in:					
Department	AECP	CTL	HDAP	SESE	TPS	Collaborative Program

Course Number:	**Term(s)** (Circle)	Sept.- Dec.	Jan.- April	May- June	July- August	Other
Section Number:						

Academic Year	20___ - 20___

Number of students registered in course:

Graduate students	
B.Ed./Tech. Studies	
Other	

When was this course scheduled? (Circle)

Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Weekend	Open (online)
Time	Morning	Afternoon	Evening				