

Report of the Teaching Task Force

February, 2008

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction and Overview	3
Enhancing Assistance to Faculty	4
Refining Policy	5
Acknowledging Excellence	8
Increasing Teaching Opportunities for Graduate Students	8
Improving Infrastructure	10

APPENDICES

A: Membership of the Teaching Task Force

B: Information and Support for Teaching Offered by the Office of Teaching Advancement

C: Information and Support for Teaching Issues Specifically Related to Academic Technology

D: OISE Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching (OGAT)

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

In September, 2006, in the context of the University of Toronto's strong emphases both on enhancing student experience and on supporting and celebrating teaching, Dean Jane Gaskell established a Teaching Task Force at OISE. Chaired by Professor Jenny Jenkins, and broadly representative of OISE's units and programs, the membership of the Task Force is included in Appendix A.

OISE, which prides itself on both its excellent teaching and knowledge about teaching, very much applauds the University's current emphases, and wishes to take advantage of the opportunity they afford for us to provide leadership in the area of teaching. In this context, it is important to make sure our own practices are as good and as well considered as they can be.

The overall mandate of the Task Force was to examine how OISE can enhance its recognition of and support for excellent teaching, in ways that will serve students well, help faculty with continuous improvement, recognize problems and reward successes. These recommendations aim to support a wide range of teaching practices and to recognize equity as a central dimension of good teaching. More specifically, Dean Gaskell asked the Task Force to review practices and make recommendations in four areas:

- Enhancing current practices for helping faculty members with their teaching and assessment of learning at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including considerations for the integration of technology into instruction
- Bringing the OISE/UT *Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching at OISE/UT* (known as the GET policy), adopted in 1999, into line with U of T guidelines for divisional policies and with current knowledge about successful practice in the assessment of teaching. This is intended to provide more consistent guidance on the assessment and evaluation of teaching through portfolios, peer reviews and student surveys for purposes of tenure, promotion and annual reviews.
- Acknowledging excellent teaching, through transparent processes that nominate OISE teachers for internal and external teaching awards
- Increasing the opportunities for graduate students to learn to teach at the university level as part of their doctoral experience

In order to conduct its work, members of the Task Force examined current practices within OISE, reviewed policy and practices in other divisions of the University of Toronto and other peer institutions, and consulted with departments, with deans and chairs, and with initial teacher education directors and coordinators. In preparing this report, the Task Force obtained several rounds of feedback from the OISE community: during the spring of 2007 when members visited all OISE departments and presented preliminary directions for the report; at the October 10, 2007 Faculty Council meeting, after the formal presentation of the report; between October 10 and November 4, 2007 when departments, programs and individuals submitted written documents; at the December 5, 2007 Faculty Council meeting; through a series of intensive individual and group consultations in December, 2007 and January, 2008 with Lecturers, tenure-stream faculty and chairs; and at a Town Hall meeting held on January 30, 2008. The Task Force very much appreciated the community's very serious consideration of the issues addressed in the report, and has worked hard to incorporate as many suggestions as possible.

In general, the work of the Task Force revealed many excellent resources, policies and ideas, both at OISE and in the University, to enhance teaching. In 2000, OISE played a leadership role in the Excellence in Teaching Initiative Design Team, whose report to the Provost included recommendations that led to the establishment of the Office of Teaching Advancement, the key University-level resource and support for teaching enhancement.

On the other hand, the Task Force concluded that, in order to ensure that we support and celebrate the best possible teaching by faculty, increase opportunities for graduate students to learn to teach, and provide all students with the opportunity to comment on their program experiences, it will be necessary to make some adjustments to policies and procedures, to improve communication about existing resources, and to provide additional support at the institutional/divisional level.

In the balance of this report, for each of the four areas specified by Dean Gaskell, we will review background and current practices, describe areas of concern identified by the Task Force, and consider recommendations for future practice. We will conclude with a section explicitly concerned with the infrastructure required to support the other recommendations made by the Task Force; this will include the establishment of an OISE Teaching Support Office.

ENHANCING ASSISTANCE TO FACULTY

The Office of Teaching Advancement (OTA) at the University of Toronto was established in 2002 as a consequence of recommendations made in the Design Team's report, *The Support and Enhancement of Teaching at the University of Toronto*. The OTA offers information and support on a wide range of teaching-related topics including, for example, grading and assessment, accessibility and teaching for an inclusive classroom, group work and collaborative learning. Few OISE faculty have availed themselves of these excellent resources. A list of resources provided by the Office of Teaching Advancement appears in Appendix B.

Within every department of OISE, there are a number of sources of information and support for the improvement of teaching. For example, in the past year, the School University Partnerships Office and Student Services, and the Office of the Associate Dean, Teacher Education have offered workshops, speakers and mentoring to assist faculty (and students) on issues of equity and social justice. OISE's Continuing Education office, while at this time developing its instructional leadership programs and conferences primarily for educators in the field, has tremendous expertise in teaching. The Centre for Teacher Development in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning has substantial knowledge, particularly from a research perspective, about teacher education, induction and mentoring, and a variety of other issues relevant to excellent teaching. Throughout OISE, faculty have an exceptional range of knowledge and experience with respect to teaching and supervision of students.

In addition, both at the University level, through the Resource Centre for Academic Technology (RCAT), and within OISE, through the Education Commons, many resources are available to provide support for teaching issues specifically related to academic technology. These resources target the use of learning technologies as a strategy for student engagement in the classroom, as an online enhancement to traditional courses and as a primary delivery platform for distance education. Lists of resources provided by the RCAT and by the Education Commons appear in Appendix C.

In this period too, there has been interest at university, division and department levels in the mentoring of newly-appointed faculty. For example, on request, the OTA will provide a mentor from outside the department who will visit classes and provide feedback on teaching. OISE's current (i.e., 1999) *Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching at OISE/UT* (the GET policy) explicitly recommends the establishment of a mentoring program for teaching. Despite both the wide interest in and the policy guidance for mentoring, mentoring practices across OISE are uneven. Although some departments offer mentors to junior faculty in the first year of their appointments, current mentorships are usually based on overlapping research interests. Departments rarely assign mentors based on their skills in teaching or in supervision of students. Although some junior faculty receive mentoring in the supervision of students (through co-supervision and other arrangements) others receive little mentoring in this critical activity.

In short, despite the considerable resources and opportunities available to support the enhancement of teaching, and despite the centrality of teaching in much that we do in OISE, the University's education faculty, there does not appear to have been sufficiently systematic communication with faculty, particularly with new faculty, about the importance of enhancing teaching, and about the supports available for doing so. Supports for enhancing teaching in the classroom include working with a mentor, team teaching, observing skilled teachers and taking a course (e.g., auditing an OISE course, attending an OTA course, or working online). Mentors can work with faculty in student supervision and the need for such mentoring has been described with respect to both graduate and preservice supervision. Both junior and senior faculty members are encouraged to take advantage of available opportunities.

Accordingly, the Teaching Task Force recommends:

THAT all faculty be made aware, in their first semester of appointment, of the importance of teaching through (1) the provision of information about University and divisional resources for teaching in general and for the use of academic technology; (2) the new divisional policy (see below); (3) the linking of all new faculty with teaching mentors which includes mentoring in the supervision process; and (4) providing all new faculty with an initial consultation on educational technologies and other innovative teaching strategies.

THAT chairs communicate regularly and consistently with their faculty regarding the programs and services available to them through these resource centres and programs, and that the OISE Teaching Support Office coordinate various activities (e.g., seminars, forums, etc.) to support the ongoing development of excellence in teaching.

REFINING POLICY

The University of Toronto has a number of policies and procedures that pertain to the evaluation of its faculty for purposes of promotion, and for annual reviews for PTR/Merit. For tenure-stream faculty, the key documents pertaining to decisions about tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Full Professor, are the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* and the *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions*, respectively. For teaching-stream faculty, the key policy document regarding promotion to Senior Lecturer is the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*. For a number of years, the University has had the expectation that each division would develop its own guidelines for assessing the

teaching activities that were part of such reviews. In 1999, OISE/UT developed its *Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching at OISE/UT* (the GET policy) to meet this expectation.

Since that time, the University has developed the updated *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions* (P&D #20, 2002-03). This document reflects best practices in the assessment of teaching effectiveness for faculty and specifies in greater detail the nature of the guidelines that divisions must develop and review regularly. In particular, the guidelines for teaching effectiveness should include expectations for the teaching portfolio, the criteria for assessing competence and excellence in teaching, and specification of the information required for evaluations of teaching. The divisional guidelines, once submitted to the Vice-President and Provost and approved under delegated authority from the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, will have the same force as any other section of the appointments and promotions policy.

The Teaching Task Force examined in detail OISE's existing GET with two intentions: to bring it into line with the Provostial guidelines and, where possible, to extend best practices in light of OISE's expertise and potential leadership in the area of teaching. Several problems with the existing GET became apparent. Some of the recommendations of the original GET policy were simply never implemented; in particular, there was no implementation of the proposal to establish a Teaching Resource Team to provide support to departments and instructors, to develop a divisional handbook, to identify a collection of resource materials on teaching assessment, to develop proposals for a mentorship program, and to investigate the feasibility of developing a teaching centre.

Although most departments at OISE do in fact conduct course evaluations, the existing GET policy does not specify any common course evaluation across departments and programs, nor does it require that course evaluations are norm-referenced. An additional element of the existing policy that was problematic for both faculty and students was that neither the department Chair nor the Associate Dean responsible for Teacher Education automatically received course evaluation data; it was regarded as the property of the individual faculty member. Hence, there was no immediate mechanism that allowed the Chair or Associate Dean to address any problems identified by students in courses. This interfered with the student's right to provide meaningful and effective feedback. This procedure also meant that if a faculty member chose not to submit their course evaluations, the Chair was not in a position to identify a faculty member who needed assistance to develop skills in teaching.

The lack of norm-referenced data can disadvantage our faculty at the time of tenure and promotion, and in situations where they are being nominated for teaching awards. Although norm-referenced data would only ever be one indicator of excellence in teaching, being able to demonstrate that a faculty member is outstanding when compared with their peers, does strengthen any case that is being made for excellence in teaching.

The Task Force, after surveying practices in other divisions of the university and in other peer institutions, concluded that the new divisional guidelines should specify a common course evaluation involving a small number of items (N=11) that will be used across OISE, as well as providing space for qualitative comments. Departments and programs will have the flexibility to add to the core items, additional items of particular interest to that unit. The analysis of the quantitative data, for both institute-wide and department/program-specific items, would be undertaken at the divisional level. The format for the course evaluations would be such that

individual instructors could add items of their own, but their analysis would not be done centrally. The eleven common items will be used by initial teacher education courses as well as graduate courses. The form for initial teacher education and graduate courses, prepared by the task force and drawn from existing instruments used at OISE, is appended to the new divisional guidelines which constitute Appendix D of this report.

The task force is aware that course evaluation data are systematically affected by student reactions to course size, level and content, instructor characteristics, teaching conditions and forms of delivery as well as whether a course is required or optional, at the graduate or B.Ed level. Additionally, in initial teacher education classes, there may be issues associated with student satisfaction with their practica that affect course evaluations. Given this, course evaluation data will be periodically analyzed for such effects and the results incorporated in guidelines for interpretation of course ratings.

In addition, as a result of a close examination of the existing GET, as well as of the Provostial guidelines, the Task Force identified an area where they believed OISE had the potential to make an important contribution, that of more clearly specifying what constitutes excellence in teaching and what differentiates it from competence. This clearer specification will assist all faculty members seeking tenure or promotion, as well as the Chairs who work with them in making cases. The Task Force suggested that the criteria for competence and excellence included in the 2002-2003 *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions* should be considered in four broad areas: Teaching Practice; Student Supervision (including Involvement in the Research Process); the Integration of Teaching and Scholarship; and Leadership in Teaching. Although the teaching of all tenure-stream and teaching-stream faculty will be considered in light of these criteria, the requirements for an assessment of competence and for an assessment of excellence in teaching are specified separately for the tenure decision, for the decision to promote to the rank of Professor, and for the decision about promotion to Senior Lecturer. Details of the criteria are included in the new divisional guidelines that appear as Appendix D.

Additionally, in this area, it was noted that, even though there is some overlap between the new guidelines on teaching being developed and some domains of the *OISE/UT Divisional Guidelines for Assessment of Creative Professional Activity* (2001), it was most advantageous to faculty to retain full descriptions of criteria in both sets of guidelines.

Accordingly, the Teaching Task Force recommends:

THAT the revised *OISE Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching (OGAT)*, presented as Appendix D of this report, be adopted. Key elements of the guidelines are (1) course evaluations with common core items; (2) availability of the data from the course evaluations to the department Chair and Associate Dean, Teacher Education; and (3) clearer specification of the criteria for competence and excellence in teaching.

THAT individuals who work with the new policy over the first two years of its use (either as department chairs or as candidates for promotion and tenure) document any difficulties that they experience in working with the policy. This feedback should be reviewed and incorporated into the policy as relevant. In addition to this initial examination of the policy after the first two years, the policy will be periodically reviewed thereafter on a five-year cycle. The policy will be implemented as of July 1, 2009. Those applying for tenure or promotion in 2008/2009 can choose the current guidelines (*Provostial Guidelines*) or the new policy.

ACKNOWLEDGING EXCELLENCE

OISE has a large number of truly excellent teachers, teachers who deserve celebration and nomination for external awards and for awards within OISE and the University. Our ability to do this effectively has been hampered by several factors. First, we have not had standard teaching evaluations that would allow for comparisons across faculty members on the same scale. Second, there has been too much variability across faculty members in the type and quality of data presented to allow for fair comparison. Third, awards within the university are conceptualized in a sequential fashion with divisional awards leading to university awards, leading to national awards. It is most beneficial for OISE faculty, therefore, to develop criteria for divisional awards that are consonant with those criteria used to judge more broadly-based awards. Fourth, one of the most serious barriers to acknowledging excellent teaching is the workload associated with putting nomination packages together. There has been little support within OISE for this preparation. Lastly, it is important to recognize that there are differences between teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels. It is important for OISE to articulate the ways in which excellence in graduate teaching may differ from excellence at the undergraduate level.

The measures recommended in the preceding sections (in particular, developing norms for course evaluations, more clearly specifying the data to be collected in evaluating teaching, and providing greater clarity about the criteria for excellent teaching) will help us to adjudicate the awards more effectively, thus dealing with the first and second obstacles described above. With respect to the third obstacle, the Task Force has revised the descriptions of the criteria for the four major OISE teaching awards in order to make them more consonant with those for external awards. Descriptions of the OISE awards – the David E. Hunt Award for Excellence in Graduate Teaching, the Award for Excellence in Initial Teacher Education, the Awards for Distinguished Contributions to Teaching, and the Award for Excellence in Continuing Education – along with their criteria and nomination procedures are outlined on the OISE website at <http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/faculty/newteachingawards.html>. With respect to the fourth obstacle, the Teaching Task Force discussed ways of working together to link relatively scarce resources (in departments, at the divisional level, and in the Office of Teaching Advancement) in the most efficient way. There was also clear recognition that in order to develop more teaching nominations from OISE, there must be some support at the divisional level for the work involved in making cases and coordinating processes with the Office of Teaching Advancement.

In this area, the Task Force recommends:

THAT there be a coordinated process for developing nominations for teaching awards (1) through using similar criteria for internal and external awards; (2) by using a general strategy of developing external nominations on the basis of successful internal ones; and (3) by increasing support at the divisional level and increasing awareness of the resources available in the Office of Teaching Advancement.

INCREASING TEACHING OPPORTUNITIES FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

There is considerable agreement among OISE doctoral students that there is a shortage of opportunities for them to learn to teach as part of their graduate experience, and that this disadvantages them when applying for academic positions. Since OISE does not have large undergraduate classes and because graduate classes usually cater to both MA and PhD students

(creating a potential conflict of interest for graduate students teaching such a class) the opportunities to do teaching assistant (TA) work are not comparable to those in many other departments and divisions. Through OISE's Teacher Education Program Assistant (TEPA) program, opportunities to gain teaching experience have been created, but these are guided by the needs of the initial teacher education program, making any significant increase in the size of the TEPA program difficult. In addition, TEPAs are chosen on the basis of their experience and ability to teach prospective teachers; the Teaching Task Force was particularly concerned with fostering opportunities for students who have not had much prior teaching experience. Finally, there are a number of constraints associated with labour agreements that limit the possibilities for graduate students to take on other teaching responsibilities.

The Task Force considered a wide range of options, and concluded that a developmental model that included a course focused on teaching in higher education could be a viable strategy for expanding teaching opportunities. This course will work to prepare students to teach independently within OISE, in other parts of the university, or in other colleges or universities.

The course proposed by the task force follows the examples of current teaching courses in the Departments of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning and Human Development and Applied Psychology. The new course will be offered at the OISE level rather than within departments. The course will have a practicum component that will involve working with a professor who is teaching in an area in which the student hopes to teach in the future; it will offer the student a range of experiences which will increase their experience and understanding of curriculum content, delivery, and assessment. Practica could take place in a variety of settings: initial teacher education core courses, related studies courses, undergraduate courses in other parts of the university including the Concurrent Teacher Education Program, courses in community colleges and universities, professional development courses, and Education Commons workshops.

The task force recommends that guidelines be drawn up to specify the types of responsibilities that can be borne by graduate students working in practicum settings, in order to ensure high quality experiences. It further recommends that discussions take place within departments to determine the ways in which practicum supervision will be recognized in faculty workload.

Although course-based approaches will be the main strategy for providing teaching opportunities, the Task Force recommends examining the possibilities of exploring other measures to increase employment-based teaching opportunities.

The major recommendations of the Task Force in this area are:

THAT OISE expand a course-based approach for preparing its graduate students for teaching roles, that guidelines be drawn up for the practicum experience and that support be made available at the divisional level to implement the recommendations.

THAT OISE continue to seek ways of expanding opportunities for graduate students to acquire teaching experience in paid positions, either as teaching assistants or sole responsibility instructors.

IMPROVING INFRASTRUCTURE

The Task Force recognized that there are a number of resource implications of these recommendations. For the recommendation concerned with enhancing assistance to faculty, additional resources are needed to proactively ensure that all faculty members know about teaching and academic technology resources in OISE and the university, and that all new faculty have a teaching mentor. For the recommendation regarding the revised OISE guidelines on teaching, additional resources are needed to ensure that course evaluations are adequately analyzed and stored; this probably implies investment in scanning technology as well as some staff time. For the recommendation regarding the acknowledgement of teaching excellence, resources are needed for coordination and support of nominations. And for the recommendation related to increasing teaching opportunities for graduate students, there will need to be support for ensuring that a course is developed and delivered, that students are aware of potential practicum settings, that guidelines are developed for practica and that there is continuing vigilance for other opportunities for students to gain experience.

These recommendations require faculty and staff resources over the short term (to ensure that procedures are put in place) and in the long term (to deliver a teaching-focused graduate course on an on-going basis). These resources can be dealt with through course release. Additional resources located in the Deans' Office and dedicated to the support and enhancement of teaching will also be required. Factoring together both faculty and administrative time the tasks are of the order of one FTE.

The Task Force recommends:

THAT OISE provide support for infrastructure of the equivalent of one FTE in order to implement the recommendations of the Task Force.

THAT OISE (1) establish the OISE Teaching Support Office; (2) appoint a faculty member to head the OISE Teaching Support Office; (3) designate resources for administrative assistance for the OISE Teaching Support Office; and (4) provide organizational support for the implementation of the Task Force recommendations.

APPENDIX A: MEMBERSHIP OF THE TEACHING TASK FORCE

Members of the Task Force on Teaching are:

- Jenny Jenkins, Professor, HDAP (Chair)
- Danielle Brown, Student, MA (Child Study) Program
- Tony Chambers, Assistant Professor, TPS and Associate Vice-Provost, Students
- Pam Gravestock, Graduate Student, TPS, and Office of Teaching Advancement
- Laurie Harrison, Director, Academic Computing, Education Commons
- Cathy Marks Krpan, Senior Lecturer, CTL
- Mike Mulder, Student, B.Ed. Program
- Carol Rolheiser, Associate Dean, Teacher Education
- Daniel Schugurensky, Associate Professor, AECF
- Dennis Thiessen, Professor and Chair, CTL
- Tanya Titchkosky, Assistant Professor, SESE

Mary Stager and Doug Hart provided administrative and research support to the Task Force.

APPENDIX B: INFORMATION AND SUPPORT FOR TEACHING OFFERED BY THE OFFICE OF TEACHING ADVANCEMENT

The Office of Teaching Advancement (OTA) provides numerous services to University of Toronto instructors, departments and divisions, including:

- **New Faculty Orientations**
The Office of Teaching Advancement helps to coordinate and deliver annual orientation sessions for all new faculty.
- **Workshops, courses, and special events on current teaching-related issues**
During the academic year, the OTA hosts a series of workshops on a wide variety of teaching-related issues. The OTA also offers lunchtime roundtable discussions where small groups of faculty have the opportunity to talk informally about current teaching issues, share their experiences, ask questions and meet colleagues from across the university. In addition, the OTA offers more intensive 8-week courses for UofT instructors. Recent offerings include:
 - Delivering a Polished Classroom Presentation
 - The Fundamentals of University Teaching
 - Teaching with Clarity: Pronunciation, Enunciation and Articulation
- **Customized workshops**
Faculties, divisions and departments wishing to address a particular topic are welcome to approach the Office of Teaching Advancement for assistance.
- **Individual Consultations and Classroom Visits (including videotaping)**
Faculty are invited to make confidential appointments with the OTA Director to discuss any aspect of teaching. Instructors wishing to receive an assessment of their classroom performance can request a classroom visit, followed by a confidential consultation. (Arrangements can also be made to have an individual class videotaped for the purposes of professional development.)
- **Teaching in the Canadian Classroom**
This professional program is primarily aimed at faculty who are new to the Canadian educational environment. Through workshops, individual consultation and small group sessions, this program will introduce faculty to the richly diverse environment of our institution and the Greater Toronto Area and will address issues unique to this educational context.
- **Assistance with the preparation of teaching award nominations**
OTA staff are happy to review nomination files or assist with the compilation of teaching award dossiers for internal and external teaching awards.

- **Resources on Teaching**

These include:

- OTA Publication Series on topics such as: *Teaching at the University of Toronto: A Resource for New Faculty*; *Copyright FAQs*; *Turnitin.com*; and, *Classroom Technology FAQs*
- Online Teaching Resources
- A Non-circulating Resource Centre

- **Academic Integrity Resources**

The Academic Integrity web site (www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity), established and maintained by the OTA, provides information and resources for faculty, teaching assistants, and students. Instructors are also welcome to contact the office to discuss ways to encourage academic honesty in their courses.

- **Turnitin.com – Plagiarism Prevention System**

On behalf of the University of Toronto, the OTA administers the site license to Turnitin.com.

- **OTA listserv**

Information regarding our events, external conferences, award deadlines and other teaching-related news is distributed through the OTA listserv.

- **Teaching Assistants' Training Program**

The TATP provides individual consultation to teaching assistants on a variety of teaching-related issues. See www.utoronto.ca/tatp for more information.

For more information on any of these resources or services, please contact the OTA at:

teaching.advancement@utoronto.ca

www.utoronto.ca/ota

416-946-3799

APPENDIX C: INFORMATION AND SUPPORT FOR TEACHING ISSUES SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY

1. OISE Education Commons (3rd Floor - 252 Bloor Street)

<http://oise.utoronto.ca/ec>

The Education Commons provides the OISE faculty and students with a range of local instructional technology services and supports.

EC Instructional Technology Support

- Training and consultation on Blackboard and Knowledge Forum Learning Systems
- Instructional technology consultations and support for special projects

Library Services

- Specialized workshops on library/curriculum resources may be requested by faculty
- Guidance on special collections

Help Desk Support

- General technical questions and troubleshooting
- Technical support for Blackboard, Knowledge Forum and First Class
- Classroom technology booking and support
- Bookable teaching labs
- AV services and equipment booking

Programs

- Technology Training Workshops
- Special Events and Seminars on emerging technologies
- Orientation Sessions for new faculty and students

Web Resources

- EC Developed Web resources include a number of sections related to Academic Technology including
 - Online Teaching and Learning
 - Research Services

2. University of Toronto Central Technology Support

The University's Central Services provide technology-related support and services to faculty including the following:

Resource Centre for Academic Technology (4th Floor - Robarts Library)

<http://rcat.utoronto.ca>

- Coordinates campus-Wide Educational Technology Events
- Supports Blackboard Learning System
- Supports use of Classroom Response Systems ("Clickers")
- Provides RCAT Workshops on Web Design, Statistical Software, Emerging Technologies

Office of Teaching Advancement (4th Floor - Robarts Library)

<http://www.utoronto.ca/ota>

- Developed and maintains FAQ document on classroom technology support
- Supports Turnitin.com (supports detection and deterrence of plagiarism)
- Provides consultations with faculty regarding the effective integration of technology and teaching
- Hosts events in collaboration with RCAT and other campus units
- Maintains resources and materials related to technology and teaching (on-line and in a non-circulating resource centre)

Information Commons

1st Floor

Robarts Library

<http://www.utoronto.ca/ic>

- Supports UtorMail
- Sells UofT campus licenced software

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

CONTENTS

	Page
OISE Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching	D - 2
Sources of Information on Teaching Effectiveness	D - 3
The Teaching Portfolio	
Course Evaluations	
Student Supervision	
Peer Review	
Written Assessments of Students with Completed Course Work, and Graduates	
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	D - 6
PTR/Merit Review	
The Third Year Review for Tenure-stream Faculty	
Tenure, and Promotion to the Rank of Professor	
Promotion to Senior Lecturer	
Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness	D - 8
Individual, Departmental and Divisional Responsibilities in Supporting Teaching Effectiveness	D - 12
OISE Teaching Evaluation Form	D - 13
Instructor Course Information Form	D - 15

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
<p><i>Evaluation of competence requires demonstration of <u>effectiveness</u> in:</i></p>	<p>stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development</p> <p>articulating ideas and concepts clearly</p> <p>developing students' mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field</p> <p>encouraging students' sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning</p> <p>actively engaging with students' learning progress and accessibility to students</p> <p>using current scholarship and research on pedagogy to respond to the different learning styles and needs among students</p> <p>promoting academic integrity and adherence to grading standards of the division and, as appropriate, the ethical standards of the profession</p> <p>using various technology-based strategies to support the learning of students</p>	<p><i>Evaluation of excellence requires demonstration of <u>exemplary practice</u> in:</i></p>

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

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

LEADERSHIP IN TEACHING		
Competence	Examples of Indicators	Excellence
<i>Evaluation of competence requires demonstration of effectiveness in:</i>	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	<i>Evaluation of excellence requires demonstration of exemplary practice in:</i>

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 <i>one</i> of the other three criteria	Demonstrated effectiveness in Teaching Practice and in <i>one</i> of the other three criteria
Excellence	Demonstrated exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and in <i>one</i> of the other three criteria	Demonstrated exemplary practice in Teaching Practice and usually in <i>two</i> 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 operationalized 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				