MEMORANDUM

To: Executive Committee of Faculty Council

From: Professor Wei Yu
             Chair, Teaching Methods and Resources Committee

Date: September 13, 2013 for October 18, 2013 Faculty Council Meeting

Re: **Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering Guidelines and Procedures
             for the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses**

REPORT CLASSIFICATION

This is a minor policy matter that will be considered by the Executive Committee for approving and forwarding to Faculty Council for information.

BACKGROUND

The Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering adopted a new course evaluation framework in April 2013. The new framework consists of 8 core institutional questions, 8-9 faculty-level questions, and up to 3-4 departmental/instructor questions. The Faculty Council adopted the wordings of faculty-level questions subject to minor changes from the question validation process. The minor changes are to be approved by the Teaching Methods and Resources Committee (TMRC). The Faculty Council adopted to implement the new evaluation framework starting the Fall term of 2013.

STRUCTURE

This report deals specifically with the following issues of the new evaluation framework:

1. The validation process for the faculty-level questions and the resulting minor changes as approved by TMRC;
2. The administration of online teaching evaluation starting Fall 2013:
3. The evaluation of teaching assistants;
4. The reporting of the teaching evaluation results and sharing of results with students.

Together with the Centre of Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI), the TMRC developed the *Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering Guidelines & Procedures for the Student Evaluation of Teaching (FASE Guidelines),* which is attached to this report.

PROCESS AND CONSULTATION

The faculty-level teaching evaluation question validation process was conducted by CTSI. TMRC met on August 22 and September 10, 2013. The revised questions were discussed and approved by TMRC, and incorporated in the *FASE Guidelines*. TMRC voted electronically to approve the *FASE Guidelines* for forwarding to the Executive Committee and to the Faculty Council. TMRC membership includes student representatives from the Engineering Society.

PROGRAM

1. Minor Changes to the Faculty-Level Questions:

The faculty-level question validation process consists of a survey of randomly chosen 293 engineering students, contacted by CTSI in August 2013, of which 39 completed the survey. The students were asked about their interpretations of the intended meaning of the questions and the perceived clarity. The CTSI recommended the following wording changes to three of the faculty-level questions (Q.12, Q.13, Q.14). In addition, the TMRC recommended a minor change to a fourth question (Q.16 Lab only):

Original Questions	New Questions
Q.12 The instructor explained how the *subject matter* related to other courses	Q.12 The instructor explained how the *course concepts* related to other courses
Q.13 The feedback I received provided guidance to improve my understanding of course materials	Q.13 The feedback I received *on tests, assignments, labs, and/or projects* provided guidance to improve my understanding of course materials
Q.14 The instructor explained *the learning objectives* for the course	Q.14 The instructor explained *what students are expected to learn* in the course
Q.16 (Lab only) The laboratory enhanced my understanding of science *and* engineering concepts	Q.16 (Lab only) The laboratory enhanced my understanding of science *and/or* engineering concepts

The revisions are minor. The revised questions were approved by TMRC. The complete set of institutional and divisional questions can be found in the attached *FASE Guidelines*.

2. Administration of Online Teaching Evaluation

Teaching evaluation is administered by CTSI in an online centralized system. The departmental questions are selected at the beginning of the term. The instructors are given a window of at least one week in the middle of the term to select instructor questions. The students are given a

window of at least two weeks prior to the start of the examination period to complete the teaching evaluation.

For 2013-14, courses that are administered by the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, but taught by the Faculty of Arts and Science (e.g., MAT188, PHY180, etc.) will continue to be evaluated under the engineering course evaluation framework. This issue may be re-visited in the future.

3. Evaluation of Teaching Assistants

Procedures for assessing teaching assistants (TAs) within the new evaluation framework are currently being established. Until these new procedures are in place, TA evaluations will continue to be administered in the usual fashion. The blue paper forms will be distributed by the respective undergraduate offices at the end of the term and retained by the instructors after completion.

4. Reporting of Teaching Evaluation Results

The course evaluation results for institutional, divisional, and departmental questions are available to the instructor, to the Dean, to the home department of the instructor, as well as to the department/program sponsoring the course (e.g., first-year program, engineering science, etc.) In addition, comparative data across the department, across the Faculty, and across the institution will be available.

The course evaluation results for instructor-selected questions are available to the instructors only. Instructors may share this data with unit or Faculty administrators, if they so choose.

In the *Provostial Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses,* the divisions are asked to identify an accessible means of distributing data from course evaluation questions to all students. *Provostial Guidelines* also allow any instructor to opt-out of sharing their evaluation data with students on an individual basis.

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering will administrate a teaching evaluation data-sharing system with students, incorporated into Blackboard/Portal. The student's report for each course will include course enrollment, number of responses, and the mean of the responses for each quantitative institutional, divisional, and departmental question. For each course, the student's report will be available for three years.

Instructors may opt out of having the teaching evaluation results made available. Instructors will be asked to indicate their interest in doing so at the time that they select their course-specific questions. This must be specified separately for each course, each time it is taught.

PROPOSAL/MOTION

For information

DRAFT (Sept 2013)

Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering
Guidelines & Procedures for the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses

The University of Toronto is committed to ensuring the quality of its academic programs, its teaching and the learning experiences of its students. An important component of this is the regular evaluation of courses by students. At the University of Toronto, course evaluations are conducted for the following reasons:

1. To provide formative data used by instructors for the continuous improvement of their teaching.
2. To provide members of the University community, including students, with information about teaching and courses at the institution.
3. To collect data used in the summative evaluation of teaching for administrative purposes such as annual merit, tenure and promotion review.
4. To provide data used by departments and divisions for program and curriculum review.

Course evaluations are part of an overall teaching and program evaluation framework that includes regular peer review, instructor self-assessment, cyclical program review and other forms of assessment, as appropriate. As part of this framework, course evaluations are a particularly useful tool for providing students with an opportunity to provide feedback on their own learning experiences (from the *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses*, 2011).

This document outlines the various roles and responsibilities of the institution, the Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering, departments/programs, and instructors in relation to the administration and use of course evaluations. In addition, this document provides information pertaining to the reporting of collected course evaluation data (addressing format and use).

1. Administration of Course Evaluations

At the Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering all undergraduate courses will be evaluated as required by the University of Toronto's *Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching in Courses* (2011).[1] The normal practice will be to utilize the University of Toronto's centralized course evaluation framework and online delivery system for all courses. The institutional framework provides a customizable evaluation form with the following general format:

Type of questions	Use of questions
Institutional questions	These questions must appear on the forms for all courses across the university.
Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering divisional questions	These questions must appear on the forms for all courses (or relevant subset of courses) in the division.
Department/program questions	These questions may be specified to appear on the forms for all courses (or subsets of courses) by the course-sponsoring unit.
Instructor questions	These questions may be specified for each course offering taught by the instructor.

---

[1] See: http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/Policy_Student_Evaluation_of_Teaching_in_Courses.htm

Responsibility for the administration of course evaluations will be as follows:

1.a. University Role and Responsibilities
- Provides and supports a centralized course evaluation framework and online delivery system that preserves student anonymity and supports various reporting options. This framework and system will be used for all courses across the university. The framework includes a common course evaluation form that is customizable by divisions, academic units, and instructors. The online course evaluation system will be managed centrally through the Office of the Vice-President & Provost and the Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation (CTSI).
- Specifies a set of institutional questions that reflect the overall teaching priorities of the University, and that must be included on all course evaluation forms.
- Provides staff support for course evaluation administration in CTSI through the Course Evaluation Support Officer (CESO) who is specifically designated to assist divisions, units, and instructors in all aspects of the evaluation process.
- Provides materials to support the interpretation and use of course evaluation data available at: http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework.htm
- Manages communication to students, faculty, academic administrators, and staff information about the course evaluation system, with the assistance of the CESO and in consultation with the division.
- Advises divisions on appropriate evaluation processes for courses with enrolment under 10.

1.b. Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering Role and Responsibilities
- Oversees the course evaluation process for all of its courses. This includes all undergraduate courses offered by its departments/programs.
- Engages the support of the Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering student society to facilitate ongoing communication with students.
- In consultation with academic units, identifies any courses that may require alternative means of evaluation. This may include low enrolment courses, team taught courses, online courses, etc.
- Identifies divisional questions that reflect division teaching and learning priorities.
- Sets the time period for course evaluations. All evaluations will be administered at the end of each term for a time period of at least two weeks duration, prior to the start of the examination period. Students will have the opportunity to complete the evaluations online throughout the given time period.
- Ensures that course evaluation data reports are shared with academic departments/programs and students (see details below).
- Reviews processes relating to the administration of course evaluations regularly to identify any necessary changes to division-wide procedures.

1.c. Department/Program Role and Responsibilities
- Identifies a faculty member (or members) to serve as the primary contact between the department/program and the Dean's office and the CESO. Normally, this would be the associate chair undergraduate. This individual (or individuals) will provide assistance with the selection of courses to be evaluated.
  - Wherever possible, information about courses and the instructional team, including instructors and TAs, will be drawn automatically from the student information system (currently ROSI). For some courses, the available information may be incomplete. Academic units will identify any courses where information is incomplete or insufficient,

and will provide to CTSI any necessary additional information needed to administer the course evaluations.

- Identifies up to 3 questions, for inclusion on the course evaluation form, based on department/program level teaching and learning priorities. These questions may apply to all courses offered by the department/program or to particular sub-sets of courses. The questions will be drawn from the institutional question bank or developed in collaboration with CTSI and the CESO.

1.d. Instructor Role and Responsibilities

- If desired, selects up to 3-4 additional questions (provided that the total number of questions is 20 or less) for the evaluation form for each offering of each course that they teach. Instructors may use these questions to assess specific teaching priorities and/or approaches not addressed elsewhere on the form. The data collected through the use of these questions are intended to provide formative feedback for the instructor and as such will only be reported to the instructor.
    - o Each instructor teaching a course will receive an email invitation to add instructor-selected questions from the question bank to the course evaluation form. Directions, guidance, and deadlines for this process will be included with the email communication. There is no requirement for instructors to add questions to their evaluation forms.
    - o Instructors may choose to share the results from course-specific questions with their chair or other academic administrators (e.g. for PTR/Merit, tenure and promotion review).

2. *The Evaluation Form*

The University of Toronto's course evaluation framework allows for the creation of a customizable form that includes a set of required core institutional questions, divisionally-selected questions, departmentally-selected questions and instructor-selected questions. **The maximum number of questions permitted on the evaluation form is 20.**

At the Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering the standard format for course evaluations is as follows:

Administrative Responsibility	Questions	Details

Core institutional questions (8)	1. I found the course intellectually stimulating.
	 2. The course provided me with a deeper understanding of the subject matter.
	 3. The instructor created a course atmosphere that was conducive to my learning.
	 4. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams improved my understanding of the course material.
	 5. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams provided opportunity for me to demonstrate an understanding of the course material.
	     Scale (Questions 1-5):
	     Not at all >> Somewhat >> Moderately >> Mostly >> A great deal
	 6. Overall, the quality of my learning experience in this course was:
	     Poor >> Fair >> Good >> Very good >> Excellent
	 7. Please comment on the overall quality of instruction in this course.
	     Open-ended.
		To be included on <u>all</u> forms

Administrative Responsibility	Questions	Details
	8. Please comment on any assistance that was available to support your learning in the course. Open-ended.	

Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering Questions (7)	9. The course helped me improve my ability to formulate, analyze and solve problems.
	10. The instructor related course concepts to practical applications and/or current research.
	11. The course expanded my understanding of the ethical and environmental issues concerning engineering in society.
	12. The instructor explained how the course concepts related to other courses.
	13. The feedback I received on tests, assignments, labs, and/or projects provided guidance to improve my understanding of course materials.
	14. The instructor explained what students are expected to learn in the course.
	    Scale (Questions 9-14):
	    Not at all >> Somewhat >> Moderately >> Mostly >> A great deal
	
	15. What is your overall rating of the instructor as a teacher?
	    Scale (Question 15):
	    Poor >> Fair >> Good >> Very good >> Excellent
		To be included on <u>all</u> Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering forms

Faculty-level questions (depending on type of course, as identified by the instructor) (1 to 2)	Lecture-based courses:
	16. The instructor used appropriate means to deliver the material in a clear and organized manner.
	
	Project-based courses:
	16. The course encouraged innovation in the project.
	17. The course provided opportunities to improve communication skills.
	
	-Laboratory-only courses:
	16. The laboratory enhanced my understanding of science and/or engineering concepts.
	
	    Scale:
	    Not at all >> Somewhat >> Moderately >> Mostly >> A great deal	

Department-level / Instructor Questions (3 to 4)	Department-level and instructor questions can be introduced as long as the total number of questions is 20 or less.	**Questions (quantitative/ qualitative) may be drawn from the central question bank.**

2.a. TA Questions [if relevant]
Procedures for assessing teaching assistants within the new evaluation framework are currently being established. Units interested in including questions pertaining to teaching assistants should contact the Dean's Office. Until these new procedures are in place, TA evaluations will continue to be administered in the usual fashion.

3. Reporting
Reports of the results of course evaluations will be available to various audiences, following the *Provostial Guidelines on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses*, which outline institutional requirements relating to the access of course evaluation data. Available reports include:

3.a. Summative Report
Purpose and Recipients
- Intended to be used for summative evaluation in support of assessment of an instructor's teaching for PTR, tenure and promotion, awards, etc. Note that student evaluation of teaching forms just one component of a thorough assessment of an instructor.
- Available to the instructor, as well as to their dean(s) and academic department/program head(s), and those responsible for program oversight, such as associate chairs.
- Available to both the home department of the instructor *and* the academic unit sponsoring the course (e.g., first-year program, engineering science, etc.)

Included Information (each course reported on separately)
- Quantitative and qualitative data from institutional, divisional, and academic department/program questions
- A composite score will be provided for core institutional questions 1-5
  - The composite reflects the extent to which each of the institutional priorities was part of a student's learning experience in his/her course. The composite takes into account multiple factors relating to this experience and provides a comprehensive assessment of that experience.
- For each question, the following data will be provided:
  - Question text
  - Response set
  - Course enrolment
  - Number of responses
  - For quantitative questions only:
    - Frequency (displayed as chart)
    - Mean
    - Median
    - Mode
    - Standard deviation
    - Note: For courses with enrolment under 5 and when response rates are under 10, only the response distributions will be provided for each of the quantitative questions.
- The following comparative data for quantitative questions will also be provided (when available):
  - For each academic unit (for institutional, divisional, and academic unit-selected questions):
    - Mean for all undergraduate or graduate courses, as relevant

5

- - Mean for courses at the same level of instruction (e.g. 100-level)
      - Mean for courses of similar size
      - Standard deviations for academic department/program means
    - From the division (for institutional and divisional questions):
      - Divisional mean for all undergraduate or graduate courses, as relevant
      - Divisional mean for courses at the same level of instruction (e.g. 100-level)
      - Divisional mean for courses of similar size
      - Standard deviations for divisional means
    - From the institution (for institutional questions):
      - Institutional mean (graduate or undergraduate)
      - Standard deviation for institutional mean
- Note: Data from instructor-selected questions will appear only on the formative report. Instructors may share this data with unit or Faculty administrators, if they so choose.

3.b. Formative Report
Purpose and Recipients
- Intended to be used for formative purposes – i.e., to inform an instructor in improvement of their teaching and course development.
- Available only to the instructor.

Included Information (each course reported on separately)
- All the information from the summative report, **plus**:
- Data from any and all instructor-selected questions, including:
  - Question text
  - Response set
  - Course enrolment
  - Number of responses
  - For quantitative questions only:
    - Frequency (displayed as chart)
    - Mean
    - Median
    - Mode
    - Standard deviation

3.c. Student's Report
Purpose and Recipients
- Intended to provide information helpful to students in course planning and selection.
- Available to students in the Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering.
- For each course, student's report is available for duration of 3 years.

Included Information (each course reported on separately)
- Data from all quantitative institutional, divisional, and departmental questions, including
  - Question text
  - Response set
  - Course enrollment
  - Number of responses
  - Mean of the responses

Note that instructors may opt out of having the information made available for each course offering they teach. Instructors will be asked to indicate their interest in doing so at the time that they select their course-specific questions. This must be specified separately for each course, each time it is taught.

3.d. Department/Program Report
Purpose and Recipients
- Intended to provide information to academic departments/programs helpful in curriculum design, planning, and assessment.
- Available to academic departments/programs heads and associate chairs.

Included Information (each course reported on separately)
- Summative report for each course and instructor, **plus**:
- Academic departments/programs may request customized reports reflecting aggregate or individual instructor data from institutional, divisional, or academic departments/programs questions.

3.e. Dean's Report
Purpose and Recipients
- Intended to provide information to the dean's office helpful in assessing teaching and curriculum across the Faculty.
- Available to dean and designates.

Included Information (each course reported on separately)
- Summative report for each course and instructor, **plus**:
- The Dean's office may request customized reports reflecting aggregate or individual instructor data from institutional, divisional, or academic unit questions.