



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING

Manual for the
Teaching Methods & Resources Committee
A Standing Committee of Faculty Council

Approved by the Council of the Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering: February 1, 1999
Last Revision approved by Speaker of Faculty Council: October 22, 2025

Manual for the Teaching Methods and Resources Committee

Preamble

Each Standing Committee of Faculty Council is required to have a manual, approved by the Speaker of Faculty Council and posted on the Faculty Council [webpage](#), which provides details particular to the committee. The purpose of the manual is to promote clarity and consistency in committee responsibilities and operations.

Each Standing Committee and the Academic Appeals Board (Undergraduate) are to be operated within the guidelines provided by the [Procedures for Committees of Council](#). These procedures provide information on the committee responsibilities, membership structure, chair and vice- chair, and meeting operating procedures.

1. Name of Committee

Teaching Methods & Resources Committee (TMRC)

2. Terms of Reference

On behalf of Faculty Council, each Standing Committee, being comprised of representative of stakeholders within the domain of the committee and supported by subject matter experts and administrative staff, is responsible, with respect to their domain, to:

1. Provide a forum for the full range of stakeholder voices to discuss present practice and new proposals;
2. Pursue best practice: investigate, study, report on and promote;
3. Review, periodically, policies and procedures;
4. Recommend, as appropriate, changes to policy and procedures;
5. Carry out specific, defined duties; and
6. Report regularly to Council on its activities and intentions.

3. Term of Office

July 1 of each academic year until June 30 of that academic year.

4. Domain

With respect to undergraduate and graduate classroom/course instruction, the Teaching Methods and Resources Committee is responsible for the domain including:

- a) Teaching methods, resources, and aids; and
- b) Setting guidelines for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and rewarding teaching effectiveness via the Faculty Teaching Awards.

5. Membership

The membership of the Teaching Methods and Resources Committee consists of:

Constituent Group	Number of Reps	Length of Term
5.1. Teaching Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemical Engineering & Applied Chemistry • Civil & Mineral Engineering • Electrical & Computer Engineering • Engineering Science • Institute for Aerospace Studies • Institute for Studies Transdisciplinary Engineering Education & Practice • Institute of Biomedical Engineering • Materials Science & Engineering • Mechanical & Industrial Engineering 	9 (One from each Academic Unit)	3 years
5.2. Members-at-Large <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate Students • Graduate Students • Alumni/ae 	2 1 1	1 year 1 year 3 years
5.3. Ex officio <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice-Dean, First Year • Vice-Dean, Undergraduate • Registrar 	1 1 1	Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing
5.4. Subject Matter Expert(s) (non-voting) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty Learning Strategist • Librarian, Engineering and Computer Science Library • Technology Specialist, Faculty 	1 1 1	Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing
5.5. Recording Secretary (non-voting)	1	Ongoing

6. Duties

6.1. Policy Duties

- The committee is responsible for creating and/or advising on and reviewing policy related to matters under its domain.
- The Chair or the Vice-Dean, Undergraduate shall be the official Faculty representative, where such is requested, on any University or Extra- University Committee, the scope of which falls within the terms of reference.
- The Committee shall represent the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering in matters concerned with teaching resources at the University level, such as the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation (CTSI) and the University of Toronto Library.
- The Committee shall provide input to the design of course teaching evaluations and monitor their use and administration.

6.2. Recurring Duties (Routine, Administrative)

- Administer all Faculty Teaching Awards.

6.3. Reporting and Coordinating Duties

- Report the decision on Faculty Teaching Awards to the FASE Director, Awards and Honours.
- Interact as needed on teaching methods and awards issues with appropriate committees and offices of this and other Faculties and the Governing Council.
- Report actions and recommendations of the Committee according to the rules of procedure established and from time to time amended by Council as set out in the *Procedures for Committees of Council*.

7. Rules and Procedures Differing from the Procedures for Committees of Council

N/A

8. Appendices

- [Appendix A: Teaching Awards Guidelines](#)
- [Appendix B: Teaching Awards Assessment Guidelines and Rubrics](#)
- [Appendix C: Teaching Award Adjudication, Procedures for the Committee](#)

9. For further information:

For policy and information items submitted to Faculty Council, see the Faculty Council [webpage](#). For other items produced by the Committee regarding operations, etc., contact the committee's Recording Secretary.

APPENDIX A: TEACHING AWARD GUIDELINES

1. [Teaching Assistant Award \(TAA\)](#)
2. [Early Career Teaching Award \(ECTA\)](#)
3. [Faculty Teaching Award \(FTA\)](#)
4. [Sustained Excellence in Teaching Award \(SETA\)](#)

TEACHING ASSISTANT AWARD

1. Eligibility

The Early Career Teaching Award is open to any teaching assistant hired within the Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering who:

- has worked as a Teaching Assistant in the Faculty for at least one semester
- has not previously won this award.

2. Nomination guidelines

Individuals nominated for the Teaching Assistant Award will be assessed based on outstanding performance as a TA in undergraduate teaching within the positions(s) they have held. The two main aspects that nomination packages should address are the impact of the nominee's teaching practice and the nominee's leadership and teaching development.

2.1. Impact of teaching practice

The nomination package should show how the nominee, within the parameters of their TA contract(s):

- demonstrates positive impact on students and course(s) through outstanding work in:
 - scheduled student instruction, which may include discussion-based tutorials, skill development tutorials, laboratories / practicals, and/or other forms of classroom instruction
 - supporting student learning through office hours and/or other activities outside of scheduled student instruction, for example by providing constructive feedback on student work, consulting with individual students and/or teams, acting as a channel of communication between students and course instructor(s) to improve the student experience, etc., in a proactive way
- shows potential for positive impact on course design and/or materials.

2.2. Leadership and teaching development

Nominees for this award will normally have demonstrated self-directed leadership within their role. The nomination package should show how the nominee, within the parameters of their TA contract(s):

- demonstrates a commitment and interest in teaching and learning
- demonstrates a strategy of facilitating student instruction and providing effective feedback
- demonstrates initiative within their role(s).

3. Nomination package documents

All documentation should be provided electronically in the form of two PDF documents, as follows, and submitted according to the instructions provided in the call for nominations. All primary documents and testimonials should adhere to the following formatting standards:

- pages must be Letter sized (8½" x 11"), with margins set at a minimum of ¾"
- pages must be single spaced, with a space after paragraphs
- all text must be in 12-pt font, with the exception of titles / headings / footnotes.

3.1. Primary documents

The following primary documents in the nomination package should be collected in a single PDF and arranged in this order:

1. **Cover letter**, written by the head of the nominee's academic unit, which can be co-signed by a faculty member who has supervised the TA (up to 2 pages)
This is the nomination letter, and it should do the following:
 - explain how the nominee has demonstrated impact and excellence within the context of the course(s) or academic unit
 - articulate factors that distinguish the nominee as a TA
 - synthesize and contextualize testimonials (provided as supporting documentation) to corroborate claims made in the cover letter
2. **Personal statement on teaching**, written by the nominee (*up to 2 pages*)
 - The statement should address their approach to teaching, and the nominee's beliefs about teaching. For example, this might include their ideas about how students learn, the role of a TA, hurdles to learning that must be overcome, and the benefits of particular instructional or assessment methods from the perspective of a TA. This may also include broader considerations of the role of a teacher in higher education, but not necessarily.

- The nominee should contextualize and/or summarize the remaining supporting documents, and highlight key aspects they wish to bring to the attention of the award selection committee. For example, they might highlight teaching experiences or accolades from their CV, share why they've chosen to include a particular teaching material as supporting document and/or note a trend in their teaching evaluation for a course.
- The nominee may also reference examples of leadership and teaching development and special project work in the statement, such as specific contributions to course design or materials, approach to the facilitation of tutorials, laboratories, or lectures, and additional experience supporting student learning in other ways.

3.2. Supporting documents

Nomination packages should include the following supporting documents. These are considered raw evidence to support the argument presented in the primary documents and should be used as such: the argument in the primary documents should integrate and interpret this evidence as appropriate. It should not be assumed that the Committee will read any supporting materials unless directed to do so in the primary documents. All supporting documents should be collected in a single PDF and arranged in this order. The Committee would appreciate the inclusion of a hyperlinked table of contents at the start of this PDF.

1. **Testimonials** (*up to 4 pages in total, formatted as required for primary documents*)
 - Testimonials are endorsements of the nominee's impact and excellence as a TA. These can take the form of traditional letters of support (maximum 1 page each), but can also include a wide range of ways to express support, such as emails, paragraphs, etc.
 - Testimonials can be written by students, alumni, faculty members, administrators – individuals who can endorse the impact and excellence of the nominee. It is helpful to include a variety of perspectives, but it is not necessary to have a testimonial from each of the aforementioned groups.
2. **Teaching materials** (*1–2 examples*)
 - This could include: plans for TA-led teaching activities, contributions to course materials (creation of assignments, projects, exam questions, lab manuals, etc.), examples of feedback to students or other evidence of supporting student learning, etc.
3. **Teaching assistant evaluation data (if available)**
 - Summary of TA evaluation results (if available) or other feedback on TA performance (e.g. via course evaluations, teaching observations, etc.).

4. Curriculum vitae (CV)

- This should focus on the nominee's role as a teacher and should include the nominee's educational background, employment history, qualifications, achievements, and any other activity related to teaching and learning.

Selection process

The selection process consists of three stages.

4.1. Call for nominations

The Office of the Dean will issue a call for nominations that will be circulated to heads of academic units (directors and chairs of departments, divisions, programs, and institutes), to invite them to nominate one person for the award.

- Heads of academic units are encouraged to consult with their students before selecting their nominee.

4.2. Award adjudication

After the submission deadline, received nominations will be considered by the Teaching Methods and Resources Committee, in accordance with the decision-making structures outlined in the Committee Manual.

- The Committee reserves the right to not select an award winner in a given year, if there are no nomination packages that sufficiently meet the award criteria.
- In exceptional circumstances, where the qualifications of the top nominees are very close, the Committee reserves the right to select more than one award winner.

4.3. Notification of the award recipient

Following Committee review and discussion of the nomination packages, the TMRC will provide the recommended nominee(s) to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will notify the award recipient.



EARLY CAREER TEACHING AWARD

1. Eligibility

The Early Career Teaching Award is open to any full- or part-time Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering appointed faculty member who:

- has up to six cumulative years teaching undergraduate Engineering students as an appointed faculty member¹
- has not previously won this award.

2. Nomination guidelines

Individuals nominated for the Early Career Teaching Award will be assessed based on outstanding performance in undergraduate teaching, normally in a few courses, of similar or varying subject matter, as suited to the early years of a teaching career. The two main aspects that nomination packages should address are the impact of the nominee's teaching practice and the nominee's critical reflection and development.

2.1. Impact of teaching practice

The nomination package should show how the nominee:

- demonstrates positive impact on students, course(s), and close colleagues through outstanding work in:
 - classroom instruction
 - consultation with students outside of class
 - development and use of teaching materials and teaching methods
- shows potential for positive impact on the academic unit and/or curriculum, which could include engagement in curricular improvements and/or participation in other pedagogical initiatives in the academic unit.

¹ The early career teaching award is for individuals at the beginning of their teaching career. Nominees should have 12 or fewer semesters of teaching experience as appointed faculty, which can also include experience teaching non-Engineering undergraduate students at the University of Toronto. Time teaching during graduate and/or postdoctoral studies does not count towards years of experience.

2.2. Critical reflection and development

Nominees for this award will normally have had some early experience critically reflecting on and developing their teaching practice. The nomination package should show how the nominee:

- demonstrates critical reflection on teaching practice through an early or developing scholarly approach to teaching²
- demonstrates early or developing strategy for teaching development within courses, and possibly also curriculum
- shows early or developing strategy for ongoing professional development³ to enhance teaching practice; may have achieved some initial key developments
- may have engaged in discourse on effective teaching through participating in or contributing to seminars, workshops, conferences, and/or other relevant activities in local, regional, and/or disciplinary contexts.

3. Nomination package documents

All documentation should be provided electronically in the form of two PDF documents, as follows, and submitted according to the instructions provided in the call for nominations. All primary documents and testimonials should adhere to the following formatting standards:

- pages must be Letter sized (8½" x 11"), with margins set at a minimum of ¾"
- pages must be single spaced, with a space after paragraphs
- all text must be in 12-pt font, with the exception of titles / headings / footnotes.

3.1. Primary documents

The following primary documents in the nomination package should be collected in a single PDF and arranged in this order:

1. **Cover letter**, written by the head of the nominee's academic unit (*up to 3 pages*)

This is the nomination letter, and it should do the following:

- explain how the nominee's outstanding teaching has been impactful within the context of the academic unit, or beyond, as appropriate for the award
- articulate factors that distinguish the nominee as an outstanding teacher

² A scholarly approach to teaching refers to looking beyond personal observation and experience to iterate on and enhance teaching practice. This includes efforts to triangulate personal observations with other sources of evidence, seeking out resources to support more credible interpretation of observations and evidence, and using credible analysis to inform future decisions about teaching. It is focused on developing teaching practice and **does not** require publication of scholarly works on teaching and learning.

³ This may include activities outside of the nominee's regular teaching practice, if this is in line with workload assignments, or may be integrated into the nominee's regular teaching activities.

- as relevant, contextualize the nominee’s teaching practice within the academic unit’s teaching culture, curriculum, and disciplinary norms
 - synthesize and contextualize testimonials (provided as supporting documentation) to corroborate claims made in the cover letter
2. **Statement of teaching philosophy**, written by the nominee (*up to 2 pages*)
- The statement should include evidence of a) supporting student learning, b) using effective teaching tools and methods, and c) engaging in critical reflection (e.g., on feedback) and developing (e.g., teaching, professional) over time.
 - This statement should be structured by including between two and four “belief statements” about teaching and learning, each with specific examples from the nominee’s teaching practice. For example, belief statements may include ideas about how students learn, the role of the teacher, hurdles to learning that must be overcome, or the benefits of particular instructional or assessment method.
 - The nominee may also reference supporting examples of professional development and special project work, if available, in the statement, such as special contributions to curriculum or course design, teaching-and-learning-related committee work, research and publications in teaching and learning, and mentorship of student groups.
3. **Interpretation of teaching materials, teaching evaluations, and teaching experience**, written by the nominee (*up to 2 pages*)
- The nominee should contextualize and/or summarize the remaining supporting documents, and highlight key aspects they wish to bring to the attention of the award selection committee. For example, they might share why they’ve chosen to include a particular teaching material as supporting document, highlight teaching experiences or accolades from their CV, or note a trend in their teaching evaluation for a course. They can also leverage this document to address any anomalies.

3.2. Supporting documents

Nomination packages should include the following supporting documents. These are considered raw evidence to support the argument presented in the primary documents and should be used as such: the argument in the primary documents should integrate and interpret this evidence as appropriate. It should not be assumed that the Committee will read any supporting materials unless directed to do so in the primary documents. All supporting documents should be collected in a single PDF and arranged in this order. The

Committee would appreciate the inclusion of a hyperlinked table of contents at the start of this PDF.

1. **Course evaluation data summary table** ([*Excel template*](#))
 - The use of the template is required. The nominating department should include data from all courses taught at the University of Toronto during the period of eligibility, grouped by course and arranged chronologically.
 - The template is designed to capture information from the standardized course evaluations questions (Q1–Q6 plus ICM for the current evaluation system). The nominee is free to include additional course evaluation data from other questions if they are relevant. If included, these additional data must be explicitly discussed. The template also has a tab for data from the old paper course evaluation system.
2. **Testimonials** (*up to 6 pages in total, formatted as required for primary documents*)
 - Testimonials are endorsements of the nominee’s outstanding teaching. These can take the form of traditional letters of support (maximum 1 page each), but can also include a wide range of ways to express support, such as emails, paragraphs, etc.
 - Testimonials can be written by students, teaching assistants, alumni, colleagues, administrators, etc. – individuals who can endorse the outstanding teaching of the nominee. It is helpful to include a variety of perspectives, but it is not necessary to have a testimonial from each of the aforementioned groups.
3. **Teaching materials** (*1–2 examples*)
 - This could include: course syllabi; assignment instructions; a sample lecture; a lab manual; a textbook or selected chapter; a research paper or article on teaching and learning; or other teaching materials to support the statement of teaching philosophy.
4. **Curriculum vitae (CV)**
 - This should focus on the nominee’s role as a teacher and should include the nominee’s educational background, employment history, qualifications, professional activities, achievements, and any other activity related to teaching and learning.

4. Selection process

The selection process consists of three stages.

4.1. Call for nominations

The Office of the Dean will issue a call for nominations that will be circulated to heads of academic units (directors and chairs of departments, divisions, programs, and institutes), to invite them to nominate one person for the award.

- Heads of academic units are encouraged to consult with their students before selecting their nominee.

4.2. Award adjudication

After the submission deadline, received nominations will be considered by the Teaching Methods and Resources Committee, in accordance with the decision-making structures outlined in the Committee Manual.

- The Committee reserves the right to not select an award winner in a given year, if there are no nomination packages that sufficiently meet the award criteria.
- In exceptional circumstances, where the qualifications of the top nominees are very close, the Committee reserves the right to select more than one award winner.

4.3. Notification of the award recipient

Following Committee review and discussion of the nomination packages, the TMRC will provide the recommended nominee(s) to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will notify the award recipient.



FACULTY TEACHING AWARD

1. Eligibility

The Faculty Teaching Award is open to any full- or part-time Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering appointed faculty member who:

- has more than six and up to fifteen cumulative years teaching undergraduate Engineering students as an appointed faculty member
- has not previously won this award.

2. Nomination guidelines

Individuals nominated for the Faculty Teaching Award will be assessed based on outstanding performance in undergraduate teaching, normally in a range of courses across varying subject matter and/or levels of study, as suited to the middle years of a teaching career. The two main aspects that nomination packages should address are the impact of the nominee's teaching practice and the nominee's critical reflection and development.

2.1. Impact of teaching practice

The nomination package should show how the nominee:

- demonstrates positive impact on students, courses, close colleagues, department, and curriculum through outstanding work in:
 - classroom instruction
 - consultation with students outside of class
 - development and use of teaching materials and teaching methods
- shows potential for impact on Faculty and/or disciplinary community, such as through contributions to departmental and/or disciplinary teaching culture, leading curricular initiatives, etc.

Critical reflection and development

Nominees for this award will normally have an established approach to critically reflecting on and developing their teaching practice. The nomination package should show how the nominee:

- demonstrates critical reflection on teaching practice through a deliberate scholarly approach to teaching⁴
- demonstrates deliberate and thoughtful strategy for ongoing course development and some curriculum development
- shows deliberate strategy for ongoing professional development⁵ to enhance teaching practice; offers clear demonstration of key developments over time
- has contributed to discourse on effective teaching through one or more of the following: textbooks, seminars, workshops, conferences, local/regional/disciplinary publications, scholarly journals, and/or publication of other relevant original work.

3. Nomination package documents

All documentation should be provided electronically in the form of two PDF documents, as follows, and submitted according to the instructions provided in the call for nominations. All primary documents and testimonials should adhere to the following formatting standards:

- pages must be Letter sized (8½" x 11"), with margins set at a minimum of ¾"
- pages must be single spaced, with a space after paragraphs
- all text must be in 12-pt font, with the exception of titles / headings / footnotes.

3.1. Primary documents

The following primary documents in the nomination package should be collected in a single PDF and arranged in this order:

1. **Cover letter**, written by the head of the nominee's academic unit (*up to 3 pages*)
This is the nomination letter, and it should do the following:
 - explain how the nominee's outstanding teaching has been impactful within the context of the academic unit, or beyond, as appropriate for the award

⁴ A scholarly approach to teaching refers to looking beyond personal observation and experience to iterate on and enhance teaching practice. This includes efforts to triangulate personal observations with other sources of evidence, seeking out resources to support more credible interpretation of observations and evidence, and using credible analysis to inform future decisions about teaching. It is focused on developing teaching practice and **does not** require publication of scholarly works on teaching and learning.

⁵ This may include activities outside of the nominee's regular teaching practice, if this is in line with workload assignments, or may be integrated into the nominee's regular teaching activities.

- articulate factors that distinguish the nominee as an outstanding teacher
 - as relevant, contextualize the nominee’s teaching practice within the academic unit’s teaching culture, curriculum, and disciplinary norms
 - synthesize and contextualize testimonials (provided as supporting documentation) to corroborate claims made in the cover letter
2. **Statement of teaching philosophy**, written by the nominee (*up to 2 pages*)
- The statement should include evidence of a) supporting student learning, b) using effective teaching tools and methods, and c) engaging in critical reflection (e.g., on feedback) and developing (e.g., teaching, professional) over time.
 - This statement should be structured by including between two and four “belief statements” about teaching and learning, each with specific examples from the nominee’s teaching practice. For example, belief statements may include ideas about how students learn, the role of the teacher, hurdles to learning that must be overcome, or the benefits of particular instructional or assessment method.
 - The nominee may also reference supporting examples of professional development and special project work, if available, in the statement, such as special contributions to curriculum or course design, teaching-and-learning-related committee work, research and publications in teaching and learning, and mentorship of student groups.
3. **Interpretation of teaching materials, teaching evaluations, and teaching experience**, written by the nominee (*up to 2 pages*)
- The nominee should contextualize and/or summarize the remaining supporting documents, and highlight key aspects they wish to bring to the attention of the award selection committee. For example, they might share why they’ve chosen to include a particular teaching material as supporting document, highlight teaching experiences or accolades from their CV, or note a trend in their teaching evaluation for a course. They can also leverage this document to address any anomalies.

3.2. Supporting documents

Nomination packages should include the following supporting documents. These are considered raw evidence to support the argument presented in the primary documents and should be used as such: the argument in the primary documents should integrate and interpret this evidence as appropriate. It should not be assumed that the Committee will read any supporting materials unless directed to do so in the primary documents. All supporting documents should be collected in a single PDF and arranged in this order. The

Committee would appreciate the inclusion of a hyperlinked table of contents at the start of this PDF.

1. **Course evaluation data summary table** ([*Excel template*](#))
 - The use of the template is required. The nominating department should include data from all relevant courses taught at the University of Toronto for the past ten years, grouped by course and arranged chronologically.
 - The template is designed to capture information from the standardized course evaluations questions (Q1–Q6 plus ICM for the current evaluation system). The nominee is free to include additional course evaluation data from other questions if they are relevant. If included, these additional data must be explicitly discussed. The template also has a tab for data from the old paper course evaluation system.
2. **Testimonials** (*up to 6 pages in total, formatted as required for primary documents*)
 - Testimonials are endorsements of the nominee’s outstanding teaching. These can take the form of traditional letters of support (maximum 1 page each), but can also include a wide range of ways to express support, such as emails, paragraphs, etc.
 - Testimonials can be written by students, teaching assistants, alumni, colleagues, administrators, etc. – individuals who can endorse the outstanding teaching of the nominee. It is helpful to include a variety of perspectives, but it is not necessary to have a testimonial from each of the aforementioned groups.
3. **Teaching materials** (*1–2 examples*)
 - This could include: course syllabi; assignment instructions; a sample lecture; a lab manual; a textbook or selected chapter; a research paper or article on teaching and learning; or other teaching materials to support the statement of teaching philosophy.
4. **Curriculum vitae (CV)**
 - This should focus on the nominee’s role as a teacher and should include the nominee’s educational background, employment history, qualifications, professional activities, achievements, and any other activity related to teaching and learning.

4. Selection process

The selection process consists of three stages.

4.1. Call for nominations

The Office of the Dean will issue a call for nominations that will be circulated to heads of academic units (directors and chairs of departments, divisions, programs, and institutes), to invite them to nominate one person for the award.

- Heads of academic units are encouraged to consult with their students before selecting their nominee.

4.2. Award adjudication

After the submission deadline, received nominations will be considered by the Teaching Methods and Resources Committee, in accordance with the decision-making structures outlined in the Committee Manual.

- The Committee reserves the right to not select an award winner in a given year, if there are no nomination packages that sufficiently meet the award criteria.
- In exceptional circumstances, where the qualifications of the top nominees are very close, the Committee reserves the right to select more than one award winner.

4.3 Notification of the award recipient

Following Committee review and discussion of the nomination packages, the TMRC will provide the recommended nominee(s) to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will notify the award recipient.



SUSTAINED EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARD

1. Eligibility

The Sustained Excellence in Teaching Award is open to any full- or part-time Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering appointed faculty member who:

- has more than fifteen cumulative years teaching undergraduate Engineering students as an appointed faculty member
- has not previously won this award
- has not previously won the President's Teaching Award.

2. Nomination guidelines

Individuals nominated for the Sustained Excellence in Teaching Award will be assessed based on sustained outstanding performance in undergraduate teaching, normally in a plurality of courses with broad and diverse content, as suited to the later years of an established teaching career. The two main aspects that nomination packages should address are the impact of the nominee's teaching practice and the nominee's critical reflection and development.

2.1. Impact of teaching practice

The nomination package should show how the nominee:

- demonstrates sustained impact on students, courses, colleagues, department, curriculum, and faculty and/or disciplinary community through outstanding work in:
 - classroom instruction
 - consultation with students outside of class
 - development and use of teaching materials and teaching methods
- shows evidence of contributions to teaching and learning culture within the Faculty, e.g. through mentorship, pedagogical leadership, etc.; may also show impact beyond the Faculty and/or disciplinary community.

2.2. Critical reflection and development

Nominees for this award will normally have a well-established approach to critically reflecting on and developing their teaching practice. The nomination package should show how the nominee:

- demonstrates critical reflection on teaching practice through an established and consistent scholarly approach to teaching⁶
- demonstrates established strategy for ongoing course and curriculum development
- demonstrates established strategy for ongoing professional development⁷ to enhance teaching practice; strong evidence of key developments over time
- has contributed to discourse on effective teaching in a way that has enhanced the engineering education process and/or added value to teaching methodology literature through multiple avenues, including but not limited to textbooks, seminars, workshops, conferences, local/regional/disciplinary publications, scholarly journals, and/or publication of other relevant original work.

3. Nomination package documents

All documentation should be provided electronically in the form of two PDF documents, as follows, and submitted according to the instructions provided in the call for nominations. All primary documents and testimonials should adhere to the following formatting standards:

- pages must be Letter sized (8½" x 11"), with margins set at a minimum of ¾"
- pages must be single spaced, with a space after paragraphs
- all text must be in 12-pt font, with the exception of titles / headings / footnotes.

3.1. Primary documents

The following primary documents in the nomination package should be collected in a single PDF and arranged in this order:

1. **Cover letter**, written by the head of the nominee's academic unit (*up to 3 pages*)
This is the nomination letter, and it should do the following:

⁶ A scholarly approach to teaching refers to looking beyond personal observation and experience to iterate on and enhance teaching practice. This includes efforts to triangulate personal observations with other sources of evidence, seeking out resources to support more credible interpretation of observations and evidence, and using credible analysis to inform future decisions about teaching. It is focused on developing teaching practice and **does not** require publication of scholarly works on teaching and learning.

⁷ This may include activities outside of the nominee's regular teaching practice, if this is in line with workload assignments, or may be integrated into the nominee's regular teaching activities.

- explain how the nominee’s outstanding teaching has been impactful within the context of the academic unit, or beyond, as appropriate for the award
 - articulate factors that distinguish the nominee as an outstanding teacher
 - as relevant, contextualize the nominee’s teaching practice within the academic unit’s teaching culture, curriculum, and disciplinary norms
 - synthesize and contextualize testimonials (provided as supporting documentation) to corroborate claims made in the cover letter
2. **Statement of teaching philosophy**, written by the nominee (*up to 3 pages*)
- The statement should include evidence of a) supporting student learning, b) using effective teaching tools and methods, and c) engaging in critical reflection (e.g., on feedback) and developing (e.g., teaching, professional) over time.
 - This statement should be structured by including between two and four “belief statements” about teaching and learning, each with specific examples from the nominee’s teaching practice. For example, belief statements may include ideas about how students learn, the role of the teacher, hurdles to learning that must be overcome, or the benefits of particular instructional or assessment method.
 - The nominee may also reference supporting examples of professional development and special project work, if available, in the statement, such as special contributions to curriculum or course design, teaching-and-learning-related committee work, research and publications in teaching and learning, and mentorship of student groups.
3. **Interpretation of teaching materials, teaching evaluations, and teaching experience**, written by the nominee (*up to 2 pages*)
- The nominee should contextualize and/or summarize the remaining supporting documents, and highlight key aspects they wish to bring to the attention of the award selection committee. For example, they might share why they’ve chosen to include a particular teaching material as supporting document, highlight teaching experiences or accolades from their CV, or note a trend in their teaching evaluation for a course. They can also leverage this document to address any anomalies.

3.2. Supporting documents

Nomination packages should include the following supporting documents. These are considered raw evidence to support the argument presented in the primary documents and should be used as such: the argument in the primary documents should integrate and interpret this evidence as appropriate. It should not be assumed that the Committee will

read any supporting materials unless directed to do so in the primary documents. All supporting documents should be collected in a single PDF and arranged in this order. The Committee would appreciate the inclusion of a hyperlinked table of contents at the start of this PDF.

1. **Course evaluation data summary table** ([Excel template](#))

- The use of the template is required. The nominating department should include data from all relevant courses taught at the University of Toronto over the past 10–20 years, grouped by course and arranged chronologically.
- The template is designed to capture information from the standardized course evaluations questions (Q1–Q6 plus ICM for the current evaluation system). The nominee is free to include additional course evaluation data from other questions if they are relevant. If included, these additional data must be explicitly discussed. The template also has a tab for data from the old paper course evaluation system.

2. **Testimonials** (*up to 8 pages in total, formatted as required for primary documents*)

- Testimonials are endorsements of the nominee’s outstanding teaching. These can take the form of traditional letters of support (maximum 1 page each), but can also include a wide range of ways to express support, such as emails, paragraphs, etc.
- Testimonials can be written by students, teaching assistants, alumni, colleagues, administrators, etc. – individuals who can endorse the outstanding teaching of the nominee. It is helpful to include a variety of perspectives, but it is not necessary to have a testimonial from each of the aforementioned groups.

3. **Teaching materials** (*2–3 examples*)

- This could include: course syllabi; assignment instructions; a sample lecture; a lab manual; a textbook or selected chapter; a research paper or article on teaching and learning; or other teaching materials to support the statement of teaching philosophy.

4. **Curriculum vitae (CV)**

- This should focus on the nominee’s role as a teacher and should include the nominee’s educational background, employment history, qualifications, professional activities, achievements, and any other activity related to teaching and learning.

4. Selection process

The selection process consists of three stages.

4.1. Call for nominations

The Office of the Dean will issue a call for nominations that will be circulated to heads of academic units (directors and chairs of departments, divisions, programs, and institutes), to invite them to nominate one person for the award.

- Heads of academic units are encouraged to consult with their students before selecting their nominee.

4.2. Award adjudication

After the submission deadline, received nominations will be considered by the Teaching Methods and Resources Committee, in accordance with the decision-making structures outlined in the Committee Manual.

- The Committee reserves the right to not select an award winner in a given year, if there are no nomination packages that sufficiently meet the award criteria.
- In exceptional circumstances, where the qualifications of the top nominees are very close, the Committee reserves the right to select more than one award winner.

4.3. Notification of the award recipient

Following Committee review and discussion of the nomination packages, the TMRC will provide the recommended nominee(s) to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will notify the award recipient.

APPENDIX B:

TEACHING AWARD ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES & RUBRIC

1. [Teaching Assistant Award Assessment Guidelines](#)
2. [Teaching Assistant Award Assessment Rubric](#)
3. [Appointed Faculty Awards Assessment Guidelines](#)
4. [Appointed Faculty Awards Assessment Rubric](#)

Assessment guidelines: TAA

for Teaching Award adjudication 2025-2026

These criteria are used holistically for the TAA and should be understood in conjunction with the requirements for the award. The guidelines can be found in the [TMRC Manual: Appendix A](#).

There are 3 analytic criteria being leveraged to assess the applications. There is also a summative assessment using the same quality levels but distinct holistic descriptors.

These criteria will be available in a Microsoft Form that will be used for individually assessing nominations, with options to select quality levels and share qualitative comments, in advance of the TMRC award adjudication meeting.

Analytic criteria

Evidence of enhancement of student learning

- The nominee demonstrates how their teaching practice influences and supports student learning
- The nominee's teaching practice works well for students
- The nominee takes a holistic perspective to supporting student learning

Use of effective teaching tools and methods

- The nominee selects their approach based on the needs of the specific learning situation
- The nominee uses observations about the effectiveness of teaching tools and methods to adjust their practice

Incorporation of feedback and critical reflection

- The nominee seeks out feedback
- The nominee reflects critically on feedback and other observations in their teaching to self-assess their practice and identify areas for ongoing development

The assessment of quality for each criterion is on the following scale, as described in more detail on the next page.

- Unsatisfactory
- Good
- Very good
- Excellent
- Outstanding

Description of quality levels

These should be understood in conjunction with the requirements for the award. The focus in these quality levels is on how the nomination package presents information to enable to committee to understand the nominee's teaching practice.

Unsatisfactory

- The nomination package fails to address the criterion and/or fails to consider student learning, or the nomination package requires excessive interpretation to determine how the nominee's teaching practice meets the criterion.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is not adequate, does not feel relevant, and/or is insufficiently integrated/interpreted to support claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Good

- The nomination package offers evidence that the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a satisfactory manner, making reference to student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is relevant but limited and/or minimally interpreted/integrated to support claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Very good

- The nomination package demonstrates how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a deliberate and systematic way that acknowledges student learning.
- A variety of evidence is offered to show how the nominee's teaching practice fulfils the criterion, and the evidence is integrated and interpreted in a way that facilitates understanding and offers good support of claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Excellent

- The nomination package clearly and convincingly demonstrates how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a rigorous way with a clear focus on supporting student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is curated, integrated, and interpreted to offer a clear and holistic demonstration of how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion.

Outstanding

- The nomination package conclusively illustrates that the nominee's teaching practice goes beyond the criterion in an extraordinary manner, with a strong emphasis on supporting student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is curated, integrated, and interpreted to offer a concise and compelling demonstration of how the nominee's teaching practice surpasses expectations for the criterion.

Summative assessment

On the basis of a holistic interpretation of the above analytic criteria and of the nomination package overall, understood in conjunction with the guidelines for this award, the nomination indicates that the nominee:

Unsatisfactory

- Has a teaching practice that appears to be limited in its effectiveness, in need of critical reflection and further development, and/or inadequate in its consideration of student learning.
- OR the nominee's teaching practice cannot be reliably assessed for this award using the information available in the nomination package.

Good

- Has a teaching practice that appears to work for students, but there is a need for more deliberate attention to allow the nominee to develop their teaching practice.
- May appear to rely heavily on existing strengths rather than seeking to develop in new areas and/or improve areas of weakness or limited experience.

Very good

- Has a teaching practice that works well for students.
- Appears to be developing their teaching practice in a credible manner.
- Has a balanced approach to both improving in existing areas of strength and building skill in areas that need improvement.

Excellent

- Has a teaching practice that strongly supports student learning.
- Has successfully developed their teaching practice in a credible manner.
- Has a balanced approach to both improving in existing areas of strength and building skill in areas that need improvement.

Outstanding

- Has a teaching practice that is clearly outstanding in its effect on student learning
- Has a clearly established strategy for ongoing and proactive development in their teaching practice in a way that involves using a rich variety of information to inform ongoing development and deliberately cultivating a supportive environment for learning.

TAA: Assessment rubric

This rubric should be used in conjunction with the requirements for the award as outlined in the award guidelines. These criteria are used holistically. Descriptors of the levels of quality are on the next page.

Criterion	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent	Outstanding
Analytic criteria					
Evidence of enhancement of student learning					
The nominee demonstrates how their teaching practice influences and supports student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nominee's teaching practice works well for students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nominee takes a holistic perspective to supporting student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of effective teaching tools and methods					
The nominee selects their approach based on the needs of the specific learning situation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nominee uses observations about the effectiveness of teaching tools and methods to adjust their practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incorporation of feedback and critical reflection					
The nominee seeks out feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nominee reflects critically on feedback and other observations in their teaching to self-assess their practice and identify areas for ongoing development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Summative assessment					
On the basis of a holistic interpretation of the above analytic criteria and of the nomination package overall, understood in conjunction with the guidelines for this award, the nomination indicates that the nominee:	Has a teaching practice that appears to be limited in its effectiveness, in need of critical reflection and further development, and/or inadequate in its consideration of student learning. OR the nominee's teaching practice cannot be reliably assessed for this award using the information available in the nomination package.	Has a teaching practice that appears to work for students, but there is a need for more deliberate attention to allow the nominee to develop their teaching practice. May appear to rely heavily on existing strengths rather than seeking to develop in new areas and/or improve areas of weakness or limited experience.	Has a teaching practice that works well for students. Appears to be developing their teaching practice in a credible manner. Has a balanced approach to both improving in existing areas of strength and building skill in areas that need improvement.	Has a teaching practice that strongly supports student learning. Has successfully developed their teaching practice in a credible manner. Has a balanced approach to both improving in existing areas of strength and building skill in areas that need improvement.	Has a teaching practice that is clearly outstanding in its effect on student learning Has a clearly established strategy for ongoing development in their teaching practice in a way that involves using a rich variety of information to inform ongoing development and deliberately cultivating a supportive environment for learning.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Description of quality levels

These should be understood in conjunction with the requirements for the award. The focus in these quality levels is on how the nomination package presents information to enable to committee to understand the nominee's teaching practice.

Unsatisfactory

- The nomination package fails to address the criterion and/or fails to consider student learning, or the nomination package requires excessive interpretation to determine how the nominee's teaching practice meets the criterion.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is not adequate, does not feel relevant, and/or is insufficiently integrated/interpreted to support claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Good

- The nomination package offers evidence that the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a satisfactory manner, making reference to student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is relevant but limited and/or minimally interpreted/integrated to support claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Very good

- The nomination package demonstrates how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a deliberate and systematic way that acknowledges student learning.
- A variety of evidence is offered to show how the nominee's teaching practice fulfils the criterion, and the evidence is integrated and interpreted in a way that facilitates understanding and offers good support of claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Excellent

- The nomination package clearly and convincingly demonstrates how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a rigorous way with a clear focus on supporting student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is curated, integrated, and interpreted to offer a clear and holistic demonstration of how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion.

Outstanding

- The nomination package conclusively shows that the nominee's teaching practice goes beyond the criterion in an extraordinary manner, with a strong emphasis on supporting student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is curated, integrated, and interpreted to offer a concise and compelling demonstration of how the nominee's teaching practice surpasses expectations for the criterion.

Assessment guidelines: ECTA, FTA, SETA *for Teaching Award adjudication 2025-2026*

These criteria are used holistically for all three faculty teaching awards and should be understood in conjunction with the requirements for each award (ECTA, FTA, and SETA). All award guidelines can be found in the [TMRC Manual: Appendix A](#).

There are 3 analytic criteria being leveraged to assess the applications. There is also a summative assessment using the same quality levels but distinct holistic descriptors.

These criteria will be available in a Microsoft Form that will be used for individually assessing nominations, with options to select quality levels and share qualitative comments, in advance of the TMRC award adjudication meeting.

Analytic criteria

Evidence of enhancement of student learning

- The nominee demonstrates how their teaching practice influences and supports student learning
- The nominee's teaching practice works well for students
- The nominee takes a holistic perspective to supporting student learning

Use of effective teaching tools and methods

- The nominee selects their approach based on the needs of the specific learning situation
- The nominee uses ongoing observations about the effectiveness of teaching tools and methods to adjust their practice

Incorporation of feedback and critical reflection

- The nominee seeks out feedback in a variety of ways
- The nominee reflects critically on student feedback and other observations in their teaching to self-assess their practice and identify areas for ongoing development, making use of both observations / primary evidence and outside sources to analyze, interpret, and develop their teaching practice

The assessment of quality for each criterion is on the following scale, as described in more detail on the next page.

- Unsatisfactory
- Good
- Very good
- Excellent
- Outstanding

Description of quality levels

These should be understood in conjunction with the requirements for the level of award being considered (ECTA, FTA, or SETA). The focus in these quality levels is on how the nomination package presents information to enable the committee to understand the nominee's teaching practice.

Unsatisfactory

- The nomination package fails to address the criterion and/or fails to consider student learning, or the nomination package requires excessive interpretation to determine how the nominee's teaching practice meets the criterion.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is not adequate, does not feel relevant, and/or is insufficiently integrated/interpreted to support claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Good

- The nomination package offers evidence that the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a satisfactory manner, making reference to student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is relevant but limited and/or minimally interpreted/integrated to support claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Very good

- The nomination package demonstrates how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a deliberate and systematic way that acknowledges student learning.
- A variety of evidence is offered to show how the nominee's teaching practice fulfils the criterion, and the evidence is integrated and interpreted in a way that facilitates understanding and offers good support of claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Excellent

- The nomination package clearly and convincingly demonstrates how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a rigorous way with a clear focus on supporting student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is curated, integrated, and interpreted to offer a clear and holistic demonstration of how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion.

Outstanding

- The nomination package conclusively illustrates that the nominee's teaching practice goes beyond the criterion in an extraordinary manner, with a strong emphasis on supporting student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is curated, integrated, and interpreted to offer a concise and compelling demonstration of how the nominee's teaching practice surpasses expectations for the criterion.

Summative assessment

On the basis of a holistic interpretation of the above analytic criteria and of the nomination package overall, understood in conjunction with the guidelines for this award (ECTA, FTA, or SETA), the nomination indicates that the nominee:

Unsatisfactory

- Has a teaching practice that appears to be limited in its effectiveness, in need of critical reflection and further development, and/or inadequate in its consideration of student learning.
- OR the nominee's teaching practice cannot be reliably assessed for this award using the information available in the nomination package.

Good

- Has a teaching practice that appears to work for students, but there is a need for more deliberate attention to allow the nominee to develop their teaching practice.
- May appear to rely heavily on existing strengths rather than seeking to develop in new areas and/or improve areas of weakness or limited experience.

Very good

- Has a teaching practice that works well for students.
- Appears to be developing their teaching practice in a credible manner.
- Has a balanced approach to both improving in existing areas of strength and building skill in areas that need improvement.

Excellent

- Has a teaching practice that strongly supports student learning.
- Has successfully developed their teaching practice in a credible manner.
- Has a balanced approach to both improving in existing areas of strength and building skill in areas that need improvement.

Outstanding

- Has a teaching practice that is clearly outstanding in its effect on student learning
- Has a clearly established strategy for ongoing development in their teaching practice in a way that involves integrating feedback, using a rich variety of information to inform ongoing development, being proactive in seeking out new opportunities, engaging in deliberate and consistent critical reflection and iteration, and deliberately cultivating a supportive environment for learning.

ECTA, FTA, SETA: Assessment Rubric

This rubric should be used in conjunction with the requirements for each award, as outlined in the respective award guidelines. These criteria are used holistically. Descriptors of the levels of quality are on the next page.

Criterion	Unsatisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent	Outstanding
Analytic criteria					
Evidence of enhancement of student learning					
The nominee demonstrates how their teaching practice influences and supports student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nominee's teaching practice works well for students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nominee takes a holistic perspective to supporting student learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of effective teaching tools and methods					
The nominee selects their approach based on the needs of the specific learning situation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nominee uses ongoing observations about the effectiveness of teaching tools and methods to adjust their practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incorporation of feedback and critical reflection					
The nominee seeks out feedback in a variety of ways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nominee reflects critically on student feedback and other observations in their teaching to self-assess their practice and identify areas for ongoing development, making use of both observations / primary evidence and outside sources to analyze, interpret, and develop their teaching practice.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Summative assessment					
On the basis of a holistic interpretation of the above analytic criteria and of the nomination package overall, understood in conjunction with the guidelines for this award, the nomination indicates that the nominee:	Has a teaching practice that appears to be limited in its effectiveness, in need of critical reflection and further development, and/or inadequate in its consideration of student learning. OR the nominee's teaching practice cannot be reliably assessed for this award using the information available in the nomination package.	Has a teaching practice that appears to work for students, but there is a need for more deliberate attention to allow the nominee to develop their teaching practice. May appear to rely heavily on existing strengths rather than seeking to develop in new areas and/or improve areas of weakness or limited experience.	Has a teaching practice that works well for students. Appears to be developing their teaching practice in a credible manner. Has a balanced approach to both improving in existing areas of strength and building skill in areas that need improvement.	Has a teaching practice that strongly supports student learning. Has successfully developed their teaching practice in a credible manner. Has a balanced approach to both improving in existing areas of strength and building skill in areas that need improvement.	Has a teaching practice that is clearly outstanding in its effect on student learning Has a clearly established strategy for ongoing development in their teaching practice in a way that involves integrating feedback, using a rich variety of information to inform ongoing development, being proactive in seeking out new opportunities, engaging in deliberate and consistent critical reflection and iteration, and deliberately cultivating a supportive environment for learning.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Description of quality levels

These should be understood in conjunction with the requirements for the level of award being considered (ECTA, FTA, or SETA). The focus in these quality levels is on how the nomination package presents information to enable to committee to understand the nominee's teaching practice.

Unsatisfactory

- The nomination package fails to address the criterion and/or fails to consider student learning, or the nomination package requires excessive interpretation to determine how the nominee's teaching practice meets the criterion.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is not adequate, does not feel relevant, and/or is insufficiently integrated/interpreted to support claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Good

- The nomination package offers evidence that the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a satisfactory manner, making reference to student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is relevant but limited and/or minimally interpreted/integrated to support claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Very good

- The nomination package demonstrates how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a deliberate and systematic way that acknowledges student learning.
- A variety of evidence is offered to show how the nominee's teaching practice fulfils the criterion, and the evidence is integrated and interpreted in a way that facilitates understanding and offers good support of claims about the nominee's teaching practice.

Excellent

- The nomination package clearly and convincingly demonstrates how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion in a rigorous way with a clear focus on supporting student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is curated, integrated, and interpreted to offer a clear and holistic demonstration of how the nominee's teaching practice addresses the criterion.

Outstanding

- The nomination package conclusively shows that the nominee's teaching practice goes beyond the criterion in an extraordinary manner, with a strong emphasis on supporting student learning.
- The evidence offered in the nomination package is curated, integrated, and interpreted to offer a concise and compelling demonstration of how the nominee's teaching practice surpasses expectations for the criterion.

APPENDIX C:
TEACHING AWARD ADJUDICATION
Procedures for the Committee

TEACHING AWARD ADJUDICATION

Procedures for the Committee

1. Preamble

This document outlines the general procedures for award adjudication. It should be understood in conjunction with the award guidelines and the assessment guidelines and rubrics for each teaching award.

These procedures are intended to serve as guidelines to help the committee conduct a thorough, fair, and transparent assessment of all nominations for teaching awards and select winners based on the greatest possible consensus. They should be understood as a living set of guidelines that evolve over time as detailed procedures and circumstances change. However, they are based on the mission and working principles of TMRC, as well as the award nomination and assessment guidelines, all of which should be considered carefully as part of any ongoing revisions.

2. Key dates and timelines

The timeline of award nomination and adjudication needs to balance a range of logistical considerations. Below are the nominal dates by month over the academic year. They are intended to offer the best possible opportunity for nominators, nominees, the committee, and the dean's office.

Mid-September: Dean's office distributes call for nominations to the faculty.

Mid-November: Chair of TMRC sends email to unit heads asking them to let us know how many nominations they are preparing, to help the committee plan its adjudication workload in February.

December: TMRC sets date for adjudication meeting based on number of expected nominations and the overall workload of committee members in February. The meeting should take place as early as possible and no later than mid-March.

January 30: Deadline for nominations for teaching awards.

January 31: All award nomination packages distributed to TMRC members. Individual members do independent pre-assessment of all nomination packages using assessment guidelines and rubrics.

February–March: Adjudication meeting. Date to be determined as outlined above.

Approx. 1 week before adjudication meeting: Committee members submit their pre-assessments of all nomination packages.

Approx. 2 business days before adjudication meeting: Chair distributes summary of pre-assessment results to committee for review.

Max 2 business days after adjudication meeting: Chair / recording secretary inform dean's office of winners.

Approx. 1 week after adjudication meeting: Dean's office notifies winners. Chair of TMRC notifies nominators of unsuccessful nominations (see Section 3.4).

As soon as possible after individual notifications: Dean's office makes faculty-wide announcement of award winners (see Section 3.4). Formal presentation of awards is typically at the last Faculty Council meeting of the academic year (late April).

3. Award adjudication procedures

This section outlines the critical procedures before, during, and after the award adjudication meeting.

3.1. Identifying and addressing potential conflicts of interest

These awards are given internally within the faculty. As such, it is expected that at least some committee members will have existing relationships with one or more nominees in any given year. For this reason, it is critical that all assessments of all nominations be based intentionally on the actual contents of the nomination packages. While it is not possible to entirely ignore prior knowledge of a nominee, it is not considered fair or acceptable to offer an argument for or against a nominee on the basis of prior knowledge. It is also not considered fair or acceptable to discount the perspective of a committee member because they have an existing relationship with any given nominee. Below are some key considerations for situations that may be seen as conflicts of interest:

- **Being nominated for an award:** This is a conflict of interest. It prohibits a committee member from attending and participation in the adjudication of that award. Any committee member nominated for an award may not have access to other nominations for that award and may not participate in the adjudication meeting during the time that award is being discussed.
 - It is not reasonable to block committee members from being nominated for an award during their service on the committee.
- **Writing a letter of support for a nomination:** This is **not** considered a conflict of interest. Given the length of appointments to the committee (usually three years), it would not be fair to potential nominees to block current members of the committee from writing a letter of support, if they have an important relationship with the nominee.
 - This is especially important for the TAA and ECTA, which have shorter timelines for eligibility, but applies for all awards.
- **Having a close relationship with a nominee:** This is **not** considered a conflict of interest. Based on the committee's composition, with one representative from each academic unit, and the close-knit communities within the faculty, this is not a reasonable expectation.
 - Any relationships with nominees should be disclosed at the start of the discussion for the affected award during the adjudication meeting. The whole committee is responsible for conducting their deliberations based on the actual contents of nomination packages. The chair is responsible for ensuring there is no discussion based on additional information provided by individuals using their prior knowledge of any nominee.

3.2. Prior to adjudication meeting: pre-assessment

Prior to the adjudication meeting, all committee members need to be fully familiar with all award and assessment guidelines. New members on the committee will be expected to become familiar with these guidelines at the start of their service on the committee. Returning members are responsible for keeping up to date with ongoing revisions to the guidelines. Part of the committee's work during the fall term should include reviewing relevant award documents and establishing a shared understanding of them for the upcoming award cycle.

At the January TMRC meeting, the committee discusses the assessment procedure and addresses any final questions. The chair reviews the timeline for pre-assessment, including the deadline to submit individual assessments and the procedure for doing so.

After the nomination deadline, the chair and recording secretary assemble all nomination packages for distribution to the committee.

The nominal pre-assessment procedure is as follows:

- Each committee member reads and assesses all nominations for all awards.
 - Caveat: if a very large number of nominations is received one year, the committee may decide to split up the assessment so not all members assess all nominations. This should be decided at the December TMRC meeting, based on received statements of intent to nominate from heads of academic units in November.
- For each award and nominee, each committee member submits their pre-assessment in a Microsoft Form administered by the recording secretary and the chair. A fillable PDF of the assessment rubrics should be used by committee members for their own pre-assessment, to document their work. The pre-assessment information each member will submit through Microsoft Forms is as follows:
 - For each nomination:
 - An analytic assessment for each of the three assessment criteria in the relevant rubric, from unsatisfactory to outstanding as described in the relevant rubric
 - Optional comments on the analytic assessment
 - A holistic assessment of the overall nomination, from unsatisfactory to outstanding as described in the relevant rubric
 - Required summative comments consisting of up to three key strengths that contributed to the quality of the nomination and three key areas of concern that limited or detracted from the quality of the nomination
 - For each award:
 - A ranking of the top nominees that member would consider giving the award to. Not all nominees need to be ranked. There may be a tie for the top ranking.
 - Any comments relevant for the ranking.

At least two business days before the adjudication meeting, the chair distributes a summary of the pre-assessment results. All members are expected to review these results before the adjudication meeting. They are as follows, for each award:

- A quantitative summary of the holistic assessment of all nominees
- A quantitative summary of the rankings of all nominees
- Collated summative comments organized by nominee

The chair and recording secretary should also prepare a quantitative summary of the analytic assessments, but these are not shared with the committee unless they are needed during the adjudication meeting.

3.3. At the adjudication meeting

This is the recommended procedure for the committee's award adjudication meeting, which takes place in person (ideally) after all committee members have independently assessed all nominations for all awards.

- Chair opens the meeting and reviews overall meeting structure
 - Quorum for the meeting is 40% of voting members (7 voting members).
 - Committee agrees on number of votes required to be considered clear majority, based on number of voting members present.
 - All votes are public to the committee at all stages of the adjudication meeting.

- Chair reminds committee to maintain strict focus on assessment of actual nomination using criteria. Additional information based on prior knowledge should not be presented, as this might create an unfair advantage/disadvantage for one or more nominees.
- The meeting structure is decided by chair in advance, especially order of awards to consider.
 - Special cases: any award for which a member of the committee is nominated, in which case that award may be adjudicated first/last to make it easier for the nominee member to join late or leave early rather than having to step out in the middle of the meeting.
- Time allocation for each award may not be equal.
 - Awards for which there are many nominations may be given slightly longer time.
 - Awards for which there appear, based on individual members' assessments, to be two or more top nominations that are approximately equally strong may be given slightly longer time.
 - Awards with only one nomination would likely be allocated less time as this discussion will be limited to whether the nominee meets minimum requirements to win the award.
- Point of order: the discussion will focus on the actual contents of each nomination package. We ask that all members refrain from adding additional information about the nominee during the discussion. Everyone is welcome to offer their interpretation, of course, but not to add new information.
- For each award:
 - Point of order: any committee member that has a close relationship with a nominee or wrote a letter of support declares this. As stated above, these are not considered conflicts of interest.
 - Pull up summary of results. Everyone should have reviewed this before the meeting.
 - First point: can we narrow focus to a selection of top nominees, especially if there are many nominees?
 - Look at the summarized rankings from committee members' pre-adjudication assessments of the nominations. Are there any trends or nominees that appear to be ranked most highly?
 - If yes, does anyone want to offer an argument for a specific nominee who may not have been highly ranked by many members?
 - Vote to limit discussion to top nominees only.
 - Exact number of top nominees may depend on total number of nominations for the award.
 - If vote passes, move on to discuss selection of top nominees.
 - Need clear majority to pass. Number of votes required for a clear majority should be decided at the start of the meeting, as already stated, based on number of voting members present.
 - If marginal majority or true tie, discuss and revote.
 - Discussion of top nominees using relevant nomination package content and assessment criteria.
 - Do this in rounds, to allow everyone space to comment.

- First round: chair calls on each member present, in a random order.
 - Purpose: to give all members equal opportunity to voice their perspective for the award under consideration before anyone makes additional comments. A response is required. “No comment” is an acceptable response.
 - Time limit per person in this round: nominally 1–2 minutes, at chair’s discretion.
 - This round does **not** allow for rebuttals or responses.
 - As part of first round, chair calls special attention to the student representatives when they offer their perspective.
- Do second round of discussion if anyone wants to make further comments.
 - Open order of further comments, decided by raising hand and being added to list for comments, as in regular TMRC meetings.
 - Individual nominal time limit of one minute applies for each comment. Encourage committee members to be brief. Also consider imposing a rough overall time limit depending on the number of nominations under discussion for a given award and the progress made in the meeting so far. This may be adjusted as the meeting progresses.
- After two rounds of discussion, vote.
 - Point of order: The committee may choose to select more than one winner, or to not select any winners. Every award must be assessed independently.⁸
 - Initial vote: for each shortlisted nomination individually, members vote whether they feel that nomination is independently deserving of the award (i.e., not in competition with other nominations).
 - If more than one nomination has a majority of the committee votes in favour, discuss possibility of giving more than one award.⁹ If necessary, vote.
 - Committee uses a combination of discussion and voting to reach a majority consensus for that award.
- After two awards are decided, or about half the time for the meeting has elapsed, or at another midway point agreed upon by the committee, take a break.
 - The committee may choose to not take a break if it is not needed.
- At the end of the meeting:
 - The chair reviews the award decisions and explains next steps.
 - All members are asked to keep the results confidential until faculty announcements are made.
 - The chair adjourns the meeting.

⁸ The award guidelines specify that the committee reserves the right to give an award to more than one nominee if that is warranted, or to not give an award at all in a given year, and each award should be assessed independently of the others. For example, if the first award adjudicated has two winners, this should not prevent subsequent awards from also having more than one winner, if there is more than one outstanding nomination that merits the award. The same would apply if no winner were to be selected for one award.

⁹ The committee may choose to consider the circumstances of some awards if there is more than one outstanding nomination. For example, limited contracts for TAs compared to permanent faculty positions may create more constrained eligibility and constitute an argument in favour of choosing more than one winner. Having been nominated multiple times for an award should be considered very carefully, if at all. Potential consequences of splitting an award may also be considered.

3.4. Following the adjudication meeting

Following the selection of winners, different parties are responsible for notifying winners and those who were not selected as winners. The procedures are as follows:

- TMRC's recording secretary, within two business days after the adjudication meeting:
 - Share all TMRC's recipients' selections to **Carolyn Farrell** (carolyn.farrell@utoronto.ca), stating the award name + winner name(s). Attach a copy of respective nomination packages, with a request to be informed once recipients have been notified. Carolyn will draft an email for the dean to let the recipients know they have been selected.
 - Share the TA Award winner's name(s), graduate unit(s), and nomination package with **Caroline Zeigler** (governance.fase@utoronto.ca) and **Silvia Delgado**, Governance and Project Administrative Assistant (silvia.delgado@utoronto.ca). They will need to draft speaking notes for the dean when they acknowledge the winner at the Faculty Council meeting, as well as prepare a gift (engraved plaque).
- Dean's office, as soon as possible:
 - Email award winners together with the head of their academic unit notifying them of the award and asking them to keep it confidential until a faculty-wide announcement is made. The chair of TMRC should be copied on these emails.
- Chair of TMRC, at the same time the dean's office notifies award winners:
 - Email all heads of academic units that submitted unsuccessful nominations to notify them and ask them to share the news with those nominees. Ask them to keep the news confidential until a faculty-wide announcement is made.
- Dean's office, as soon as possible:
 - Make a faculty-wide announcement of award winners by email.
 - We propose this be as soon as possible and by email, rather than at the April Faculty Council meeting, so that those who were nominated but did not win are not required to keep the result confidential for an unreasonable length of time. Our position is that we should not use the delivery time of the physical awards to decide when awards are announced to the faculty at large.