



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: November 8, 2024**

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

## 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 position(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 member<sup>1</sup>
- 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 teaching<sup>2</sup>
- demonstrates early or developing strategy for teaching development within courses, and possibly also curriculum
- shows early or developing strategy for ongoing professional development<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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 teaching<sup>4</sup>
- demonstrates deliberate and thoughtful strategy for ongoing course development and some curriculum development
- shows deliberate strategy for ongoing professional development<sup>5</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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 teaching<sup>6</sup>
- demonstrates established strategy for ongoing course and curriculum development
- demonstrates established strategy for ongoing professional development<sup>7</sup> 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:

---

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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 2024-2025*

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
<b>Analytic criteria</b>					
<b>Evidence of enhancement of student learning</b>					
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"/>
<b>Use of effective teaching tools and methods</b>					
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"/>
<b>Incorporation of feedback and critical reflection</b>					
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"/>
<b>Summative assessment</b>					
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 2024-2025

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
<b>Analytic criteria</b>					
<b>Evidence of enhancement of student learning</b>					
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"/>
<b>Use of effective teaching tools and methods</b>					
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"/>
<b>Incorporation of feedback and critical reflection</b>					
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"/>
<b>Summative assessment</b>					
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.