Faculty of Arts & Science
Procedures for the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses

Administration of Course Evaluations
The University of Toronto requires that all courses, both undergraduate and graduate, be evaluated by students. This document explains the procedures to be followed in the Faculty of Arts & Science (FAS) by the Dean’s office, the academic units, and individual instructors, in planning for, carrying out, and reporting on the results of course evaluations.

Normal practice in FAS will be to utilize the University of Toronto’s centralized course evaluation framework and online delivery system. This framework provides a customizable course evaluation form with the following general format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of questions</th>
<th>Use of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional questions</td>
<td>These questions must appear on the forms for all courses across the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS questions</td>
<td>These questions must appear on the forms for all courses (or relevant subset of courses) in the division. (In our case, this means undergraduate courses in FAS, and graduate courses offered through an FAS graduate program or tricampus graduate program that FAS participates in.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit questions</td>
<td>These questions may be specified to appear on the forms for all courses (or subsets of courses) by the course-sponsoring unit. (Similarly, this means academic units in FAS, and tricampus graduate units that FAS participates in.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor questions</td>
<td>These questions may be specified for each course offering taught by the instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document first outlines the roles and responsibilities of the University, FAS, the academic units, and instructors in the course evaluation process, including how each determines the relevant content of the evaluation form to be used in each course, following the format above. Later the document turns to the issue of reporting the results of course evaluations for various purposes.

University roles and responsibilities
- Provides and supports a centralized course evaluation framework and online delivery system that preserves student anonymity and supports various reporting options. This

---

1 Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses (2011)
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/Policy_Student_Evaluation_of_Teaching_in_Courses.htm
2 For the purposes of this document, “academic unit”, or simply “unit”, refers to any course-sponsoring entity in FAS, including a department, college, or EDU.
3 Pre-tenure/pre-promotion faculty who started their employment prior to July 2012 may opt to administer a paper version of the evaluation form in their courses. Please contact the Course Evaluation Support Officer (cherie.werhun@utoronto.ca) for more information about this process.
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framework and system is intended to be used for all courses across the university. The framework includes a common course evaluation form that is customizable by divisions, academic units, and instructors. The online course evaluation system will be managed centrally through the Office of the Vice-President & Provost and the Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation (CTSI).

- Specifies a set of institutional questions that reflect the overall teaching priorities of the University, and that must be included on all course evaluation forms.
- Provides staff support for course evaluation administration in CTSI. A Course Evaluation Support Officer (CESO) is specifically designated to assist divisions, units, and instructors in all aspects of the evaluation process.
- Provides materials to support the interpretation and use of course evaluation data available at: [http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework.htm](http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework.htm)
- Manages communications to students, faculty, academic administrators, and staff about the course evaluation system, with the assistance of the CESO and in consultation with the division.
- Advises divisions on appropriate evaluation processes for courses with low enrolment.
- Works with divisions to ensure that summative evaluation reports are shared with academic units for all courses they sponsor.
- Works with divisions to ensure that formative evaluation reports are shared with all instructors.

Faculty of Arts & Science roles and responsibilities

- Oversees the course evaluation process for all of its courses. This includes all undergraduate courses offered by its academic units. Procedures for assessing graduate courses are determined in consultation with the Tricampus Deans.
- Engages the support of the Arts & Science Student Union (ASSU) and unit/program graduate student associations to facilitate ongoing communication with students.
- Works with CTSI to ensure that summative evaluation reports are shared with academic units for all courses they sponsor.
- Works with CTSI to ensure that formative evaluation reports are shared with all instructors.
- Ensures that course evaluation data reports from undergraduate courses are shared with students (see details below).
- In consultation with the course-sponsoring units, identifies any courses that require:
  - an adapted evaluation. This includes team-taught and online courses.
  - an alternative means of evaluation. This includes individual research courses, Research Opportunity Program (ROP/299) and Research Excursion

---

4 In the case of tricampus graduate programs that FAS participates in, these roles and responsibilities are undertaken by the Tricampus Deans.

5 In some cases, individual reading and research courses may have more than one registered student. Where courses have more than one registered student but are taught in a format typical to individual reading and research courses, units should report them as individual research and research courses. Very small undergraduate or graduate courses taught in a traditional seminar
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(398/399) courses; and courses that take place entirely outside the classroom (e.g. internships, practicums).

- Specifies divisional questions that reflect FAS priorities, recognizing that the institutional teaching priorities capture many of our overall divisional priorities.
- Sets the time period for course evaluations. All evaluations will be administered at the end of each undergraduate and graduate term, normally for a time period of at least two weeks duration. (Condensed courses may have a shorter evaluation period.) Specifically, all undergraduate courses will be evaluated during the same time period, and all graduate courses during the same time period. Students will have the opportunity to complete the evaluations online throughout the given time period.
- Reviews processes relating to the administration of course evaluations regularly to identify any necessary changes to faculty-wide procedures.

Academic unit roles and responsibilities
- Identifies a faculty member (or faculty members) to serve as the primary contact between the unit and the Dean’s office and/or CESO on the matter of course evaluations. Normally, this would be the associate chair for undergraduate studies and/or associate chair for graduate studies. This individual (or individuals) will provide assistance with the identification of courses to be evaluated.
  - Wherever possible, information about courses and the instructional team, including instructors and TAs, will be drawn automatically from the student information system (currently ROSI).
  - Each semester, a memo will be circulated to units asking them to identify any courses that require an adapted or alternative means of evaluation (as defined above) or where the information available through ROSI is incomplete or insufficient. Units will provide to CTSI any necessary additional information needed to administer the course evaluations.
- Identifies the primary teaching priorities of the unit and (optionally) specifies up to 3 evaluation questions that reflect these priorities. The questions may apply to all courses or coherent subsets of courses within the unit. Any such questions will be included on all evaluation forms for the relevant courses. The questions will normally be drawn from the institutional question bank. If relevant questions are not available there, the unit should work with the CESO to have appropriate questions developed and added to the bank.

Instructor roles and responsibilities
- Optionally specifies up to 3 additional questions for the evaluation form for each offering of each course that they teach. Instructors may use these questions to assess teaching priorities not addressed elsewhere on the form, or to evaluate specific teaching approaches. The data collected through the use of these questions are intended to provide formative feedback for the instructor, and as such, they will be reported only to the instructor.
  - Each instructor teaching a course will receive an email invitation to add instructor-selected questions from the question bank to the course evaluation form. Directions, guidance, and deadlines for this process will be included with format should NOT be identified as individual reading or research courses and should be assessed according to the standard evaluation framework.
the email communication. There is no requirement for instructors to add questions to their evaluation forms.

- Instructors may choose to share the results from course-specific questions with their chair or other academic administrators (e.g., for PTR/Merit, tenure and promotion review).

**The Evaluation Form**

The University of Toronto’s course evaluation framework allows for the creation of a customizable form that includes a set of required core institutional questions, along with divisionally-selected questions, unit-selected questions, and instructor-selected questions, as described above.

In the Faculty of Arts & Science, the standard format for course evaluations is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Number of Questions</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Core Institutional Questions (8) | 1. I found the course intellectually stimulating.  
2. The course provided me with a deeper understanding of the subject matter.  
3. The instructor created a course atmosphere that was conducive to my learning  
4. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams improved my understanding of the course material.  
5. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams provided opportunity for me to demonstrate an understanding of the course material.  
   Scale (Questions 1-5):  
   Not at all >> Somewhat >> Moderately >> Mostly >> A great deal  
6. Overall, the quality of my learning experience in this course was.  
   Poor >> Fair >> Good >> Very good >> Excellent  
7. Please comment on the overall quality of instruction in this course.  
   Open-ended.  
8. Please comment on any assistance that was available to support your learning in the course.  
   Open-ended.  
9. Compared to other courses, the workload for this course was:  
   Very heavy >> Heavy >> Average >> Light >> Very light  
10. I would recommend this course to other students.  
   Not at all >> Somewhat >> |

To be included on all forms.

| FAS Questions (3) | Questions 9, 10 & 11 will be included on all Faculty of Arts & Science forms for undergraduate courses.  
Questions 9 & 10 will be included on all forms for graduate courses |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Number of Questions</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Moderately>>Mostly >>A great deal** offered through an FAS graduate program or tricampus graduate program that FAS participates in. | 11. I attended class:  
Almost always>>More than half of the time>>Half of the time>>Less than half of the time>>Almost never | |
| **Unit Questions** (up to 3) | To be determined at the unit level | Course sponsoring academic units may add up to 3 questions drawn from the central question bank or developed in collaboration with the Course Evaluation Support Officer in CTSI. Sets of up to 3 questions may apply to all or a subset of their courses. |
| **Instructor Questions** (up to 3) | To be selected by the instructor | Instructors may add up to 3 questions drawn from the central question bank. Instructors may suggest additional question topics to be added to the question bank according to the processes outlined at [http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework/instructors.htm](http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework/instructors.htm). |

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

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

**Summative Report**
**Purpose and Recipients**
- Intended to be used for summative evaluation in support of assessment of an instructor’s teaching for PTR, tenure and promotion, awards, etc. Note that student evaluation of teaching forms just one component of a thorough assessment of an instructor.

---

6 In courses offered fully online, this question will be reworded to read:  
Overall, I participated in the available online course activities: Not at all>>Somewhat >> Moderately>>Mostly >>A great deal
Available to the instructor, as well as to their dean(s) and academic unit head(s), and their designates.

Included Information (each course reported on separately)

- Quantitative and qualitative data from institutional, divisional, and academic unit questions
- A composite mean score will be provided for institutional questions 1-5
  - The composite reflects the extent to which each of the institutional priorities was part of a student’s learning experience in his/her course. The composite takes into account multiple factors relating to this experience and provides a comprehensive assessment of that experience.
- For each question, the following data will be provided:
  - Question text
  - Response set
  - Course enrolment
  - Number of responses
  - For quantitative questions only:
    - Frequency (displayed as chart)
    - Mean
    - Median
    - Mode
    - Standard deviation
- The following comparative data for quantitative questions will also be provided (where sufficient comparable courses (normally 5) are available):
  - For institutional, divisional, and academic unit questions:
    - Mean for all undergraduate or graduate courses in the academic unit, as relevant
    - Mean for courses at the same level of instruction in the academic unit (e.g. 100-level)
    - Standard deviations for academic unit means
  - For institutional and divisional questions:
    - Divisional mean for all undergraduate or graduate courses, as relevant
    - Divisional mean for courses at the same level of instruction
    - Standard deviations for divisional means
  - For institutional questions:
    - Institutional mean (graduate or undergraduate)
    - Standard deviation for institutional mean

Additional comparative data may be reported in the future. Customized analyses may also be requested from CTSI.

Note: For courses with fewer than 5 responses, quantitative reports will include response distributions, but no summary statistical information will be provided.

Note: Data from instructor-selected questions will appear only on the formative report. Instructors may share this data with unit or Faculty administrators, if they so choose.
Formative Report
Purpose and Recipients
- Intended to be used for formative purposes – i.e., to inform and aid an instructor in the improvement of his/her teaching and course development.
- Available only to the instructor.

Included Information (each course reported on separately)
- All the information from the summative report, plus:
  - Data from any and all instructor-selected questions, including:
    - Question text
    - Response set
    - Course enrolment
    - Number of responses
    - For quantitative questions only:
      - Frequency (displayed as chart)
      - Mean
      - Median
      - Mode
      - Standard deviation
  - Note: For courses that receive fewer than 5 responses, quantitative reports will include response distributions, but no summary statistical information will be provided.

Students’ Report
Purpose and Recipients
Students play an important role in the assessment of teaching by providing feedback on their learning experience in courses. This data helps us improve our teaching, but is also important to students, who use it to facilitate their course selection process. The Faculty of Arts & Science has a long history of sharing data from course evaluations with undergraduate students to acknowledge the time and consideration they contribute to the evaluation process.

Normally, the summary results of quantitative institutional and divisional questions on the course evaluation form in undergraduate courses are made available to students through a website maintained by the Faculty of Arts & Science. Written comments in response to open-ended institutional questions, as well as the results of unit- and instructor-selected questions, are NOT shared with students. At this time, no data from graduate courses is shared with students.

Opting-out
The Faculty of Arts & Science recognizes that instructors may wish not to share results from certain courses. For example, instructors in their first year of teaching or who are experimenting with a new course or teaching approach may wish to review their first year of data.

Each semester, instructors can opt out from sharing the results of course evaluation data collected that term on a section-by-section basis by visiting https://course-evaluations.chass.utoronto.ca/. This website will be available to instructors for approximately two weeks at the end of each semester. The dates during which the website will be available will be updated and posted to this website each semester.
Included Information (each course section reported on separately)

- Quantitative data from all institutional, and divisional questions in undergraduate courses
- For each question, the following data will be provided:
  - Question text
  - Response set
  - Course enrolment
  - Number of responses
  - Response data, including:
    - Frequency (displayed as chart)
    - Mean
    - Median
    - Mode
    - Standard deviation
- A composite mean score will be provided for core institutional questions 1–5

Unit’s Report
Purpose and Recipients
- Intended to provide information to academic units helpful in curriculum design, planning, and assessment.
- Available to academic unit heads and their designates.

Included Information
- Summative report for each course, plus
- Academic units may request customized reports reflecting aggregate or individual data by course or instructor from institutional, divisional, or academic unit questions. Such reports will support the unit in monitoring teaching effectiveness and in working with curriculum committees and instructors to ensure a strong learning experience for our students.

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

Included Information
- Summative report for each course, plus:
- The Dean’s office may request customized reports reflecting aggregate or individual data by course or instructor from institutional, divisional, or academic unit questions. Such reports will support the Dean's office in monitoring teaching effectiveness and in working with curriculum committees and instructors to ensure a strong learning experience for our students.