

General Faculties Council
University Teaching Awards Committee (UTAC)
Approved Open Session Minutes

Thursday, April 11, 2023
South Academic Building (SAB) 2-31
2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

ATTENDEES:

Trish Manns, Chair
Minn N Yoon, Vice-Chair
Angelina Botros
Robert Gardner
Florence Glanfield
Karsten Mündel
Aamir Mohamed

Cayden Ransom
Victoria Ruetalo
Megan Tipler
Nakita Valerio

non-voting:
Kate Peters

staff:
Carley Roth

REGRETS:
Joanne Rodger
Carrie Smith
John Lemieux

OPENING SESSION

Before calling the meeting to order, the Chair acknowledged the territory.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Trish Manns, Professor and Chair of UTAC

Discussion: T Manns presented the draft agenda and offered an opportunity to members to make changes.

2. Comments from the Chair (no documents)

Presenter(s): Trish Manns, Professor and Chair of UTAC; Karsten Mündel, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives)

The Chair reminded members about the upcoming Festival of Teaching and Learning and informed members that the minutes from the April 4, 2024 meeting would come forward for approval at a later date.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. Application and Adjudication Guidelines (no documents)

Presenter(s): Karsten Mündel, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives);

Discussion: K Mündel reminded members about the two-phase application process and noted some learnings including the necessity to clarify that criteria for phase 1 and phase 2 of the process are the same and to include a question on the context in which the applicants teach in the initial application process.

Committee members noted:

- The use of metrics from the Faculty Annual Reporting (FAR) process and how to balance those data with narrative about in-classroom teaching;
- The difference between studio teaching, clinical teaching, credit-bearing teaching or other teaching activities that are not necessarily captured in institutional data;
- Whether each award should capture distinct data, for example undergraduate vs graduate teaching;
- How asking for context can prompt applicants to provide information that may not be intuitive evidence of teaching context, for example, mentoring graduate students;
- That it will be difficult for UTAC members to compare the information provided but that it will help members to situate the applicants' work;
- That clarity in each award about what the committee is looking to reward is key to avoid subjective and interpretive practices in the committee that may not be consistent;
- A comment that graduate teaching requires mentorship and that being precise around whether the awards are targeting class-room teaching which is different teaching in other contexts;
- The value of data such as the length of time they have been teaching at the University;
- How quantitative data may not help to describe the applicants history and current teaching context; and
- That the narrative CV may not offer this information up in a way that is easy to capture.

K Mündel asked for feedback on the process to solicit applications, third party nominations, and other ways to identify potential applicants.

Committee members discussed:

- The value of supporting nominations through various mechanisms including department and college structures;
- The need for supports and resources to complete nominations and help applicants with their packages; and
- Whether a multi-level process of nomination could help and the example of the narrative CV workshop.

K Mündel presented the possibility of putting together an adjudication rubric that would support the committee in ranking applications. He suggested that the Framework for Effective Teaching could provide a useful starting point and showed a draft rubric for the committee's feedback.

Committee members expressed support for the idea and provided suggestions and made comments including:

- Support for a tool that will help committee members to stay away from the middle;
- A suggestion that a ranking of 0-3 for both Indigenous initiatives and equity, diversity and inclusion rather than a binary yes or no;
- That in addition to detailed rankings on different criteria, an overall ranking might help;
- That it would be useful to clarify where teaching impact might fall in the rubric;
- How to ensure that there is room for qualitative assessments to ensure that applicants are holistically and fairly assessed;
- That a rubric will also give the committee common vocabulary to assess candidates;
- That the Framework for Effective Teaching does have gaps, for example, curriculum; and
- Whether the rubric could function without numbers and use labels or words instead of numbers;

4. Learnings on Committee Practices for the Next Cycle (no documents)

Presenter: Trish Manns, Chair, GFC UTAC

Discussion: T Manns invited committee members to add to the preceding conversation and provide comments or feedback on the adjudication process.

Members discussed:

- How we can communicate on the website the work of UTAC to adjudicate applications;
- Whether publishing the rubric would be a way to ensure transparency; and

- That each committee member will read applications from a specific point of view but that the work of the committee is to integrate those multiple perspectives in a collective process.

CLOSING SESSION

5. Adjournment
 - Next meeting of GFC: April 29, 2024
 - Next meeting of UTAC: April 11, 2024