



October 18, 2026

Summary of Evidence Parker Glynn-Adey Continuing Status Review

This is a summary of the evidence collected for your continuing status review and promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream, in the Department of Computer & Mathematical Sciences, UTSC. In addition to the materials you submitted, we received:

- Five letters from external reviewers
- A Teaching Committee report and two classroom observation reports
- Letters from 13 of your students (10 undergraduate students and 3 teaching assistants)
- Course evaluation reports for 16 course offerings, from Fall 2021 to Winter 2026 (you were on approved Research & Study Leave from July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024)

The letters from external reviewers, students, and teaching assistants are confidential. In the excerpts below, identifying details have been omitted; [...] marks an omission and [square brackets] mark a replaced word. Quotes from the same source are not necessarily consecutive. Spelling and punctuation in the excerpts are as in the originals. Apart from the factual course-evaluation data, this summary presents excerpts from the collected evidence without independent assessment.

Letters from external reviewers

Five external reviewers assessed your teaching and your pedagogical/professional development against the criteria in the UTSC Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching. Excerpts from each letter follow.

Letter 1

[...] after a careful review of the teaching material provided, my assessment is that Parker has demonstrated both excellence in teaching and continuing pedagogical and professional development.

After reviewing the material provided, it is clear that Parker deeply cares about student learning and well-being. To start with, his teaching philosophy is very much student-centered. The emphasis on kindness and accessibility is notable: establishing a positive relationship with [students] is the foundation for excellence.

[...] students appreciate Parker's kindness, accessibility and enthusiasm. They like the welcoming environment in Parker's classroom. Many students found Parker's instruction excellent. Some comments are not entirely positive however and highlight aspects of Parker's teaching that could be improved, but overall, student comments paint the picture of an effective, respectful, kind and committed instructor. Numerical scores, while perhaps not outstanding, are strong and generally above average.

From the point of view of course design, Parker hasn't been involved in any major redesign, but he

decided to rewrite the course MAT A02 – The Magic of Numbers when he taught it for the first time, to make it more student-centered and active. This is commendable.

It is also worth mentioning that Parker supervised three undergraduate research projects in 2025-2026, which led to publications and conference presentations.

I believe that Parker has demonstrated pedagogical and professional development, at a level that is expected at this stage of his career. He served as the Chair of the IBL Special Interest Group of the Mathematics Association of America (SIGMAA) from 2019 to 2023.

Overall, my assessment is that Parker is a kind, effective, enthusiastic, respectful and committed instructor. His focus on active learning and his genuine care about student learning and well-being are commendable.

Letter 2

In my judgment, Professor Glynn-Adey's teaching and pedagogical/professional work meet the criterion of excellence.

Professor Glynn-Adey's teaching is guided by three principles: kindness, interaction, and accessibility. These commitments are evident throughout his course design. He maintains rigorous mathematical expectations while giving students clear structures, accessible materials, and frequent opportunities to discuss their ideas. His use of guided problem solving seems especially effective: he models important mathematical processes, asks students to work collaboratively on related questions, and circulates among groups to provide targeted support.

His course development work provides additional evidence of excellence. In MAT A29, Calculus I for the Life Sciences, he adopted an accessible open educational resource and redesigned the course around it, reducing costs while improving accessibility. In MAT A22, Linear Algebra I, he developed proof-oriented materials that make the central ideas of mathematical arguments more explicit, helping students move beyond procedural work toward deeper mathematical reasoning.

His redesign of MAT A02, The Magic of Numbers, is a strong example of innovative teaching. He reorganized a large-enrollment breadth course around principles of active and experiential learning. Activities involving birthdays, counting systems across students' languages, and an end-of-term Mathematics Festival connected mathematical ideas with students' cultural knowledge and lived experiences.

Professor Glynn-Adey demonstrates a critically reflective teaching practice. He regularly collects feedback through exit surveys, anonymous forms, and course evaluations, and he documents concrete responses. For example, he reduced the density of prepared notes after students reported excessive transcription demands and clarified the relationship among lectures, tutorials, homework, and assessments after students perceived inconsistencies.

His supervision of undergraduate projects has led to multiple conference presentations, publications, and awards. He has co-authored mathematical work with students and created co-curricular spaces through the [U(t)-Mathazine], undergraduate seminars, problem-solving groups, and board-game nights.

Letter 3

I was pleased to find clear and compelling evidence that Dr. Glynn-Adey's work significantly exceeds the promotion criteria of excellence in teaching and pedagogical/professional work.

Dr. Glynn-Adey's teaching philosophy centers on three aspects: kindness pedagogy, active learning, and accessibility. He achieves kindness pedagogy through a welcoming syllabus, an introductory

Professor's Message, and inviting students to share pronouns and preferred names. His classes are highly active and stimulate students – for instance in one course involving quantitative reasoning skills students all share how they count in their over 20 different languages revealing various mathematical properties in the comparisons.

Reviewing the quantitative and qualitative feedback from students demonstrates that Dr. Glynn-Adey is a highly effective educator. His scores on course evaluations are strong, often surpassing departmental averages. The qualitative feedback demonstrates that students believe that he effectively communicates math, helps them develop a deep understanding of the subject, challenges them appropriately, and creates a class culture of respect that promotes growth.

I appreciated that Dr. Glynn-Adey was a highly reflective teacher. He deliberately solicits feedback from students at multiple points throughout the course with anonymous surveys and exit tickets, reflects on the feedback, and uses that information to either make adjustments to his teaching or to better understand challenges his students are facing. Dr. Glynn-Adey additionally does a lot of work mentoring graduate students, post-docs, and new instructors.

Letter 4

In short, I find that he does meet the criteria for both.

Glynn-Adey's record shows that he surpasses most of the requirements above while being a bit more mixed when it comes to a few. First, it is clear that he cares deeply about his students' well-being and educational journey. His teaching statement makes his goals and perspectives clear, and—for the most part—student evaluations suggest that his approach has been effective and meeting items i, iv, vi, and vii above.

Glynn-Adey has also been successful in meeting criteria items ii, iii, and viii, but his record here is a bit more ambiguous as I judge based on comments from student evaluations. Multiple students highlighted issues with understanding the point of some in-class activities and lack of clarity in how he works through examples. This suggests a small issue with communicating effectively (item ii) and developing students' mastery (item iii), although the majority of student comments mention no such concerns. Some students also suggested a disconnect between in-class activities and assessments (item viii), saying they felt unprepared for the more challenging problems they encountered on assessments. Again, such comments typically make up a minority point of view in his classes.

Glynn-Adey's emphasis on active learning comes across strongly in all of his materials and is based on a clear understanding of the mathematics education literature. Yet, whether he has been successful in implementing this in in-class settings varies a bit from class to class.

Adding onto some of the negative student comments mentioned above, multiple students found his approach of working through example problems together as a group to be unmotivated and at times simplistic since the problems he used are often on the easier side. Such students also felt that his going around from group to group to check-in was not a good use of time, but others (probably the majority) felt that having time to talk to their classmates is very useful.

I do not see clear evidence that the negative comments that appear in evaluations are indicative of a major issue with Glynn-Adey's in-class teaching, and indeed I appreciate that he takes the time in his materials to reflect on these and the impact they have had on his approach.

His mentorship of teaching assistants working under him is a notable strong point and the letters from such graduate students provided in his dossier make his role in their development clear.

The only mixed part of his record I found, based on student evaluations, was his in-class teaching. However, the guidelines for Excellence in Teaching include many other ways in which the teaching

skills standard can be assessed beyond in-class teaching alone, and Glynn-Adey's record more than demonstrates such excellence in these other ways. His leadership and professional development work make up an exceptionally strong part of his record.

Letter 5

Based on my review of the provided evidence, I judge Professor Glynn-Adey's teaching and pedagogical/professional development to meet the criterion of excellence as articulated by the document Guidelines for the Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching: University of Toronto Scarborough.

Specific evidence provided includes course evaluation data that shows consistent growth and student appreciation of the atmosphere that Professor Glynn-Adey created for them in his courses. Additionally, the Advice for Students and Advice for New Teachers documents that Professor Glynn-Adey included in his evidence shows that he cares about the student experience and that he makes himself accessible to students in several ways. His course outlines and his course evaluations show alignment between learning outcomes and assessment expectations which support academic integrity and developing student mastery of the subject.

The Creative and Educational Leadership criteria is met by Professor Glynn-Adey's publications and connections to the broader mathematics education community, by his commitment to promote [students'] involvement in research through supervision of undergraduate projects, and by the Teaching Development Grant to support active learning in the post-secondary mathematics classroom.

The evidence that Professor Glynn-Adey has provided demonstrates that he is continuously revising his teaching and contributing to others' thinking about teaching by engaging in professional contributions to academic conferences and contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning mathematics through engaging with other scholars and the publication of research and professional articles. Professor Glynn-Adey has also participated as a learner through hiring a coach to support his own development as a teacher and a teaching scholar.

Teaching Committee report

Excerpts from the Teaching Committee report:

His teaching evaluation reports and student letters are superb. We are convinced that Parker has clearly met - and surpassed - the criteria for excellence in teaching. We are also of the view that his dossier offers compelling evidence of demonstrated and continuing pedagogical and professional development.

A few student evaluations noted some minor discrepancies between Parker's teaching and another teacher for multi-sectioned courses. We surmise that he became aware of this issue while the course was underway. He addressed these issues carefully on-line and in lectures. We believe his actions were friendly and responsible.

Our opinion is that Parker's activities and impact in the realms of diverse creative educational leadership and mentorship are impressive. We think his initiatives in these realms have enriched and enlightened students, our campus, and the wider mathematical community.

Parker has completed the CTL's eight-month Best Practices in Teaching and Learning course. This intensive course consists of 14 sessions and is limited to just twelve faculty at a time. We think this in of itself is solid evidence of continued professional development.

Classroom observation reports

MAT B42 – Techniques of the Calculus of Several Variables II

One observer attended a one-hour MAT B42 lecture in March 2026. Excerpts from the classroom observation report:

Based on my lecture observation, my opinion is that Parker meets the criteria for the UTSC standard of teaching excellence. He is very welcoming and enthusiastic with our students.

His presentation was clear, methodical, yet personable. He detailed advanced complicated mathematics and made it accessible, digestible, and interesting.

He warmly invited questions as he progressed. Several students asked some good questions that were beyond procedural. Parker handled these smoothly and with polite authority.

MAT A02 – The Magic of Numbers

The second observer attended an announced final class of MAT A02, a course designed to satisfy the quantitative reasoning requirement. Excerpts from the classroom observation report:

Most of the students' projects required extensive preparation outside class, and it was evident that students had invested a great deal of time in preparing their presentations. Some students had also invited friends to attend.

I thought this was a very carefully planned class. Although it is difficult to assess how much mathematics students had learned based solely on observing the final project presentations, it was clear that they were enthusiastic about their work and enjoyed the session. In my view, Parker Glynn-Adey has done outstanding work in designing this course.

Letters from students

We received 13 letters from students: 10 from undergraduate students and 3 from teaching assistants. The request for comments asked students to address stimulation and challenge, mastery of the subject, inquiry, involvement in research, lasting impact, communication, engagement with students' learning, and accessibility, and asked teaching assistants to comment on mentoring, management, organization, and communication. Excerpts follow, grouped by theme.

Lectures and course content

His teaching style, in my opinion, is incredibly unique. He prints out his lesson plan on paper and physically goes through practice problems, which I'm a fan of. I find that it helps me understand the problem intuitively. Additionally, he lays out the problems in a specific order to purposefully subvert expectations and help you build deeper intuition of a problem.

He taught the course in a very structured and clear way that made it really easy to keep up with.

Professor Parker's lectures are incredibly sharp while remaining accessible, with lecture notes consistently uploaded for student use outside of the class. His lectures were stimulating and challenging, with examples designed to test our breadth of understanding of a given concept spread throughout the lecture.

In lectures, he explained concepts clearly and encouraged students to think actively by asking questions and having us contribute ideas while working through problems. He also took time to review solutions carefully and regularly invited questions or points of confusion, which helped create a supportive learning environment.

He was explaining concepts well like the derivation of quotient rule and product rule, visualization of Riemann sum and various integration techniques. [...] his unique teaching still caught my missing points

by actively interacting with the audience in order to make the lecture environment not boring. He often connected the mathematical content to applications, historical context, and broader ideas, which helped the material feel less abstract and more intellectually stimulating. His approach to teaching MATA02 was especially memorable because he used real-life applications, including magic, card games, and other creative examples, to explain mathematical ideas. For instance, when discussing permutations, he used Faro shuffles with playing cards to illustrate different types of permutations. These kinds of activities made students noticeably more engaged with the lecture content.

Availability and support outside class

Where Parker truly shines is in one-on-one discussions and office hours. He is incredibly accessible, whether through email or in person. Whenever I and other students would visit, whether it was for direct assistance or general advice, Parker would provide guidance from outside sources by sharing his own textbooks, offering visual aids, and encouraging further inquiry.

I brought this up in his office hours and he took the time to ensure I truly understood the concept rather than simply memorizing the process of solving these questions. His patient explanations and approachable teaching style helped me become comfortable with limits and build a stronger foundation in calculus.

I also remember in office hours when he was helping me with practice questions I did not know how to do ANYTHING but he didn't just give me a solution or tell me how to do it, he waited for me to think and gave hints until I could put the pieces together.

He also made it clear that he was available to students after class, over email, and during office hours, whether their questions were directly related to the course or simply motivated by curiosity about mathematics. Whenever I emailed him, he responded quickly, kindly, and thoroughly.

I was very intimidated by his course at first but he made everything approachable and with his help I achieved my goals

He's friendly, approachable, fun, and memorable.

Inquiry, research, and lasting impact

His recent teaching and leading a Math Festival as part of a course-based assignment for MATA02 is really inspiring. I think events like this do a lot to promote a sense of inquiry and understanding of mathematics on campus.

Students created displays showing applications of mathematics that were relevant to their programs, cultural backgrounds, hobbies, and interests. It was a wonderful example of how Professor Glynn-Adey encourages students to see mathematics as something creative, personal, and connected to the world around them.

I think that Parker has provided invaluable contributions in terms of building community among the students involved in mathematics on campus, and in terms of encouraging people to get involved in pure and applied math research.

The impact of Professor Glynn-Adey's teaching has extended far beyond a single course. [...] the academic confidence I gained in his class played an important role in my success in later science courses.

Comments from teaching assistants

As a TA, I particularly appreciated his strong communication and organizational skills. Expectations for tutorials, assessments, and student support were always communicated clearly, which created a

collaborative and supportive teaching environment for both students and teaching assistants. Professor Glynn-Adey also demonstrated excellent mentorship and professionalism in his interactions with TAs. He treated members of the teaching team with respect, welcomed feedback, and created opportunities for us to contribute meaningfully to the student learning experience.

What stood out most to me was that he treated the course as a learning opportunity for the TAs as well as for the students. He shared valuable lessons about science education [...] and showed us how to make a classroom environment engaging, comfortable, and accessible.

Concerns about course organization and assessment

The following excerpts, including comments on teaching assistant supervision, all come from one letter:

My overall opinion is that his teaching is fair, but his course organizing and TA monitoring are really weak and irresponsible.

For [one course], the teaching is fair and my TA is responsible. However, we have 10 homework assignments but only 6 of them got graded, while the other 4 are left blank, no grade, no comment. I don't know how the grade is calculated without these 4 assignments and there is no explanation.

During lecture, sometimes he stuck at some point and cannot continue. Also, for many times, he taught some theorem wrong and told us to change after one week which I think it shouldn't happen. Another point is that his exam usually has some wrong statements (not typo, just purely wrong question) [...]

I didn't get grading scheme for any of the assignments or exams, which I suppose is the same for other TAs. Then, we can only grade the question based on our understanding, and created some bias. The bias raised lots of regrade requests and since we didn't get the policy about regrading, we TAs got lots of complaints from the students.

Course evaluations

Course evaluation reports were provided for 16 offerings in five courses: MAT A29 Calculus I for Life Sciences (5 offerings), MAT A22 Linear Algebra I for Math Sciences (3), MAT B41 Techniques of the Calculus of Several Variables I (3), MAT B42 Techniques of the Calculus of Several Variables II (4), and MAT A02 The Magic of Numbers (1). Scores for courses with multiple sections are averaged over the sections in the same term. The two Winter 2026 offerings are not in the summary table in your dossier; their scores below are taken from the individual reports. The 16 entries record 1,432 completed course evaluations; this is a count of responses, not of unique students.

Scores

Questions 1 to 5 use a 1 to 5 scale from "Not at all" to "A great deal"; Question 6 uses a 1 to 5 scale from "Poor" to "Excellent". The composite is the mean of Questions 1 to 5. "Dept" is the departmental mean over all evaluated courses in the same term. Question 3 is "The instructor created an atmosphere that was conducive to my learning." Question 6 is "Overall, the quality of my learning experience in this course was..."

Term	Course	Responded / invited	Composite: you	Composite: dept	Q3: you	Q3: dept	Q6: you	Q6: dept
2021 Fall	MAT A29	176 / 514 (34%)	4.4	3.9	4.7	4.0	4.2	3.6
2022 Winter	MAT A22	101 / 376 (27%)	3.6	3.9	4.0	3.9	2.8	3.5
2022 Winter	MAT B42	61 / 224 (27%)	4.0	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.5
2022 Fall	MAT A29	128 / 470 (27%)	4.1	4.0	4.5	4.1	3.8	3.6

Term	Course	Responded / invited	Composite: you	Composite: dept	Q3: you	Q3: dept	Q6: you	Q6: dept
2022 Fall	MAT B41	50 / 220 (23%)	4.4	4.0	4.6	4.1	4.1	3.6
2023 Winter	MAT A22	83 / 424 (20%)	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.2	3.5
2023 Winter	MAT B42	40 / 262 (15%)	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
2024 Fall	MAT A29	190 / 439 (43%)	3.7	4.0	3.8	4.1	3.3	3.7
2024 Fall	MAT B41	60 / 225 (27%)	4.4	4.0	4.6	4.1	4.4	3.7
2025 Winter	MAT A22	98 / 277 (35%)	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.3	3.6
2025 Winter	MAT A29	32 / 180 (18%)	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.5	3.6
2025 Winter	MAT B42	100 / 281 (36%)	3.3	4.0	3.3	4.0	2.7	3.6
2025 Fall	MAT A29	171 / 457 (37%)	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.5	3.6
2025 Fall	MAT B41	45 / 219 (21%)	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.6	3.6
2026 Winter	MAT A02	39 / 139 (28%)	3.5	4.0	3.7	4.1	3.3	3.7
2026 Winter	MAT B42	58 / 287 (20%)	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.7

Compared at one decimal place, your composite was above the departmental mean in 5 offerings, equal in 2, and below in 9. For Question 3 it was above in 8, equal in 4, and below in 4. For Question 6 it was above in 5, equal in 2, and below in 9. Response rates ranged from 15% to 43%.

Student comments

Each report includes open-ended comments on the quality of instruction and on the assistance available. Excerpts for each course follow, as written by students.

MAT A29 Calculus I for Life Sciences

Parker is great. I like the way he explains things and he is so encouraging of questions even if the question is absolutely stupid, it's very reassuring. His enthusiasm is infectious and despite going into this course thinking I was bad at math, I did not dread going into class every day and I actually got better at math.

I think that the instruction was very vague and confusing. No simple explanation was given during the lectures. I found that I had to resort to learning everything on YouTube (which was night and day compared to the lectures). I think that slowing down and talking through everything in a simple way could help in the future.

This semester, the instructors for the course changed the style of teaching to be more worksheet based, with less emphasis on teacher instruction especially in the first half of the course. While this would have been more ideal in a tutorial setting, within the lecture period I found the worksheets to be unhelpful in clarifying my questions or providing me a good understanding as to how I could complete various types of questions.

Parker was one of the friendliest and approachable professors in terms of lectures, office hours, etc. He went through familiar concepts at a reasonable pace, and walked us through new concepts with beginner-friendly examples and lessons.

The quality of instruction was fairly good, but there was a portion of content that Parker didn't cover a lot or didn't touch on at all that we were tested on. It was a lot of self-learning and study.

MAT A22 Linear Algebra I for Math Sciences

Lecture quality was very good and the topics that were covered could be clearly understood. However, the whole course was quite chaotic as the two professors did not have their teaching material aligned which made it so that one professor could be teaching at a different pace or different material entirely.

Parker taught well and made the classroom environment a healthy one. He would accept and answer questions as best as possible and had a friendly demeanour, making him more approachable. However, the course was poorly run. Notes weren't released on time, Assignments weren't graded on time, many questions on Piazza were unanswered, deadlines were pushed or changed in some way, assignments were unnecessarily hard, etc.

MAT B41 Techniques of the Calculus of Several Variables I

Parker is one of the best math professors at the university because he genuinely made us love math! I really enjoyed his lectures because they were simple to follow, since he made difficult concepts easier to understand through breaking down problems.

It was 10 assignments throughout the semester consisting of 7-10 questions where the professors would choose 2 questions AT RANDOM to grade. Additionally they wouldn't tell us which questions they would grade which does not reflect on our understanding of the course.

Professor Adey was very helpful in the lectures, making sure everyone could understand the material before moving on, although the tutorials weren't very helpful, and the "all or nothing" grading scheme for the homework provided no room for error if a question was missed.

MAT B42 Techniques of the Calculus of Several Variables II

I love the way Parker does his proofs. They're clear, concise, and elegant. I also love the fact that Parker records his lectures. There were a few hiccups regarding the organization of the course and the posting of assignments but it was resolved nicely.

Assignment distribution is not fair. The course outline shows that there are 7 assignments in total. The professor distributed first four assignments every two weeks, but required to submitted last three assignments together only in one week. That is too stressed!

Parker is an excellent professor, doesn't rush the content, explains all questions politely, and makes learning seem fun and easy.

Lectures were mostly engaging and enjoyable. Parker is a great guy, and it comes out well during lectures. Lectures were just way too far behind compared to tutorials, homework, and previous years' pace, which made the experience a little worse.

MAT A02 The Magic of Numbers

He was fantastic. I hated math and all things to do with it, but he made me feel less of an idiot and made me feel comfortable. He is one of my favorite professors at U of T

Parker just needs to slow down and simplify when explaining things, and go through all the steps of equations. I think he forgot that this class is for non-math students to get their breadth requirement.

Prof Parker was a great instructor, but I feel the math festival needed a rubric. Somethings were announced a couple of days before and was really confusing.

I believe that many students in this class are primarily taking it to fulfill their Breadth requirements. Personally, I am not very interested in math, and I find that many of the in-class activities feel

unproductive.

Comments about interactions with the instructor

Some written course-evaluation comments raise concerns about interactions with the instructor. Representative excerpts follow. Course identifiers and distinctive personal details have been omitted to reduce the risk of identifying respondents.

I was humiliated and verbally abused in front of the whole class [...]

The office hours were packed and when you asked a question about the topic, he was unwilling or annoyed to help. He also seemed to favour the asian students a lot over the other students [...]

Overall, prof. Parker did a really good job at teaching the material in the course. [...] One thing I find disturbing in his class is the fact that he targets students and nicknames them. [...] I find this extremely inappropriate and offensive [...]

there were office hours but i went for a regrade and he immediately told me he would not give me one. [...] really humiliating, felt like i was bothering him and he did not want me to be there.

The professor seems not to care about the students' questions during office hours, and just wants to rush through everything. Additionally, in some cases, his tone was neither professional nor respectful.

Prof. Parker is pretty passive aggressive, which makes attending office hours or asking questions feel very intimidating. I do not think he means to come across this way, but that is what I have perceived. Despite this, Prof. Parker will go over examples with students as many times as they are willing to ask. I appreciate that.

This is a selection of excerpts from the evidence collected; the complete letters, reports, and evaluations are in the review file.

Sincerely,



Bianca Schroeder
Professor & Chair
Department of Computer & Mathematical Sciences
University of Toronto Scarborough