

HRHD Rubric for Assessing Appendix H (APPROVED April 13, 2022)

General Comments re: How to Apply This Rubric

This rubric is presented in the order in which the process is intended to be conducted. For reasons that should become apparent, on the recommendation of the PTAC Training Workshop (December 2020), Part (c) will be evaluated before Part (b).

(a) Requisite academic qualifications as posted

After the application period has closed, the Program Coordinator will conduct a preliminary assessment of all applications to determine if applicants satisfy the requisite academic qualifications as posted. The Program Coordinator will notify the other members of the PTAC who are participating in the hiring process of the names of any applicants who the Program Coordinator identified as not being qualified as well as the courses for which they applied and were deemed unqualified. The other members will review the files of these applicants and inform the other members of the PTAC if they concur with the Program Coordinator's assessment. If there is any disagreement, the PTAC members will communicate to determine if the applicant(s) should be deemed qualified.

(c) overall record of teaching

(I) student evaluations

This evaluation will be based on the applicants' teaching evaluations over the previous six years.

This will include all Laurier evaluations conducted over this period.

It will also include official reports of teaching evaluations submitted by the applicant from other universities, but only if it is clear to the PTAC that it is in possession of **all** of the evaluations from the applicant's experience from at least the previous three years.

Otherwise, the process in (b)(I) will apply in this section.

Provisions for transition from prior rubrics

Evaluations conducted prior to the Winter 2019 semester will not be re-scored. Rather, they will be included in the weighted average by assigning 13.5 points for all evaluations that had been assessed as Excellent; 10 for all that had been assessed as Good; 5.5 for all that had been assessed as Satisfactory; and 0 for all that had been assessed as Less than Satisfactory.

Where a candidate had not been assessed in the past, but has evaluations from courses offered prior to Spring 2019, the earlier courses will be assessed according to the HRHD PTAC rubric (May 29, 2019) and then assigned points as above. Evaluations for all subsequent offerings will be assessed according to the criteria set out in this rubric.

(III) total seniority points

Seniority points will count on a one-to-one basis.

(II) teaching dossier or other supporting documents

HRHD Rubric for Assigning Points for Teaching Dossiers and Other Supporting Documents (CTFCA Appendix H part (c)(II))
<u>This rubric reflects the following guiding principles:</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Points should only be assigned for qualities of good teaching that are <i>demonstrated</i>, not those that are merely described, claimed, or committed to.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What should be assessed in reviewing the dossier are the <i>qualities</i> of good teaching it <i>demonstrates</i>, not the execution of the dossier as a dossier, since there is no reason to believe that success in creating a teaching dossier is correlated to being a good teacher.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no agreement on a prescriptive “common core” of teaching knowledge or competencies, so the criteria to be applied here shall aim to be of the least controversial sort.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• These portfolios are being assessed for people who are to be employed as instructors, not administrators or designers of academic programs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The PTAC will only consider those elements of cover letters, curriculum vitae, and teaching dossier that correspond to the items noted in the rubric. (This approach reflects information shared at the PTAC training workshop, December 8, 2020.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Given the new nature of this practice of evaluating portfolios, it is to be expected that this rubric will be revised frequently over the next few years as the PTAC gains more experience applying it.

Sources considered in developing these criteria:

Centra, John A. (2000). “Evaluating the Teaching Portfolio.: *Evaluating Teaching in Higher Education: A Vision for the Future*. Ed. Katherine E. Ryan. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 87-93.

Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation. University of Toronto. (2017) “Developing Assessing Teaching Dossiers: A guide for University of Toronto faculty, administrators and graduate students.” Accessed January 14, 2020 at <http://www.dlsph.utoronto.ca/files/media/docs/Faculty/Teaching%20Dossier%20Publication%20Excerpt.pdf>.

Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation. University of Toronto. (2020). “Appendix D: Evaluating Teaching Dossiers for Department Chairs and Tenure, Continuing Status and Promotions Committee.” Accessed January 14, 2020 at <https://teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching-support/documenting-teaching/teaching-dossier/appendix-d-evaluation-teaching-dossiers-for-department-chairs-and-tenure-and-promotion-committee-members/>.

Environment Program. University of Waterloo. (n.d.) “Peer Evaluation for Purposes of Tenure and Promotion.” Accessed January 14, 2020 at <https://uwaterloo.ca/environment/faculty-staff/policies-procedures-terms-reference/peer-evaluation-purposes-tenure-and-promotion>

Harris, Ryan C. Learning Teaching Center. (n.d.) “Evaluation of Faculty Teaching: Methods of Evaluation.” Accessed January 14, 2020 at <https://docplayer.net/21073902-Evaluation-of-faculty-teaching-methods-of-evaluation.html>.

Leijen, Ali, Bert Slof, Liina Malva, Pihel Hunt, Jan van Tartwijk and Marieke van der Schaaf. (2017). “Performance-Based Competency Requirements for Student Teachers and How to Assess Them,” *International Journal of Information and Technology*, 7(3): 190-194.

Smith, Kari and Harm Tillema. (2007). “Use of Criterial in Assessing Teaching Portfolios: Judgemental practices in summative evaluation,” *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 51(1): 103-117.

**HRHD Rubric for Assigning Points for Teaching Dossiers and Other Supporting Documents
(CTFCA Appendix H part (c)(II))**

Part 1) Assessment for Part (c) (II).

Instructions: Each PTAC member will apply the following rubric to determine a score out of 20. These scores will be averaged by the Program Coordinator and entered into Appendix H.

Each applicant will only be evaluated for Part (c) (II) once per 12-month period

Step 1: Review statements about teaching in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the applicant's cv, cover letter, and the first two pages of the applicant's Statement of (a) Teaching Philosophy, etc. (CTFCA 19.6.2 sections a, b, e). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the applicant demonstrates self-awareness and growth in their teaching practice, score: 5. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the approach described seems appropriate for students in the HRHD program and for delivering the program's learning objectives, score: 5. 	
Step 2: Review the cv and teaching dossier for any teaching awards or teaching award nominations. (CTFCA 19.6.2 section (d))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each teaching award score: 5. For each teaching award nomination score: 2. (Maximum for this category: 10 points.) 	
Step 3: Review one course outline submitted by the applicant (CTFCA 19.6.2 section k, l). Select the first outline that appears in the teaching dossier. If such does not exist, select the first that appears elsewhere in the folder.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the outline is logically organized, clear, and complete, score 5. If it is seriously flawed, score: -5.* Otherwise: 0. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the assigned readings demonstrate year-level- appropriate rigour and breadth of coverage score: 5. If they are seriously inappropriate, score: -5.* Otherwise: 0. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the assessment strategies demonstrate year-level appropriate rigour score: 5. If they are seriously inappropriate, score: -5.* Otherwise: 0. 	
Step 4: Review student comments <u>in the three most recent official student evaluations</u> and/or the <u>first three letters and testimonials</u> submitted by students and colleagues. (CTFCA 19.6.2 section (d))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On balance, if the comments suggest that the instructor is exceptional, score: 5. 	

SCORE (MAXIMUM: 20 POINTS and no less than 0)

Part 2): Assessment for Part (b)(I) (As per PTAC Training Session December 8, 2020)

Instructions: While performing Part 1) above, did you notice anything exceptional with respect to specific HR courses that should be credited? Assign **2** if what was noted was exceptional and **1** if it was excellent.

Course #	Note what was special	Points: 1 or 2	Course #	Note what was special	Points: 1 or 2

* If a candidate receives a negative score(s) that raise serious concerns about their suitability to teach the course, the PTAC may recommend not hiring the candidate (with an explanatory note to the Dean) on this basis regardless of the candidate's overall score on Appendix H.

Note: This rubric was designed based on the explanation that was given at the PTAC training workshop on December 8, 2020 that PTACs could select which of the elements of Teaching Dossiers described in the CTFCA 19.6.2 they would review and the purpose for which they would review them.

(b) Teaching experience in the posted or similar course or substantially similar course(s)

HRHD operationalizes the terms “similar course” and “substantially similar course” to apply in any one of the following circumstances:

- the same course offered in a different modality (i.e., intramural or online).
- the course is a Laurier course that is listed as an exclusion for the posted course.
- the applicant submitted teaching evaluations for a course at another university with the same or substantially similar title and content.

(I) student evaluations in the posted course or similar or substantially similar course(s)

Teaching evaluations will only be considered in this evaluation if:

- the survey is presented in the form of **official university reports** (including photocopies);
- the survey was completed by **no less than five students**; and
- where the candidate has submitted teaching evaluations from other universities, the PTAC can determine that it is in possession of **all of the relevant evaluations** from the applicant’s experience over **at least the most recent three years**.

The following adjustments are to be made to the score assigned for each course evaluation:

- +1 for courses with enrolments between 31 and 70 students;
- +2 for courses with enrolments over 70 students;
- +1 for 100-level or BF courses or statistics (if known).

Score	Operationalization for each applicable course
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All MEDIAN scores <u>at equivalent of approximately 80% or above</u>, i.e.: 6/7; 4/5 or 2/5 (if 1 is highest)
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any MEDIAN scores falling between the criteria for 12 and 3.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Majority of MEDIAN scores <u>at approximately 60% or below</u>: i.e., 4/7; 3/5.• The applicant has experience in the course or a similar or substantially similar course as a Teaching Assistant <u>or</u> in another medium of instruction (e.g., intramural vs. online), regardless of the median score, <u>or</u> the only relevant evaluations of the instructor in the course had less than six respondents.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There were no OFFICIAL teaching evaluations for the PTAC to consider.

Score out of 15:

The **score out of 15** for this category will be determined by averaging the points assigned to each relevant course to the nearest whole number and then adding 0 or +1 or +2 for course-specific items identified in Part 2) of the rubric for assessing Part (c) (II) above.

Provisions for transition from prior rubric

HRHD courses that were taught prior to Winter 2019 will be included in the weighted average using the same process as outlined under (c)(I) above.

(II) seniority points in the posted or similar or substantially similar course(s)

Seniority points will count on a one-to-one basis.

(d) Relevant qualifications including scholarship in the field, professional experience, pedagogical development, development of course materials

1) Award points cumulatively according to the following scoring system. With the exception of the PhD, each item **must be “directly relevant to the position advertised”** to receive points in any particular competition.

Category	Points per item	Maximum points per category
Doctoral dissertation (Since the only applicants receiving these points will already have been deemed to hold an MA in a relevant discipline, a PhDs do not have to be directly relevant to the position advertised.)	9	9
Book-scholarly monograph; Textbook	12	30
Co-edited scholarly book or textbook	8	30
Peer-reviewed article	5	30
Book chapter	3	15
Conference presentation (per unique paper); Book review	2	6
Course-relevant professional work experience	5 (Experience with one organization in excess of 3 years counts for 9 points)	9
Course-relevant professional report	3	8
Participation in teaching workshops	1	3
Publication of scholarly articles on teaching	3	6
Relevant development of course materials (e.g., textbooks, textbook materials (e.g., slide deck) developing a course from scratch, course-related YouTube videos, innovative forms of evaluation)	3	6
Other	As assessed by the committee	As assessed by the committee

2) While points will normally be awarded as indicated by 1) above, the committee reserves the right to assign points other than those indicated by this rubric when this is justified by elements of the information used for assessment. **When this occurs, it must be noted in Appendix H.**