

Department of Biology

PTAC Evaluation Rubric (Appendix H) for Assessment of CTF Candidates according to Article 13.6.1

Course & Term offered:

Applicant name:

PTAC Members:

Date of meeting:

Materials used for the assessment (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cover letter | <input type="checkbox"/> Student evaluations (Laurier) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CV | <input type="checkbox"/> Student/course evaluations (other institution) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching Dossier | <input type="checkbox"/> Member's official file |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation of member per Article 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other materials (provide details): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Roster application | |

Section A. Requisite Academic Qualifications: Y / N

Qualifications for CTF appointments in Biology normally require a **doctoral degree in Biological Sciences** or a related field AND evidence of expertise in the area of specialization as indicated in the advertisement. *For example*, the qualifications to teach an Ecology course would normally be a PhD in Biology, a dissertation on a topic related to ecological research, and perhaps postdoc experience (or other research/work experience) in the field of ecology.

Section B. Teaching Experience in the posted or similar or substantially similar course(s) (up to 20 pts)*

**Note that the PTAC will normally consider Section B after Section C – Overall Record of Teaching, in recognition that course-specific information assessed in Section B will be included in the materials used to assess the overall record of teaching*

(B.I) Student evaluations in the posted course or similar or substantially similar course(s) (up to 15 pts):

The assessment of the candidate's teaching experience in the posted (or similar) course shall be based on evidence such as student evaluations from previous times the posted or similar course was taught at Laurier (per Article 19), or the equivalent from another institution, the candidate's CV, their teaching dossier, and any other relevant information submitted by the candidate. The definition of similar courses will be determined by PTAC. Normally, a "similar" or "substantially similar" course would be a previous version of the posted course (e.g. with a slightly different title and/or description, but the same course code), or one of two previously offered courses that were merged to create a new course. A related course in the same discipline, but of a different level or with a different focus will normally NOT be considered "similar" or "substantially similar", nor will "similar" courses at other institutions, unless clear evidence is provided that demonstrates the courses are equivalent in terms of level, content, format, mode of delivery, etc. Experience in the posted or similar course as a TA, as an instructor in a different format (e.g. online vs. intramural), or from team-teaching may be considered, but points for such experiences will be reduced as compared to points awarded for experience gained in the role of instructor in the posted course.

The maximum of 15 points available in this category will be awarded according to the following scale:

Excellent (14-15 pts) Very Good (11-13 pts) Good (8-10 pts) Moderate (5-7 pts) Unsatisfactory (0-4 pts)

An initial rating category will be assigned based on student evaluations, but will be further adjusted based on other factors (see below). The overall mean teaching evaluation score for the Department of Biology (including all courses taught by F/T faculty and all those taught by CTF and for all questions combined) from Spring 2016 – Fall 2020 was **5.8**. This will be used as a benchmark to assign an initial rating in this category as follows:

- Candidates with evaluation scores that are approximately equivalent (+/- 0.3) to the department mean will be given an initial rating of **Good** (8-10 pts)
- Candidates with typical evaluation scores that exceed the department mean (by approximately 0.4-0.8 points) will be assigned an initial rating of **Very Good** (11-13 pts)

- Candidates with typical evaluation scores that far exceed the department mean (by >0.8 points) will initially be assigned a rating of **Excellent** (14-15 pts)
- Candidates with typical evaluation scores that are below the department mean (by approximately 0.4-0.8 points) will initially be assigned a rating of **Moderate** (5-7 pts)
- Candidates with typical evaluation scores that are below the department mean (by >0.8 points) will initially be assigned a rating of **Unsatisfactory** (0-4 pts)

After assigning an initial rating based on a review of the teaching evaluations, the final number of points awarded will be determined by considering several additional factors. The rating category can be adjusted and the exact number of points awarded within the category will be determined based on the assessment of the following factors:

- Variance in scores across student evaluation questions (e.g. how many scores are above, on par with, or below the departmental mean). For example, consistent scores may increase confidence in the reliability of student evaluations and be used to award more points, whereas large variances between questions or between courses might be reason to lower scores.
- The number of teaching evaluations available will also be considered. It is more difficult to evaluate student opinions of teaching for candidates that have received evaluations for a small number of courses (e.g. fewer than three) or from a small number of students (e.g. fewer than 30 students total). In cases where a small number of teaching evaluations are available, information other than student evaluations (see below) may need to be weighted more heavily.
- Points can be deducted from the candidate's score if there is evidence of a downward trajectory in evaluation scores over time (in cases where the candidate has taught multiple courses over multiple years); likewise, evidence of an upward trajectory in evaluation scores over time can be used to add points.
- Consideration will also be given to information provided in the CV, teaching dossier, and any other information submitted by the candidate that can be used to assess the candidate's teaching experience that is *specific to the course*, and can be used to raise or lower the score, as appropriate. Professional development activities related to teaching and pedagogical development (including workshops, teaching certificates, etc.), and the development of course materials that aren't specific to the posted course shall **NOT** be considered here, as these are not specifically related to the course and are considered separately in Section (d) – Relevant Qualifications. Examples of information that can be considered in this section include:
 - The use of innovative approaches to teaching and assessment of the content specific to the course
 - Samples of course-specific course outlines, lecture materials, assessments
 - Student testimonials and other feedback specifically related to the posted or similar course
 - Information provided in the Official File

B.I Sub-total (up to 15 pts): _____

(B.II) Seniority points* in the posted course or similar or substantially similar course(s)

**Note that seniority points earned for teaching the lab or tutorial of a course may be given less weight than seniority points earned for teaching the lecture in cases where the position being filled is for a course instructor and not a tutorial leader.*

B.II Sub-total (up to 5 pts): _____

Section B Sub-Total (B = B.I + B.II): _____

Section C. Overall Record of Teaching (up to 50 points)*

**Note that the PTAC will normally consider Section C before Section B, in recognition that course-specific information used for Section B will be included in the materials used to assess the overall record of teaching*

(C.I) Student evaluations (up to 15 pts):

The points assigned in this category shall be based on the candidate's student evaluations from all previous university courses taught at Laurier (per Article 19), and/or evaluations from other institutions. An initial rating will be assigned based on an assessment of the overall student evaluation scores, and subsequently adjusted based on other factors, as outlined below.

Note that points are awarded separately for the teaching dossier and other supporting documents provided by the applicant in section C.II, and therefore care should be taken when using the dossier to adjust the student evaluations score, so that factors presented in the dossier aren't used to adjust scores in multiple places.

The maximum of 15 points available in this category will be awarded according to the following scale:

Excellent (14-15 pts) **Very Good (11-13 pts)** **Good (8-10 pts)** **Moderate (5-7 pts)** **Unsatisfactory (0-4 pts)**

An initial rating category will be assigned based on an overall assessment of the student evaluations, but will be further adjusted based on other factors (see below). The overall mean teaching evaluation score for the Department of Biology (including all courses taught by F/T faculty and all those taught by CTF and for all questions combined) from Spring 2016 – Fall 2020 was **5.8** (the equivalent of 5.8 on a 7-pt scale is 4.13 on a 5-pt scale). This will be used as a benchmark to assign an *initial* rating in this category as follows:

- Candidates with evaluation scores that are approximately equivalent (+/- 0.3) to the department mean will be given an initial rating of **Good** (8-10 pts)
- Candidates with typical evaluation scores that exceed the department mean (by approximately 0.4-0.8 points) will be assigned an initial rating of **Very Good** (11-13 pts)
- Candidates with typical evaluation scores that far exceed the department mean (by >0.8 points) will initially be assigned a rating of **Excellent** (14-15 pts)
- Candidates with typical evaluation scores that are below the department mean (by approximately 0.4-0.8 points) will initially be assigned a rating of **Moderate** (5-7 pts)
- Candidates with typical evaluation scores that are below the department mean (by >0.8 points) will initially be assigned a rating of **Unsatisfactory** (0-4 pts)
- Candidates that do not provide any teaching evaluations will initially be assigned a value of 0 (see last bullet point in next sub-section)

After assigning an initial rating based on a review of the teaching evaluations, as described above, the final score will be adjusted and determined by considering several additional factors, including:

- Variance in scores across student evaluation questions (e.g. how many scores are above, on par with, or below the departmental mean). For example, consistent scores may increase confidence and be used to award more points, whereas large variances between questions or between courses might be reason to lower scores.
- The number of teaching evaluations available will also be considered. It is more difficult to evaluate student opinions of teaching for candidates that have received evaluations for a small number of courses (e.g. fewer than three) or from a small number of students (e.g. fewer than 50 students total). In cases where a small number of teaching evaluations are available, information other than student evaluations may be weighted more heavily.
- Points can be deducted from the Candidate's score if there is evidence of a downward trajectory in evaluation scores over time (in cases where the candidate has taught multiple courses over multiple years); likewise, evidence of an upward trajectory in evaluation scores over time can be used to add points
- Consideration can also be given to information provided in other parts of the application, if appropriate. But the Teaching Dossier is assessed separately in the next section, so should not be weighed heavily in the determination of the score for section C.I so as to avoid candidates being assessed on the same criteria in multiple sections of the rubric (with the exception of those candidates that did not provide teaching evaluations and were consequently assigned an initial value of 0, but whose Teaching Dossier contains other evidence of excellence in their teaching that can be evaluated, such as student testimonials or impartial peer evaluations of teaching).

(C.II) Teaching dossier or other supporting documents (up to 20 pts):

The Teaching Dossier and other supporting documents (e.g. CV, cover letter) will be used to assign a score in this category. The elements of a Teaching Dossier are described in Article 19.6.2 of the collective agreement for Contract Teaching Faculty & P-T Librarians. The specific aspects of the teaching dossier that will be evaluated for the purposes of determining a score in this section include: the teaching philosophy statement, descriptions of teaching practices and how they are applied to achieve student outcomes, evidence of teaching effectiveness, description of duties related to coordination of multi-sectioned or co-

taught courses (as appropriate), evidence of published scholarship in T&L, *delivery* of T&L workshops, symposia, seminars, certificate programs, etc., experience and approaches connected with the training, orientation and supervision of Teaching Assistants, contributions to the academic and cultural life of students outside activities normally associated with course instruction. Information that may be included as part of the Teaching Dossier that should **NOT** be considered when determining the score for this section, because they are assessed in Sections B.I, C.I or D instead, include: student/course evaluations and student testimonials (Sections B.I & C.I), *participation* in professional development activities related to teaching and learning such as seminars, workshops, conferences, certificates, etc. (Section D), evidence of curriculum (course or program) development (Section D), supervision of research students (Section D), and outreach activities (Section D).

The maximum of 20 points available in this category will be awarded according to the following scale:

Exceptional (19-20 pts)	Very Good (13-15 pts)	Moderate (7-9 pts)	Unsatisfactory (0-3 pts)
Outstanding (16-18 pts)	Good (10-12 pts)	Fair (4-6 pts)	

All candidates who submit a teaching dossier (and other materials) that provide evidence that the instructor will be capable of delivering relevant and up to date course content in an engaging way will start with a rating of **Good**.

Any one or two of the following can be used to increase the rating to **Very Good** or **Outstanding**, and to determine the exact number of points within the step:

- The Teaching Philosophy provides a *clear description* of the candidate's approach to teaching, and how they apply their teaching practices to achieve student outcomes
- Clear evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of published peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching and learning
- *Delivery* of T&L professional development sessions (participation in such sessions is considered in Section D)
- A teaching award nomination in the last 5 years
- Evidence of good quality supervision of Teaching Assistants
- Experience teaching at least four different university-level courses over the last three years
- Other evidence PTAC considers appropriate

The following can be used to increase the rating to **Outstanding** or **Exceptional**, and to determine the exact number of points:

- A combination of any 3 from the above list
- Receiving a teaching award
- Other evidence PTAC considers appropriate

The following can be used to decrease the rating to **Moderate**, **Fair** or **Unsatisfactory**:

- No dossier or supporting documents provided
- A vague or unclear Teaching Philosophy
- A sample syllabus with unclear or inappropriate objectives, content or assessments
- Disciplinary notes from the Dean or VPA on teaching performance in official file

(C.III): Total seniority points (up to 15 pts):

Sub-Total (C = C.I + C.II + C.III): _____

Section D. Relevant Qualifications including scholarship in the field, professional experience, pedagogical development, development of course materials (**up to 30 pts**):

Qualifications under this section must be directly relevant to the position advertised. A candidate's CV, teaching dossier and any other relevant materials provided by the candidate may be considered in this category.

Demonstrable evidence will be used to award points based on the criteria listed in the Table (partial points can be awarded):

Criterion	Max Pts	Pts
Relevant work (research) experience (e.g. postdoc, research associate, industrial research, other relevant professional experience, technical certifications). Length of time, responsibilities in position, and relevance of research to the course content will all be considered	Up to 3 pts	
Major scholarships or fellowships received (e.g. NSERC, OGS); points <i>not</i> awarded for “graduate scholarships” or internal “travel grants” provided by grad schools.	Up to 2 pts	
Peer-reviewed publications relevant to the course content. Quantity, impact, contribution from the candidate, and relevance to the content of the course will be considered.	Up to 6 pts	
Conference presentations. Quantity, type of presentation (oral vs. poster) and type of conference (regional, national, international) will be taken into consideration.	Up to 2 pts	
Awards received for accomplishments such as best thesis, best conference presentation (oral or poster), or other recognitions	Up to 2 pts	
Supervision or Mentorship of students in a research project. The number of students and type of supervision will be taken into consideration.	Up to 2 pts	
Participation in Professional Development activities related to teaching and learning (e.g. seminars, workshops, conferences, certificates). Quantity, type, and recency of activity will be considered	Up to 4 pts	
Curriculum development including development of courses and programs. Type of development, specific contributions, and recency of activity will be considered	Up to 3 pts	
Service activities , including university service (e.g. committee work), activities in support of a professional society (e.g. filling society volunteer roles), service in support for the broader research discipline (e.g. peer-review of papers, grants, scholarship applications) and broader community service (e.g. outreach activities, science communication)	Up to 3 pts	
Fit of research background with course content. In recognition of the value of having experience doing research that is directly related to the content of a course, additional points can be awarded. The “fit” will be assessed based on area of specialization of degrees earned, publication record and other evidence provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100- & 200-level courses: up to 1.5 pts • 300- & 400-level courses: up to 3 pts 	Up to 3 pts	
Recency of scholarly activity. In recognition of the importance of recent scholarly activity (e.g. authoring peer-reviewed publications, books, book chapters, conference presentations, etc.) for informing one’s teaching practice, recency of scholarly activities will be used to adjust points as follows: For 100- and 200-level courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <6 years since last scholarly activity: 0 points deducted • 6-12 years since last scholarly activity: up to 2 points deducted • >12 years since last scholarly activity: up to 4 points deducted For 300- and 400-level courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <5 years since last scholarly activity: 0 points deducted • 5-10 years since last scholarly activity: up to 3 points deducted • >10 years since last scholarly activity: up to 6 points deducted 	Up to 6 pts can be deducted	
Sub-Total (D)		

TOTAL POINTS (A+B+C+D /100): _____

Comments for the Dean's consideration (optional; would include concerns raised about a member's ability in meeting the duties and responsibilities under Article 16, and that were addressed with the member under Article 10):

Note that awarding of a course is subject to a member's success in meeting the duties and responsibilities outlined in Article 16 of the PT Collective Agreement. The PTAC may submit comments or express concerns regarding the candidate in this section.

Awarding the course: tie-breaking and equity considerations

****The following is existing language (from the previous CA) and will be replaced with the revised equity process****

If two or more candidates have an equal number of points under Appendix H, the member who has taught the posted course before shall be offered the appointment

If this is insufficient to determine the appointment the Member with the most seniority points in the course shall be offered the course

If this is insufficient to determine the appointment, a candidate who has self-identified, through the recruitment process, as a member of an equity seeking group (Indigenous, radicalized, female, having a disability, and/or a sexual or gender identity), shall be awarded the course

If this is insufficient to determine the appointment, the Dean shall make the appointment from among these applicants by lot.