

Mathematics Department
PTAC Rubric May 2024
Appendix H: Assessment of CTF Candidates under 13.6.1

This rubric shall be used for the assessment of candidates for CTF appointments under Article 13.6.1 and shall not be used to evaluate Members for any other purpose. The completed Appendix H is for PTAC use only and shall only be made available to the Dean upon request or if there are comments for the Dean's consideration in (e), or if there is a tie, and shall be made available to the Association in the event of a request under 23.5.3 or a grievance. A form must be completed for each candidate and appended to the minutes of the PTAC meeting.

| | |
|--|----------------|
| NAME: | COURSE: |
| TERM OFFERED: | |
| Information used in the assessment: List all sources of information used to assess the candidate, including: application form; cover letter; curriculum vitae; teaching dossier; student course surveys from WLU; student course survey from other institution(s); Member's Official File, if applicable; evaluations of Member's performance under Article 10, if applicable; any other materials listed as optional in the job posting and provided by the candidate. | |
| A. Is the candidate qualified? | Yes/No |
| i. Requisite Qualifications as Posted Does the candidate have the required academic and/or professional qualifications as posted (e.g., the relevant degree and/or the appropriate professional training and experience)? If No, then the PTAC is required to discontinue the evaluation. | Yes/No |
| ii. Further Qualifications In addition to the required qualifications, does the candidate have the relevant qualifications and experience to teach the course? This may include qualifications listed as "preferred" on the posting (e.g., academic specializations, experience in the field). If No, then the PTAC is not required to continue the evaluation. | Yes/No |
| B. Competency to teach the posted course | /50 |
| Currency and mastery of the subject matter Score only with these explicit values 30-excellent 20-very good 15-good 10-satisfactory 0-poor or no evidence Overall scores are based on the strength of evidence of 1. scholarship related to the area of specialization of the course 2. relevant professional experience (including training and professional development) related to the area of specialization of the course Refer to Math PTAC Rubric: Appendix H Part Bi | /30 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <p>ii. Previous teaching experience in the posted course (or substantially similar course)</p> <p>Award full point for each Laurier seniority point in the posted course or substantially similar course.</p> | /10 |
| <p>iii. Ability to perform the duties of the posted course</p> <p>This rating is based partially on a review of institutionally documented student course surveys (based on a 7-point scale) for this course (or substantially similar courses) in the past five years. An initial rating will be made as follows:</p> <p>10 points for excellent survey results (e.g., medians mostly 7s) 8 points for very good survey results (e.g., medians mostly 6s) 6 points for good survey results (e.g., medians mostly 4s and 5s) 2 points for satisfactory survey results (e.g., medians mostly 3s) 0 points for unsatisfactory survey results (e.g., medians mostly <3s) or no course surveys submitted</p> <p>The initial rating may be adjusted upward or downward (by up to 2 points) based on information pertaining to the candidate's teaching effectiveness that is <i>specific to the course</i>. Examples of information that can be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 specific to the course • Student testimonials and other feedback specifically related to the posted or similar course • Experience teaching the same type of course as the posted course (lecture, seminar, online) previously | /10 |
| <p>If the score after B is less than 25, then the PTAC is not required to continue the evaluation.</p> | |
| <p>C. Teaching qualifications (not specific to the course)</p> | /30 |
| <p>i. Teaching-related experience</p> <p>a) Total WLU seniority points other than in the posted course or substantially similar course. Award full point for each Laurier seniority point <u>not already counted in B ii.</u> (max 15 points)</p> <p>b) If (a) is less than 15 points:</p> <p>i. Award half point for each course/tutorial taught elsewhere. (max 5 points)</p> <p>ii. Award points for teaching training (including but not limited to training related to pedagogy, equity, diversity, inclusivity, Indigeneity, anti-racism, anti-oppression, and accessible learning). Rating based on the amount of teaching training documented: 5=exceptional level of training, 4=highly extensive level of training, 3=extensive level of training, 2=moderate level of training, 1=minimal training, 0=no training. (max 5 points)</p> | /15 |

ii. Assessment of teaching skills (including teaching-related transferrable skills demonstrated outside a teaching context)

/15

Score with only these explicit values (add the two ratings below and round up to next explicit value; e.g., a score of 6 gets rounded up to 10):

15-very good

10-good

5-satisfactory

0-poor or no evidence

a) Student course surveys (max 10 points)

Based on a review of institutionally documented student course surveys (based on a 7-point scale) for the last five years. Rate as follows:

10 points for excellent survey results (e.g., medians mostly 7s)

8 points for very good survey results (e.g., medians mostly 6s)

6 points for good survey results (e.g., medians mostly 4s and 5s)

2 points for satisfactory survey results (e.g., medians mostly 3s)

0 points for unsatisfactory survey results (e.g., medians mostly <3s) or no course surveys submitted

b) Teaching-related skills (max 5 points)

Based on review of information in teaching dossier, cover letter, or other supporting documents. Points for documentation of the following elements:

1. Teaching philosophy: descriptions of pedagogical goals and objectives and teaching practices and how they are applied to achieve student outcomes.

2. Teaching effectiveness: course survey results; applicant commentary about course survey results; informal student course surveys, letters, and testimonials; teaching awards; and other relevant material.

3. Teaching innovations and professional development; participation in seminars, workshops, or professional meetings related to teaching; the publication of articles, commentaries or reviews related to teaching; examples of instructional innovation and evaluation of their effectiveness; and activities connected with the training and orientation of teaching assistants.

4. Contribution to the academic and cultural life of students in addition to activities normally associated with course instruction or research.

Rating of the elements overall as follows:

5 points: excellent

4 points: very good

3 points: good

2 points: satisfactory

0 points: poor, or no evidence

If the total score after B and C is less than 40, then the PTAC is not required to continue the evaluation.

| D. Other relevant qualifications and experience | /20 |
|---|------------|
| <p>Score with only these explicit values: 20-very good 15-good 10-satisfactory 5-limited 0-no evidence</p> <p>Qualifications and experience under this section must be directly relevant to the course advertised and may include (but not limited to) those listed below. Overall rating is based on the strength of documentation and relevance to the course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional degrees or professional qualifications not already captured in Section B(i) • community engagement not already captured in Section B(i) • development of educational materials • equity, diversity, and inclusion experience • Indigenous knowledge systems • pedagogical development • post-doctoral experience not already captured in Section B(i) • professional development and/or experience not already captured in Section B(i) | |
| <p>If the total score after B, C, D is less than 50, then the PTAC is not required to recommend the candidate for the course.</p> | |

| |
|---|
| <p>E. Optional</p> <p>i. Comments for the Dean's Consideration:</p> <p>Awarding of a course is subject to a Member's success in meeting the duties and responsibilities in Article 16. In this section, the PTAC may submit comments or express concerns regarding the candidate. If the Member has failed to maintain a record of satisfactory teaching and/or has failed to satisfy all requirements under Article 16, it is expected that there will be evidence that progressive consultations with the Member have failed to address concerns.</p> <p>ii. Anomaly or trend in student course survey results:</p> <p>If the PTAC has identified an anomaly or trend in student course survey results that has caused concern, then provide details, including evidence of consultation with the Member, if applicable.</p> |
|---|

