

Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
PTAC Rubric
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.

CANDIDATE'S NAME:	COURSE:
	TERM OFFERED:
PTAC MEETING DATE:	CHAIR:
MEETING PARTICIPANTS:	
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 (If no, state why)
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 (If no, state why)

B. Competency to teach the posted course	/50
i. Currency and mastery of the subject matter Score with only these explicit values: 30-excellent 20-very good 15-good 10-satisfactory 0-poor or no evidence	/30

Overall scores are based on the strength of evidence of the following three criteria considered in combination. Emphasis is placed on the evidence of relevant scholarship (such that excellence on this criterion alone could result in an overall score of 30) however, all three criteria are taken into consideration in the overall score. 1. Evidence of scholarship related to the area of specialization of the course (e.g., relevant peer reviewed articles or chapters, conference presentations, graduate theses, relevant post-doctoral experience). (30 points max) 2. Evidence of professional work experience related to the area of specialization of the course (e.g., research associate positions, clinical/practitioner experience, research in industry, government, or community organizations). (This criterion acknowledges experience that does not fall within the category of traditional scholarly output described in point #B(i)1 above.) (10 points max) 3. Evidence of training and professional development related to the area of specialization of the course (e.g., additional degrees, workshops/certifications in the area of the course). (This criterion acknowledges experience that does not fall within the category of traditional scholarly output described in point #B(i)1 above.) (10 points max)	
ii. Previous teaching or tutorial or lab experience in the posted course (or substantially similar course) Award full point for each Laurier seniority point in the posted course or substantially similar course. Award full point for each time a candidate instructed a tutorial or lab in the posted course or substantially similar course but did not receive seniority points for it.	/10
iii. Ability to perform the duties of the posted course This rating is based <i>partially</i> on a review of institutionally documented student course surveys for this course (or substantially similar courses) in the past five years. An initial rating will be made as follows: 5 points for excellent evaluations (e.g., medians mostly 7s) 4 points for very good evaluations (e.g., medians mostly 6s and 7s) 3 points for good evaluations (e.g., medians mostly 6s) 2 points for satisfactory evaluations (e.g., medians mostly 5s) 1 points for unsatisfactory evaluations (e.g., medians mostly <5s) 0 no evaluations The initial rating may be adjusted upward based on information pertaining to the candidate's teaching effectiveness that is <i>specific to the course</i>. Information that can be considered in this section include: • The nature of the course (ex. Large enrolment first year service course vs. low enrolment senior elective course) (add up to 2pts for large enrolment, first year and/or required courses) • The use of innovative approaches to teaching and assessment of the content specific to the course (add up to 1pt)	/10

• Samples of course-specific course outlines, lecture materials, assessments specific to the course (add up to 1pt) • Student testimonials and other feedback specifically related to the posted or similar course (add up to 1pt) •	
If the score after B is less than 25, then the PTAC is not required to continue the evaluation.	

C. Teaching qualifications (not specific to the course)	/30
i. Teaching-related experience a) Total WLU seniority points other than in the posted course or substantially similar course. Award full point for each Laurier seniority point not already counted in B ii. (max 15 points) b) If (a) is less than 15 points, award partial points for each course or tutorial and lab taught elsewhere (max 5 points).	/15
ii. Assessment of teaching skills (including teaching-related transferrable skills demonstrated outside a teaching context) 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 5 points) Based on a review of institutionally documented student course surveys for the last five years. Rate as follows: 5 points for excellent evaluations (e.g., medians mostly 7s) 4 points for very good evaluations (e.g., medians mostly 6s and 7s) 3 points for good evaluations (e.g., medians mostly 6s) 2 points for satisfactory evaluations (e.g., medians mostly 5s) 1 points for unsatisfactory evaluations (e.g., medians mostly <5s) 0 no evaluations b) Documentation of teaching-related skills and training (max 10 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. (up to 1.5pt) 2. Teaching effectiveness: applicant commentary about evaluations; informal student course surveys, letters, and testimonials; teaching awards; and other relevant material. (up to 3.5pt)	/15

3. Teaching training and professional development (e.g., training related to pedagogy, EDI, Indigeneity; accessible learning); 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. (up to 3.5pt) 4. Contribution to the academic and cultural life of students in addition to activities normally associated with course instruction or research. (up to 1.5pt)	
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
Score with only these explicit values: 20-very good 15-good 10-satisfactory 5-limited 0-no evidence 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. • development of educational materials • equity, diversity, and inclusion experience • Indigenous knowledge systems • pedagogical development •	
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.	

E. Optional i. Comments for the Dean's Consideration: 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. ii. Anomaly or trend in student course survey results: 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.

Definitions: Similar and Substantially Similar Courses

Substantially similar courses(s) may include a course that appears in the Academic Calendar as a course exclusion or a course that encompasses substantially similar subject matter with the same or similar assessment techniques.”

In the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, “substantially similar” courses are defined as courses typically taken as pairs, such as CH110/CH111 or CH202/CH203, or their equivalents at other institutions.

Similar courses: to be determined by PTAC; experience in similar courses may also include TA experience, Online teaching, and team-teaching.

In the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, “similar” courses are those whose content is within the same specific sub-discipline of chemistry at the undergraduate level. Teaching, team-teaching and TA experience in equivalent courses at other institutions may be considered. Online teaching is covered under “substantially similar” courses above.

Substantially similar courses*:		Similar courses*:	
<u>Chemistry Course</u>	<u>Substantially Similar Course(s)</u>	<u>Sub-discipline of Chemistry</u>	<u>Courses Deemed “Similar” within the sub-discipline</u>
CH110/120/130	CH111/121/131	Analytical Chemistry	CH261/262, CH360
CH111/121/131	CH110/120/130	Biochemistry	CH250, CH350, CH354, CH355, CH356, CH357, CH358, CH419, CH432, CH433, CH450, CH452, CH453, CH454, CH456, CH458, CH459
CH202/204/206	CH203/205/207	Environmental Chemistry	CH233, CH234, CH445
CH203/205/207	CH202/204/206	Inorganic Chemistry	CH225/226, CH327, CH328
CH212	CH213/215	Organic Chemistry	CH202/204/206/203/205/207, CH301/CH302, CH303, CH306, CH404
CH213/215	CH212	Physical Chemistry	CH212/213/215, CH313
CH225	CH226	Materials Chemistry	CH340, CH345, CH440
CH226	CH225		
CH261	CH262		
CH262	CH261		
*Chemistry courses listed in the undergraduate or graduate academic calendars but not included in the above table are deemed not to be “ substantially similar ” to any other course.		*Chemistry courses listed in the undergraduate or graduate academic calendars but not included in the above table are deemed not to be “ similar ” to any other course.	