

## Archaeology and Heritage Studies - Rubrics for Appendix H – Revised 2021-02-25

### B. Teaching experience in the posted course or substantially similar or similar course(s)

i) Student evaluations in **posted** (having taught) / **substantially similar** (similar subject matter or exclusion) / **similar** course(s) (e.g. TA experience, Online, team-teaching) up to a maximum 15 points

Points	Criteria
<b>15 points: excellent performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent-very good institutional evaluations; consistently 6+</li> </ul>
<b>10 points: good performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good institutional evaluations; consistently 5+</li> </ul>
<b>5 points: satisfactory performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfactory institutional evaluations 4+</li> <li>Fluctuating institutional evaluations (some very good, some poor, below 4)</li> </ul>
<b>0 points: less than satisfactory or supporting documentation absent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor institutional evaluations; consistently below 4</li> <li>Has not taught a posted/similar/substantially similar course</li> <li>No documentation supplied</li> </ul>

\*Check O File for candidate explanation for a low evaluation e.g. tried a new teaching method, consider in relation to parts of teaching dossier relevant to specific course (e.g. course syllabi, pedagogical comments)

ii) Seniority points in the **posted / substantially similar / similar** course(s)

\*In the event that two candidates have the same number of seniority points, the candidates' teaching records will be reviewed to determine the type and breadth of their experience, and the candidate whose experience most closely matches the advertised position will receive additional points

### C. Overall Record of Teaching

i) Student evaluations of all/any courses taught up to a maximum 15 points

Points	Criteria
<b>15 points: excellent performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent-very good institutional evaluations; consistently 6+</li> </ul>
<b>10 points: good performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good institutional evaluations; consistently 5+</li> </ul>
<b>5 points: satisfactory performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfactory institutional evaluations 4+</li> <li>Fluctuating institutional evaluations (some very good, some poor, below 4)</li> </ul>
<b>0 points: less than satisfactory or supporting documentation absent</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor institutional evaluations; consistently below 4</li> <li>Has not previously taught a course</li> <li>No documentation supplied</li> </ul>

\*Check O File for candidate explanation for a low evaluation e.g. tried a new teaching method

ii) Teaching dossier or other supporting documents up to a maximum 20 points

Points	Criteria: Teaching dossier or supporting documentation includes:
<b>20 points: excellent documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent statement of teaching philosophy with discussion of classroom strategies</li> <li>• Example syllabi of posted/similar/substantially similar course</li> <li>• Substantial evidence of ongoing professional development</li> <li>• Teaching award(s) or nominations for</li> </ul>
<b>15 points: good documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good statement of teaching philosophy with discussion of classroom strategies</li> <li>• Example syllabi</li> <li>• Ongoing professional development</li> <li>• May have teaching award(s) or nominations for</li> </ul>
<b>10 points: satisfactory documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory statement of teaching philosophy, may include teaching strategies</li> <li>• Example syllabus</li> <li>• Little evidence of ongoing professional development</li> <li>• No teaching award(s) or nominations</li> </ul>
<b>5 points: less than satisfactory documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor statement of teaching philosophy, does not include teaching strategies</li> <li>• No example syllabi</li> <li>• No ongoing professional development</li> <li>• No teaching award(s) or nominations</li> </ul>
<b>0 points: supporting documentation absent</b>	No documentation supplied

\* Includes information supplied in the candidate's cover letter and CV.

iii) Total seniority points

**D. Relevant qualifications: scholarship in the field; professional experience, pedagogical development, development of course materials**

Up to a maximum of 30 points

Points	Criteria
<b>30 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent record of publications and conference presentations in relevant field</li> <li>• Substantial record of research funding received</li> <li>• Significant record of fieldwork and/or professional experience (i.e. relevant private or public sector, CRM, museums)</li> <li>• Considerable pedagogical development (i.e. attends pedagogical training, conducts pedagogical experimentation, collaborates with colleagues)</li> <li>• Member of academic societies</li> </ul>
<b>25 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good record of publications and conference presentations in relevant field</li> <li>• Current research funding received</li> <li>• Evidence of recent fieldwork and/or professional experience (i.e. relevant private or public sector, CRM, museums)</li> <li>• Evidence of recent pedagogical development (i.e. training, experimentation, collaboration)</li> <li>• Member of academic society-ies</li> </ul>
<b>20 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory record of publications and conference presentations in relevant field</li> <li>• Older research funding received</li> <li>• Evidence of older fieldwork and/or professional experience (i.e. relevant private or public sector, CRM, museums)</li> <li>• Evidence of past pedagogical development (i.e. training, experimentation, collaboration)</li> <li>• Member of academic society</li> </ul>
<b>15 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor record of publications and conference presentations in relevant field</li> <li>• Little evidence of research funding received</li> <li>• Little evidence of older fieldwork or professional experience (i.e. relevant private or public sector, CRM, museums)</li> <li>• Little evidence of pedagogical development (i.e. training, experimentation, collaboration)</li> <li>• Not a member of academic societies</li> </ul>
<b>5 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of publications, conference presentations or alternate forms of knowledge mobilization but no professional experience</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of professional experience but no documentation of publications, conference presentations or alternate forms of knowledge mobilization</li> <li>• No evidence of pedagogical development (i.e. training, experimentation, collaboration)</li> </ul>
<b>0 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No documentation supplied</li> </ul>

\*Qualifications must be directly relevant to advertised position. Consider candidate's CV, Teaching Dossier, other relevant documents. Indicate candidate's qualifications and experience.

#### **E. Comments for the Dean's consideration (optional)**

\*Comments must relate to issues that are known to the candidate and that have been brought forward through an evaluation under Article 10.