

# Guidelines governing the WLU Faculty of Liberal Arts (FLA) English program (EN) Part Time Appointments Committee (PTAC) hiring deliberations.

Approved by WLU EN FLA Program Coordinating Committee (PCC), January 2021, revised March 2021.

**Overview:** PTAC hiring decisions are made by scoring candidates for teaching jobs posted by the FLA English program against a rubric called the “Appendix H” (App H) form that has been developed by WLU and WLUFAs and enshrined in the Collective Agreement contract that defines employment conditions for Contract Teaching Faculty (CTF) at WLU.

The present document provides guidelines to the FLA EN PTAC that seek to ensure the consistent application of each part of the App H form.

## Contents

<b>Appendix H form</b> .....	2
App H section (A): Requisite academic qualifications .....	3
App H section (B) Teaching experience in the posted course or similar or substantially similar course(s): .....	4
(Bi) Student evaluations in the posted course or similar or substantially similar courses(s) (up to 15).....	5
(Bii) Seniority points in the posted course or similar or substantially similar course(s) (up to 5) .....	6
Appendix H section (C) Overall record of teaching:.....	7
Appendix H section (Ci): student evaluations (up to 15) .....	7
Appendix H section (Cii): teaching dossier or other supporting documents (up to 20) .....	8
(Ciii) total seniority points (up to 15).....	9
Appendix H section (D): Relevant qualifications including scholarship in the field, professional experience, pedagogical development and/or development of course materials. ....	10
(E) Comments for the Dean’s consideration: .....	14

**On this page is the Appendix H: Assessment of CTF Candidates form** (defined in article 13.6.1 of [Collective Agreement between Wilfrid Laurier University and Wilfrid Laurier University Faculty Association for Contract Teaching Faculty and Part-time Professional Librarians September 1, 2019 to August 31, 2022](#))

Each part of the form is hyperlinked to guidelines that are designed to ensure its consistent interpretation by FLA EN PTACs.

## Appendix H form

Information used in the assessment:

List all sources of information used to assess the candidate, including curriculum vitae; teaching dossier; student evaluations from WLU; student evaluations from another institution(s); the Member's Official File, if applicable; evaluations of Member's performance under Article 10, if applicable; any other information provided by the candidate

[\(A\) Requisite academic qualifications as posted: yes / no](#)

[\(B\) Teaching experience in the posted course or similar or substantially similar courses\(s\): /20](#)

[\(Bi\) Student evaluations in the posted course or similar or substantially similar courses\(s\) \(up to 15\)](#)

[\(Bii\) Seniority points in the posted course or similar or substantially similar course\(s\) \(up to 5\)](#)

(C) Overall record of teaching: /50

[\(ci\) student evaluations \(up to 15\)](#)

[\(cii\) teaching dossier or other supporting documents \(up to 20\)](#)

[\(ciii\) total seniority points \(up to 15\)](#)

[\(D\) Relevant qualifications including scholarship in the field, professional experience, pedagogical development, development of course materials: /30](#)

**Total points: /100**

[\(e\) Comments for the Dean's consideration \(optional\)](#)

App H section (A): Requisite academic qualifications

**WLUFA approved guidelines (in italics)**

*Does the applicant have the requisite academic qualifications for the appointment as posted, i.e., the relevant academic degree or certificate, education in the academic specialty, and/or the appropriate professional training and experience?*

*Departments shall specify, in the posting for the appointment, the minimum degree necessary for the appointment and specify the area or field for the required degree.*

*Departments may also specify recognized professional degrees or designations or specialized training (e.g., LLB, BEd, CA, language proficiency).*

*If the applicant does not have the requisite academic qualifications for the position as posted, they shall not be considered for the position.*

**EN FLA PCC approved guidelines:**

none

App H section (B) Teaching experience in the posted course or similar or substantially similar course(s):

**WLUF A approved guidelines (in italics)**

*The assessment of the candidate's teaching experience shall be based on the candidate's university student evaluations under Article 19, or the equivalent from another institution, the candidate's CV, teaching dossier, and any other information submitted by the candidate.*

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

*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.*

**EN FLA PCC approved guidelines:**

“Similar course” = a course with *a majority of overlapping material* (ie. 50 to 75%) with the course area defined in the job positing.

“Substantially similar course” = a course that is *entirely* or *almost entirely overlapping* with the course area defined in the job posting (ie: 75% or more overlap).

- Clarification: A survey course in an area and an in-depth course in some aspect of that area, are not “similar,” under this definition because though they may have some overlap [ie. 30 or 40% perhaps] they are not *primarily* dealing with the same area: they do not have more than 50% overlapping content.

A candidate that has **team taught** a “substantially similar” course will be given credit for having taught a “**similar**” course (because they will have taught less than 75% of the substantially similar course).

A candidate that has **worked as a teaching assistant** in a “substantially similar” course will be given credit for having taught a “**similar**” course (because they will have taught less than 75% of the substantially similar course).

No credit for teaching in a “similar course” will be given for those who have team taught or TA'd in a similar courses.

“Substantially similar” courses not taught at a University (ie. at a College) may be considered “similar.” However, if the PTAC cannot verify that the course is “substantially similar” it may be given a weight of 0, at the PTAC's discretion.

**(Bi) Student evaluations in the posted course or similar or substantially similar courses(s) (up to 15)** (See above (B) for definitions of “similar” and “substantially similar” courses.)

**Relative weighting of “similar” and “substantially similar” courses:** Student evaluations from both “similar” and “substantially similar” courses will be considered in the determination of the points awarded in Bi, but “similar” courses will be given ½ the weight of substantially similar courses, meaning that evaluation score will be assessed out of the whole # nearest to 1/2 (ie. 8) of the 15 possible points.

**Scoring guidelines:**

**WLUFAs approved guidelines (in italics):** *The department mean should not be used **solely** as the cut-off for satisfactory performance. Your rubric should specify an examination of all the evaluations for the course and consider alternative methods to using department means, such as distribution and patterns looking for trends and anomalies in the evaluations. Are there improvements in teaching or concerning trends in teaching? If there are concerning trends, look in the Official File as the Member might have submitted information explaining a low evaluation, such as they tried a new teaching method.*

**EN FLA PCC approved guidelines for scoring teaching evaluations in “similar” and “substantially similar” courses.**

Disqualifyingly substandard: 1-4 (medians mostly 4 or below)

Satisfactory to average: 5-7 (medians mostly 5, some higher some lower)

Average to good: 8-12 (medians mostly 6's, some 5's some 7's)

Excellent: above 12 (medians mostly 7's)

**Mitigations:**

These scoring guidelines are subject to modification according to trends and anomalies in the evaluations.

The committee recognizes that these scores can be qualified by courses that include challenging content (i.e. topics such as colonialism, racism, gender etc.) and by the implicit biases that are proven to inhere in the student evaluations of teachers who are Indigenous, racialized, women, two-spirit etc, and will mitigate accordingly.

The committee recognizes that required courses typically receive lower scores than electives and will mitigate accordingly.

The committee recognizes that large courses (i.e. more than 100 students) typically receive lower scores than small courses (i.e. fewer than 30 students), and will mitigate accordingly.

**(Bii) Seniority points in the posted course or similar or substantially similar course(s) (up to 5)** (See above (B) for definitions of “similar” and “substantially similar” courses.)

**WLUFA approved guidelines:**

*None*

**EN FLA PCC approved guidelines for awarding seniority points for “similar” and “substantially similar” courses.**

“Substantially similar” courses, including courses not taught at WLU, will be assigned 1.0 point for each time they’ve been taught.

“Similar” courses will be weighted at 0.5 of a point for each time they’ve been taught.

If the candidate has worked as a TA or team-teacher in a substantially similar course, that work shall be weighted as “similar” (0.5 seniority point). No seniority points awarded for team teaching or TAing in “similar” courses.

“Substantially similar” courses not taught at a University (ie. at a College) may be considered “similar.” However, if the PTAC cannot verify that the course is “substantially similar” it may be given a weight of 0, at the PTAC’s discretion.

Appendix H section (C) Overall record of teaching:

## **Appendix H section (Ci): student evaluations (up to 15)**

### **WLUFA approved guidelines:**

*The department mean should not be used solely as the cut-off for satisfactory performance. Your rubric should specify an examination of all the evaluations for the course and consider alternative methods to using department means, such as distribution and patterns looking for trends and anomalies in the evaluations. Are there improvements in teaching or concerning trends in teaching? If there are concerning trends, look in the Official File as the Member might have submitted information explaining a low evaluation, such as they tried a new teaching method.*

### **EN FLA PCC approved guidelines:**

Disqualifyingly substandard: 1-4 (medians mostly 4 or below)

Satisfactory to average: 5-7 (medians mostly 5, some higher some lower)

Average to good: 8-12 (medians mostly 6's, some 5's some 7's)

Excellent: above 12 (medians mostly 7's)

### **Mitigations:**

These scoring guidelines are subject to modification according to trends and anomalies in the evaluations (see WLUFA guidelines, above).

The committee will take into consideration that evaluation scores can be depressed in courses that include challenging content (i.e. topics such as colonialism, racism, gender etc.) and by the implicit biases that have been proven to effect the student evaluations of teachers who are Indigenous, racialized, female, two-spirit etc.,

The committee will take into consideration that required courses typically receive lower scores than elective courses.

The committee will take into consideration that large courses (i.e. more than 100 students) typically receive lower scores than small courses (i.e. fewer than 30 students).

## **Appendix H section (Cii): teaching dossier or other supporting documents (up to 20)**

### **WLUFA approved guidelines:**

*The assessment of the candidate's teaching record shall be based on the candidate's university student evaluations under Article 19, or the equivalent from another institution, the candidate's CV teaching dossier, and any other information submitted by the candidate.*

### **EN FLA PCC approved guidelines:**

**Principle of evaluation:** *the candidate's final score shall be the sum of the relative weights of the various evidence and indicators provided, considered in the context of mitigating concerns that diminish or increase the value of the evidence or indicator.*

### **Definition of terms:**

**Evidence** of teaching effectiveness: Material related to past teaching that demonstrates effective teaching in previous courses.

**Indicators** of teaching effectiveness: Material from past teaching that suggests the potential for effective teaching in the course being applied for.

### **I, A) Types of evidence or indicators of teaching effectiveness, in order of descending weight.**

#### **1) Teaching evaluations**

- Considerations and mitigating factors in evaluation:
  - Size of response group: was it a particularly small group or low response rate?
  - Kind of course: was it a historically unpopular course?
  - Ryerson report considerations: weigh possibility of bias on basis of sex, ethnicity, accent, etc.
  - Anomalies: are evaluation results relatively consistent? Outlier courses (inconsistent with candidate's other evaluations) could be regarded as non-representative and weighted more lightly.
  - Completeness of sample: if external candidate, if *all* recent evaluations are not present, committee may weigh in possibility of non-representativeness of sample (cherrypicking).

#### **2) Course outlines / syllabi:**

- Considerations and mitigating factors:
  - Do past outlines provide *evidence* of practical, do-able course (ie. appropriate evaluation and incentivization mechanisms) appropriate to course



description, with reading load and content appropriately structured to work with a 5 course UG student load?

- Does the submitted outline provide *indications* of practical, do-able course (ie. appropriate evaluation and incentivization mechanisms) appropriate to course description, with reading load and content appropriately structured to work with a 5 course UG student load?

**3) Other evidence or indicators of pedagogical innovation or success.**

- Considerations and mitigating factors:
  - How well do the evidence or indications of pedagogical innovation or success – ie. experiential learning models, alternative evaluation mechanisms, alternative delivery modes (digital content, etc) – fit with the priorities and pragmatic possibilities of course delivery in EN at FLA? Ie. are they in line with our program priorities? Or are these less feasible given the constraints on course delivery present at the Brantford campus.
  - How reliable/verifiable are the evidence or indicators of pedagogical innovation or success presented in the teaching dossier. Ie. has the candidate provided ways for innovation or success to be verified?

**(Ciii) total seniority points (up to 15)**

Compiled independently of the PTAC.

Appendix H section (D): Relevant qualifications including scholarship in the field, professional experience, pedagogical development and/or development of course materials.

**WLUFA approved guidelines:**

*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. Indicate the candidate's qualifications and experience.*

**EN FLA PCC approved guidelines:**

Principle of evaluation: the candidates final score shall be the sum of the relative weights of the various evidence provided, considered in the context of mitigating concerns or evidence of increased value.

**II, A) Types of scholarly or professional accomplishments, in order of descending weight.**

NOTE: Professional experience in area of course, and pedagogical development in course area is an amplifier (ie. it can be used to supplement or magnify strictly academic qualifications) of all of the qualifications categories below, though its effect is most relevant in courses that call for professional experience (ie technical writing), or have a strong technical aspect (ie. Gaming and Narrative Theory).

**1) Single-authored book in course area. ("book")**

- Possible considerations or mitigating factors:
  - Not published with well-recognized or major scholarly or university press.
  - Concerns about peer-review integrity of press.
  - Age of publication. Book not published in last 5-10 years or not followed up by more recent publications in the area.
- Book recognized as high-impact or authoritative in its area.

**2) Dissertation in course area.**

- Possible considerations or mitigating factors:
  - No evidence dissertation is proceeding to publication with well-recognized or major scholarly or university press.
  - Age of dissertation. Defended 5-10 years without recent follow-up publications in the area.
- Dissertation receives prestigious awards.

**3) First author of co- or multiple-authored book in area.**

- Possible considerations or mitigating factors:
  - Not published with well-recognized or major scholarly or university press.

- Number of authors.
- Concerns about peer-review integrity of press.
- Age of publication. Book not published in last 5-10 years or not followed up by more recent publications in the area.
- Book recognized as authoritative in its area.

**4) Book single-authored in peripheral or related areas**

- Possible considerations or mitigating factors:
  - Not published with well-recognized or major scholarly or university press.
  - Concerns about peer-review integrity of press.
  - Age of publication. Book not published in last 5-10 years or not followed up by more recent publications in the area.
- Book recognized as authoritative in its area.

**5) Edited book in course area.**

- Possible considerations or mitigating factors:
  - Not published with well-recognized or major scholarly or university press.
  - Concerns about peer-review integrity of press.
  - Multiple authorship.
  - Age of publication. Book not published in last 5-10 years or not followed up by more recent publications in the area.

**6) Single authored peer reviewed article in area.**

- Possible considerations or mitigating factors:
  - Age of publication.
  - Journal quality.
  - Number of citations.
  - Length of article.

**7) Conference paper in area (conference paper significantly less weight)**

- Possible considerations or mitigating factors:
  - Number of times presented.
  - Relationship to course area.
  - Quality of conference.
  - Pipeline: relationship of conference presentations to peer reviewed publications.
  - Type of presentation (panel, roundtable, keynote, etc)

**8) Other non-peer reviewed research or knowledge mobilization initiatives in course area, ie. blogs, podcasts, public lectures, media interviews, etc.**

- Possible considerations or mitigating factors:
  - Reach of initiative.
  - Prestige of venue.
  - Originality or innovative aspects of initiative.

- Influence, if measurable, of initiative (ie. republications, "shares," etc).

### **Relevant Qualifications for writing courses.**

#### **EN 269, 270, 271, 272: Creative Writing Courses.**

The above hierarchy of scholarship remains, but is superseded by a new top category:

- 1) Creative work in the area of the course
  - Considerations and mitigating factors:
    - Impact and prestige as well as quantity and consistency of publication in course area genre.

#### **EN 303, 304: Professional Writing Courses.**

- 2) Writing experience in area of the course.
  - Considerations and mitigating factors:
    - Length of experience.
    - Range of experience with different genres of professional writing.
    - Measures of impact or quality of professional writing.

**II B) App H (D) Benchmarks (to be used as a quick guide for evaluating candidates).** This is what this score *might* look like. Scoring should be relative to these common configurations of evidence and indicators.

Primary variable: accomplishments relative to stage of career and amount of time since PhD.  
Recent = past 5 years.

#### **Score: 30)**

- Book in the area, Dissertation in the area, with multiple recent peer review publications and evidence of high degree of scholarly activity in the area (without mitigating considerations that diminish weight)

OR

- Multiple relatively recent peer reviewed publications, dissertation in the area, with major research grants in the area and other evidence of high scholarly activity in the area. (without mitigating considerations that diminish weight)

#### **Score: 25)**

- Book in the area without supporting recent peer reviewed publications and evidence of high degree scholarly activity, some non-peer reviewed knowledge mobilization.

OR

- Multiple peer reviewed recent publications in area, no book in the area, external grant success, and evidence of high degree scholarly activity in the area, large quantity of non-peer reviewed knowledge mobilization.

OR

- Dissertation in area, at least two recent peer reviewed publications in the area, one or two out of area, no book in the area, with one grant, and evidence of high degree scholarly activity in the area, large quantity of non-peer reviewed knowledge mobilization.

OR

- Non-recent book, dissertation and/or peer reviewed publications in area. Some evidence of recent active scholarship and knowledge dissemination in the area.

**Score 20)**

- Some peer reviewed publications in area, some out of area. Dissertation in a peripheral area. Some peripheral scholarly activity in the area.

OR

- Dissertation in area, one recent peer reviewed publication in area, one or more out of area. Grant or other evidence of considerable scholarly activity in the area, some non-peer reviewed knowledge mobilization.

OR

- Non-recent book, dissertation and/or multiple peer reviewed publications in area. No evidence of recent active scholarship and knowledge dissemination in the area.

**Score 15)**

- Dissertation in area, one recent peer reviewed publications in the area, little evidence of other scholarly activity in the area, smaller quantity of non-peer reviewed knowledge mobilization.

OR

- Dissertation not in area, but two or three recent peer reviewed publication in area. Some evidence of recent active scholarship and knowledge dissemination in the area.

OR

- No dissertation (M.A., PhD ABD), three or four recent peer-reviewed publications in the area, strong evidence of recent active scholarship and knowledge dissemination in the area.

**Score 10)**

- Dissertation in area, no peer reviewed publications in the area, some evidence of recent active scholarship and knowledge dissemination in the area.

OR

- Dissertation not in area, one recent (or two non-recent) peer reviewed publication in area. Little evidence of recent active scholarship and knowledge dissemination in the area.

OR

- No dissertation (M.A., PhD ABD), two recent peer-reviewed publications in the area, some evidence of recent active scholarship and knowledge dissemination in the area.

**Score 5)**

- No dissertation (M.A., PhD ABD), one recent peer reviewed publication in the area, some evidence of recent active scholarship and knowledge dissemination in the area.

(E) Comments for the Dean's consideration:

(App H WLUF A approved guidelines in italics)

*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.*

*\*\*The following is existing language and will be replaced with the revised equity process\*\**

*If two or more candidates have equal 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, racialized, female, having a disability, and/ or a sexual or gender minority), 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.*

*Comments made here must be about issues that are known to the applicant. See Article 10.1 regarding Chair, or equivalent, "providing ongoing advice and coaching on teaching performance, especially if there are concerns, and clarification of expectations, duties and responsibilities of a Member's teaching contract including those listed in Article 16." 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 that have arisen through an evaluation under Article 10.*