

Strategies for Developing Summary Departmental Standards

Using Rubrics to Help Determine Standards

- Single-level standards
- Identifying mandatory and more flexible indicators
- Multi-level standards

Summary Standards Document – Single-Level Standards

During the process of developing the University of Windsor Research and Teaching Evaluation Framework templates, we drafted a teaching evaluation rubric and a research evaluation rubric, which provided descriptors for poor, competent, good, and excellent performance related to each indicator. These can be adapted for use as they are, but can also be used as tools for developing other kinds of standards documents.

This hypothetical committee used the teaching rubric as a starting point for discussing what they did and didn't want to include in their standards, and exactly what the standard should be for associate professor. They circled what they wanted to keep (blue), crossed out what they didn't, and adjusted language or added indicators as they went along.

3. Assessment and giving feedback to students	N/A	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
Quality of assessment tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarity ▪ Alignment with learning outcomes ▪ Appropriate level of difficulty 		Assessment activities were hard to follow, poorly aligned with intended learning outcomes, or of an inappropriate level of difficulty	Assessment activities were inconsistent in terms of clarity, alignment, or appropriateness of difficulty, but generally appeared to be reasonable for the course level.	Assessment activities were generally clear, well-aligned with learning outcomes, and appropriately challenging for the course level.	Assessment activities were clear, well aligned, appropriately challenging, and provided innovative opportunities for student learning,
Timely feedback is provided to students		Feedback is not timely – late and infrequent.	Assignment feedback is generally timely.	Assignment feedback is timely and occurs several times through the course.	Feedback is proactive, ongoing, and timely.
Constructive feedback is provided to students ³		Constructive feedback appropriate to the nature of the course was rarely or never provided to students, or was not constructive for future improvement	Assignment feedback was appropriate to the nature of the course and generally provided useful guidance to help students to know how to improve, including some strengths and weaknesses.	Student feedback or other evidence suggests that assignment feedback was consistently appropriate to the nature of the course and provided useful guidance regarding how to improve for	Assignment feedback was appropriate to the nature of the course, detailed, balanced appropriately with strengths and weaknesses and provided systematic and highly effective

They identified core, mandatory indicators, and areas where proponents could choose among indicators to meet the standard. They also decided that they didn't want a whole criterion for assessment (Criterion 3, above), so they selected one indicator to include in Criterion 1 (Design and Planning of Learning Activities). Once they reviewed the rubric, they built a 2-page standards document they'll use for decision making, which identifies a minimum threshold for associate professor rank, as well as items that are mandatory, and items where there's more flexibility in making one's case. The circled descriptors (in blue) become the standards the department outlines below.

Single-level Standards with Mandatory and More Flexible Indicators

Here's their proposed 2-page standards document – a committee could use this with a relatively simple check-minus, check, check-plus system. This would best be used in conjunction with a criteria template that outlines the criteria and evidence for people preparing their submissions.

Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor: Sample Teaching Standards Document ^{1,2}

Criterion 1: Design and Planning of Learning Activities (*must demonstrate x out of 4*)

- Some evidence of capacity to design effective and well-aligned learning materials and activities
- Consistently in compliance with bylaw and policy, outlines show the alignment of materials, activities and assessments with intended course learning outcomes.
- Planned learning activities appear to be intended to foster student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes, but may not do so consistently
- Reasonable knowledge of the course content and material, some areas of weakness

Criterion 2: Instructional methods and motivation and enhancement of student learning

Must demonstrate:

- Consistent evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning
- Student feedback on overall instructor scores reaches x standard.

Must demonstrate x out of 5:

- Student feedback and other evidence indicates consistent clarity of instruction
- Students generally indicated interest or increased interest in the courses taught.
- Some evidence of efforts to encourage student-faculty interaction, consistent with the nature of the courses involved
- Some evidence efforts to encourage appropriate student-student interaction, consistent with the nature of the courses involved
- Sample assessments are clear, well-aligned with learning outcomes, and at an appropriate level of difficulty for the course.

¹ This example does not include either minimum SET standards for generic items or reference to specific SET items. Departments are welcome to include these or other quantitative standards if they wish.

² An example where this information is formatted so that proponents can see relevant evidence next to each criterion can be found here: <http://uniteachingcriteria.edu.au/framework/career-promotions/indicative-standards-promotional-level/new-senior-lecturer-c/>

Criterion 3: integrated into Criterion 1

Criterion 4: Developing effective environments and student support

- Somewhat available outside of class time – regular office hours, can demonstrate use of CLEW site (not in rubric example – added by department)
- Actively and explicitly works to establish respectful practices and interactions with students and among students

Criterion 5 – Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and in support of learning *Optional – any of the following may be used as extra or alternative evidence to support (1) and (2)*

- Evidence that teaching and learning forms a regular source for planning and decision making in teaching and course design, or that informal inquiry forms an element of teaching improvement practice (rewrite of “Good” standard)
- Current, discipline-based research or creative practice forms a regular and integrated part of the curriculum
- Consistent and effective efforts to engage students with disciplinary research or inquiry culture. This may include effectiveness in undergraduate/ graduate student research supervision, (Good standard narrowed to make it discipline specific).
- Professional, industry, and work-based practice and experiences have been incorporated in the curriculum, well-aligned with intended learning outcomes, and well supported.

Criterion 6: Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development

Either:

- Some evidence of participation in workshops, forums, conferences, or peer-led activities intended to enhance teaching and learning
- Several examples of changes to teaching practice based on reflection or engagement with professional development

Criterion 7: Professional effectiveness

No substantiated evidence of sustained or repeated a lack of professionalism, in the areas of:

- Ownership and management of teaching role
- Preparation for teaching
- Formal and informal communication with students or peers regarding teaching and learning (revised text)
- Ethical practices consistent with university policy and the collective agreement (revised text)

Summary Standards Document – Multi-Level Standards

This hypothetical committee first took the original research evaluation rubric and identified standards that they thought faculty members at the associate/tenure (blue) and full (purple) professor levels should reach. Then they used those to create their standards document (next page).

Criterion 4: Effective research or commissioned income generation and infrastructure development strategies	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good/Superior (5-6)	Excellent (7)
a) Ability to attract internal or external research or creative activity funding <i>A score of 4 can be mitigated by 6-7 in (b) or (c)</i>	Efforts to or success in acquiring research funding have not been consistent with the satisfactory standard established by the unit	Submission of external grant proposal and funding internal or external grant requests generally meet the standards set by the department.	Funding of external research grants judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.	History of regular, repeated and evolving success in major granting competitions, including those considered being the most highly competitive within the discipline, given the career stage of the candidate.
b) Ability to foster partnerships that directly contribute to research capacity or the development of research or creative activity infrastructure <i>Not mandatory – but can be used in support of (a)</i>	No or weak evidence of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Some degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Strong degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Exceptional degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.
c) Engagement in grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field <i>Not mandatory – but can be used in support of (a)</i>	No or weak evidence of in grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field	Some evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field	Strong evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field	Exceptional evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.

They also identified how committees could balance strengths of a given scholar to achieve tenure through a different mix of the indicators.

In a model like this, the standard for Criterion 4 might look like this:

	Associate Professor	Professor
Criterion 4: Capacity building through income generation, collaboration development and infrastructure development strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Funding of external research grants judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors. b) Strong degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually. c) Strong evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) History of regular, repeated and evolving success in major granting competitions, including those considered being the most highly competitive within the discipline, given the career stage of the candidate. b) Exceptional degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually. c) Exceptional evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.
<p><i>Note: Excellence in items (b) and/or (c) may provide mitigation for marginal success in item (a) to create overall evidence that this criterion has been met.</i></p>		

Examples of full sample standards using these approaches can be found on the website.

<http://www1.uwindsor.ca/provost/renewal-promotion-and-tenure-rpt-research-and-teaching-evaluation-frameworks>