

Using Rubrics to assist teachers to embed evaluation feedback in the development of their teaching and learning

Trudy Harris, Teaching Development Unit, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand

Dorothy Spiller, Teaching Development Unit, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand

Michele Schoenberger-Orgad, Department of Management Communication, Faculty of Management, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand

Cheryl Cockburn-Wooten, Department of Management Communication, Faculty of Management, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand

Abstract

Professional development of academic staff is an area which highlights the difficulty of embedding evaluation feedback into continuous improvement of teaching and learning. While most institutions require academic staff to conduct formal evaluations of their teaching, frequently little attention is paid to follow up processes which would assist staff in interpreting feedback and using it to enhance their practice. This gap makes it difficult to embed an internal evaluations culture and perpetuates a perception of formal evaluation as an add-on compliance process. As professional developers, strategies are needed to demonstrate to staff that evaluation feedback can have an immediate pertinence for their practice. One such strategy is to develop tools to support staff with the interpretation of evaluation feedback and suggest associated pathways for professional development. Within this strategy there are a number of options, one of which is to use rubrics for interpretations and signposting for further action.

This paper describes a pilot project in which rubrics were introduced to help teachers interpret student feedback received through the formal evaluation system. Alongside the rubrics, suggestions were made about appropriate resources for professional development opportunities. We set out to investigate whether the introduction of rubrics could improve the link between evaluation feedback and professional development. Findings from the initial iteration of the project will be presented here..

Key words: Evaluation; Rubrics; Professional Development

This article has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication in *SLEID*, an international journal of scholarship and research that supports emerging scholars and the development of evidence-based practice in education.

© Copyright of articles is retained by authors. As an open access journal, articles are free to use, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings.

ISSN 1832-2050

Introduction

At the beginning of 2011, the researchers initiated the pilot study to introduce rubrics to assist teachers to interpret evaluation feedback for use in their professional development. The initiative was set up within the context of an institution that has recently established a number of policies and plans to enhance teaching. This context intensified monitoring of the quality of teaching and the reference to evaluations data. There was concern about ensuring that this proliferation of data and quality monitoring emphasis was translated into enhanced teaching and learning.

Consequently, we recognised the need to support teachers to embed evaluation feedback in the development of their teaching and learning. A number of strategies are needed to realise this goal, and one such tool is a rubric. With this context and this goal in mind the researchers set out to investigate whether a pilot project to introduce rubrics in the evaluation process could improve the link between evaluation feedback and professional development.

The context – the institutional policies around teaching

The University of Waikato is a young university with some 14,000 students enrolled across 80 qualifications. It has 663 academic staff. The University has a strong research focus with 10 areas achieving number one rankings in the 2006 PBRF round. Academic staff members are required to split their time according to a university workload model of 40% research, 40% teaching and 20% administration. Professional development for all of these dimensions is included in that time. However, at the University of Waikato, professional development around teaching is **not** compulsory.

Practice around teaching is governed by a number of strategic documents that provide teachers with guidance. For example, in 2010 the University of Waikato developed the Teaching and Learning Framework, a strategic document that outlined the important areas that staff should engage with to provide students with a quality teaching and learning experience. Developed using a consultative approach across the institution, the framework has identified seven main areas that help to provide a quality teaching and learning experience, and offers a rationale and pedagogical underpinning for each area. The framework was then distilled into the Teaching and Learning Plan.

The Teaching and Learning Plan contains goals and key performance indicators (KPIs) for each of the seven main areas. One of the KPIs relates to evaluation data and provides a benchmark for all departments /schools/faculties within the institution. The KPIs provide a base line from which the institution is to develop, through a process of continuous improvement. The challenge for the university is to ensure that the requirement to meet these KPIs does not just become a numerical game, but is underpinned by appropriate and relevant developmental activity. The evaluation system mandated by the university provides one opportunity for meeting these institutional goals.

Linking evaluation feedback and teaching development - findings from research

Findings from research indicate that work needs to be done around evaluation processes to optimise institutional teaching and learning goals and to use evaluations for professional development. This is partly because professional development around teaching is not compulsory, and PBRF is predominant at the university. Therefore it is very difficult to motivate staff to take up available professional development opportunities. A recent, yet unpublished research study confirmed that some academics were reluctant to engage further with evaluation feedback because of a more general perception that teaching is not important. A comment such as the following one represents this viewpoint:

Don't even think about it. Too busy to obsess about my teaching. I am a very busy researcher and have a huge teaching and supervision load; I do not have the luxury of time for introspection about teaching. (Stein et al. 2012)

In this climate it is vital that evaluation processes are as helpful as possible so as to encourage academics to link their feedback with their teaching. Supportive practices around the evaluation of teaching can lead to improvement in teaching quality. For as Kember *et al.* (2002) argue, evaluation data alone will not bring about change and some form of intervention has to occur before improvement can be made. An intervention in this case could be any form of professional development around teaching.

Similarly, research indicates that supportive frameworks are necessary because it is argued that shortcomings in the evaluation instruments themselves can deter even those who are willing to use the data to inform their teaching development. For example, an interviewee in the research investigation cited above commented:

The institution only uses the data for quantitative matters. More emphasis needs to come on how individuals can use the appraisal [evaluation] system to improve and develop their teaching. Currently, appraisals [evaluations] are compulsory, but interpreting them is not compulsory so teachers tend to justify particular appraisal [evaluation] rather than trying to interpret the results. (Stein et al. 2012)

A similar finding was noted in an earlier study by Spiller & Ferguson (2011). In a paper drawing on interviews conducted at the University of Waikato, the qualitative feedback from the respondents showed that there were problems with interpretation of data. For example, one respondent noted that staff should “be taught about interpreting the data and the modifications to make to their courses in response.”

In support of these findings, work by Smith (2008) suggests that academic staff with little or no pedagogical knowledge, had difficulty in interpreting evaluation information, and specifically had issues in relating the data to pedagogical areas. Additionally, researchers (Arthur, 2009; Penny & Coe, 2004) found that evaluation data themselves often do not suggest pathways for improvement. It is therefore understandable that the absence of forward-looking guidance could deter staff from using evaluation feedback as a tool for teaching development.

Drawing on the literature (Smith 2008) and recognising the perceived limitations of the instrument, teaching development staff at the University of Waikato, began to consider ways of enhancing the developmental opportunities that are potentially available in evaluation information. Consequently, a decision was made to embark on a small pilot intervention in collaboration with a department in the Waikato

Management School (WMS). The aim of the project was to investigate whether the inclusion of rubrics with the evaluation results could enhance the usefulness of evaluations as a professional development tool.

Research method

An action research process was adopted to investigate the impact of our intervention on teachers' use of evaluation feedback. The initial iteration of the action research consisted of a pilot phase with a particular department in WMS.

Description of the intervention

The department was selected as a research partner because of its perceived dedication to teaching. The department has 13 full time academic staff, two of whom became research partners on this project. After ethics clearance was given we invited all remaining teaching staff to participate in the project. One of the main criteria for participation in the project was that academic staff be teaching in one or both semesters of 2011. Out of the 13 potential participants 2 were on study leave over the duration of the project, 1 was on teaching buy-out and 7 agreed to participate.

The first phase of this project was to align teaching criteria with the expectations formulated in the Teaching and Learning Plan (2010-2012). Drawing on the benchmarks for effective practice identified in the Plan, pedagogical headings were developed for the evaluation questionnaires.

Once the main pedagogical areas had been identified for the questionnaires, it was then possible to start work on the interpretation of the evaluation data. After a presentation by Davidson (2010) on the use of rubrics, it was decided to develop a set of rubrics (see Appendix 1) for each of the pedagogical areas. The headings are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Pedagogical areas

Paper Evaluation	Teaching Evaluation
Outcomes/Goals	Communication
Assessment and resources to support learning	Facilitation of learning
Intellectual content:	Approach/style
Coverage/depth/organisation	
Quality of paper	Effectiveness of teaching

Once the rubrics were identified, it was then necessary that attention be paid to the link between the rubrics and possible sources of professional development. A resource document was developed that outlined short term and longer term forms of professional development around teaching (see Appendix 2).

At the end of Semester A, the questionnaires were integrated into the evaluations process and treated as normal evaluations. After processing, the evaluation reports were printed for distribution and accompanied by a letter, the rubrics and the resources document.

The letter (see Appendix 3) provided personalised guidance as to how participants could use the rubrics and the resource sheet to engage in follow up professional development from the evaluation results. This approach was chosen to give a concrete and contextualised example which would be relevant for each participant.

Evaluation method

It was decided to use interviews to investigate teachers' perceptions of the usefulness of the intervention. Semi-structured interviews were chosen because this was qualitative research in which we were primarily interested in eliciting individuals' experiences and perceptions of the process. Additionally, because this was a small scale pilot study we chose an evaluation strategy which would enable us to probe peoples' responses as opposed to using a questionnaire or survey.

In preparation for this evaluation, advance notice was also given to participants, via the letter, that they would be approached to conduct follow up interviews to hear their perceptions of the usefulness of this process. It was decided not to interview our two co-researchers in the department because it was ethically inappropriate. However the two participants were invited to add their personal reflections to the discussion.

The interviews comprised four semi-structured questions. The selection of questions was determined by our primary research question. It was decided to use prompts to elicit further comment in order to cater for individual differences and to encourage deeper reflection. The questions were:

1. How have you used your appraisal [evaluation] results for professional development prior to the project? If you have used it please provide specific examples?
2. Have you undertaken or considered further professional development as the result of the project?
3. Describe any differences in your engagement with the evaluation results as a result of the inclusion of the rubrics and resources.
4. What suggestions would you make about improving this tool for professional development?

In keeping with the action research process, a further cycle of this methodology will be applied at the end of Semester B, incorporating changes and suggestions identified in the findings from Semester A.

Findings

Our analysis of the data uncovered some interesting views in relation to our goal to enhance the teachers' use of evaluation feedback for professional development.

1. How have you used your appraisal [evaluation] results for professional development prior to the project? If you have used it please provide specific examples?

Project participants In response to this question we found the entire spectrum ranging from very detailed usage of comments ("read comments carefully") to lack of interest in evaluations ("do not really use appraisal"). Within this range, 3 out of 5 participants made some use of evaluations to inform their teaching practice and course refinements. As a qualifier, it should be noted that the two participants who did not use evaluations as a primary tool to inform their teaching, both used regular informal feedback and dialogue strategies, and adapted teaching accordingly.

Another interesting theme that emerged in relation to current usage was the high level of emotion registered by two participants. Their language indicated their feeling of emotional sensitivity around receiving evaluations:

Bit of a fear factor. When I see students going to fetch their assignments and look at their faces, I know how they feel. I think that's how I feel when the brown envelope comes.

Spent an upset night after reading the appraisal [evaluation] comments.

Also evident in these responses is reference to institutional use of the evaluations by four of the participants. Two of the participants expressed concern because of the consequences that hinge on evaluations, while two others noted that teaching is not rewarded by the institution.

Reflections of a co-researcher One of our co-researchers reported “a high level of engagement with qualitative comments.” She also indicated that “appraisals [evaluation] feedback has directly motivated extended professional development”.

2. Have you undertaken or considered further professional development as the result of the project?

Findings around this question were limited. Only one lecturer directly and explicitly indicated that she used the rubrics for specific and focussed professional development. This lecturer indicated that she valued the breakdown of results into pedagogical areas both because it made the feedback “less overwhelming” but also because the rubrics enabled her to “highlight the specific areas” that she needed to go back and review. This lecturer indicated that she would seek out professional development specifically around the areas that the rubrics identified as potentially problematic.

3. Describe any differences in your engagement with the evaluation results as a result of the inclusion of the rubrics and resources.

Project participants There was a generally positive response to the notion of rubrics, although only one of the 5 lecturers actively and deliberately used the rubrics to help interpret the feedback from students. For this participant, the rubrics provided a number of valuable functions. They acted as a way of balancing or checking the evaluations data and feedback. She noted “they acted as a balance or check, calmed my initial response to their comments”. In some instances, the rubrics helped to confirm what she already knew.

Two lecturers expressed an intellectual appreciation of the potential benefits of the rubrics, while one noted that they were useful for identifying the reasons for lower scores and could sharpen the data. While the other participant found the interpretation “useful”, her emotional reaction to lower scores appeared to block further engagement with the rubrics.

Reflections of a co-researcher One of our co-researchers indicated that “there has been a difference in my engagement with the results because I found that I have read them far more carefully and referred to the rubric attached”.

4. What suggestions would you make about improving this tool for professional development?

Project participants Some participants provided specific details on improvements to enhance the professional development potential. For example one lecturer said “I'd put a box in relation to where you are in a specific area- and make specific

appropriate PD suggestions e.g. helpful reading or attendance at a particular workshop”. Likewise, another participant recognised that the resources needed to be targeted “...and should focus on issues that resonate with them in the classroom”.

For other participants, the view was that the rubrics were limited in their usefulness because of broader issues around evaluations and teaching. For one, he said that the formative potential of evaluations could only be improved “...as part of a larger process in which questions are tailored to different discipline areas”. Two lecturers again refer to institutional problems around the use of the questionnaires and attitudes to teaching:

...the institution is dysfunctional. Says it uses a TQM methodology, but doesn't follow through with it.

Another colleague did not engage with ideas for possible improvements as she felt that teaching is undervalued and that “...appraisal [evaluation] has been high jacked by promotions”.

Reflections of a co-researcher Like some of the participants in the research, one of our co-researchers felt the usefulness of the rubrics for professional development was limited by problems with the evaluation questions themselves:

I think this is where most of the issues for teachers lie – in the construction of the questions in the appraisals [evaluations] and then the students' choice of answer.

Discussion

In terms of our initial goal, feedback from the research indicates that the inclusion of rubrics has potential to enhance the links between evaluation feedback and professional development. However, the findings themselves and the nature of this particular pilot study suggest that we have to exercise caution about making claims for the widespread usefulness of such of strategy. At the same time this pilot study has provided helpful suggestions for strengthening the rubric strategy and its link to professional development.

This positive trend is in keeping with Kember et al's (2002) view that additional interventions around evaluations are a way of helping change to occur.

The positive potential for the rubrics for linking evaluation and professional development

Kember et al (2002) indicated that evaluation instruments needed to have interventions for improvements around teaching and learning to happen. Similarly, Penny & Coe (2004), Arthur (2009), and Smith (2008) argue for the importance of interpretative and supportive systems in relation to student evaluation feedback. In keeping with these views, our findings indicated a strong positive disposition towards the strategy. There was clear evidence of enhanced interest in the results. Some people commented on the usefulness for interpreting and clarifying evaluation feedback and focussing engagement. In one instance, one interviewee noted that the rubrics acted as a check on her emotional reactions. In addition to this evidence of heightened engagement, one participant in our sample and one co-researcher actively employed the rubrics to sharpen the interpretation of student feedback and apply the findings to future professional development.

Cautions

The first caution which emerged from the findings and which may limit the potential of the strategy was the recurrent reference to institutional factors. Negativity around the evaluations process because of their institutional role was one the findings of the study undertaken by Stein et al (2012). In our pilot study these broader institutional issues that are associated with evaluations also emerge as a barrier to significant wide scale engagement with professional development around teaching. A strong message from the findings is that while small improvements such as the rubrics may help individuals to enhance their practice, the institutional context around teaching still apparently continues to undermine any wholehearted and widespread engagement with evaluations as a teaching and learning tool. Tellingly, there were strong messages about the institution privileging research over teaching, the constraints imposed by the use of evaluations for promotion, and serious reservations about the quality of the evaluation instrument itself.

A second caution relates to the sample of the interviewees and the small scale of the pilot study. One of the features of the particular sample group is that they are members of a department who are interested generally in teaching and its enhancement. Thus for example, when only two people specifically mention using the rubrics undertake further professional development this finding has to be read in context. It needs to be recognized that a number of interviewees use regular formative evaluations and modify their teaching accordingly, and may therefore not be appropriate participants in this study.

A third caution relates to our understanding of the emotional barriers that teachers experience when engaging with evaluations. The presence of the emotional dimension needs to be further investigated and strategies explored for helping teachers to manage the emotions of feedback so that it becomes less of a barrier to professional development. Interestingly, this emotional dimension has emerged more vividly in the context of this project than in the analysis of interviews at Waikato (Spiller & Ferguson, 2011).

Improvements

In terms of the strategy itself and its potential for professional development, the interviewees gave some specific suggestions. These involve refining the rubrics further and targeting the resource options more precisely with the identified shortcomings.

Conclusion

In the short term the researchers have attempted to respond to specific suggestions for improvement around the rubrics intervention, notably introducing more targeted resources. A second iteration of the action research project is underway to investigate the effect of these refinements and any other changes in use of them. The second iteration includes some different members of this department in the interview sample so we hope to get a slightly broader picture of dispositions towards and use of the intervention.

The findings of our research has not undermined the conviction that an intervention such as rubrics can heighten teacher engagement with evaluations and prompt

professional development. Even the fact that interviewees report closer scrutiny of the evaluation feedback because of the rubrics, can be seen as a step towards teaching enhancement. While the numbers of those who made direct connections with teaching development are very small, it is recognised that there is still a range of wider issues that will have bearing on any initiative that attempts to support how staff engage with evaluation feedback. In particular, the institutional use of evaluations and valuing of teaching need to be addressed. Furthermore, there needs to be other complementary supporting initiatives around student evaluations to maximise the potential of the rubrics. These include ideas such as more general education of staff around evaluation and strategies to help academics to deal with the emotional dimensions of feedback.

References

- Arthur, L. (2009). From performativity to professionalism: Lecturers' responses to student feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(4), 441-454.
- Davidson, E. J. (2010). Actionable evaluation for real-world decision makers. Paper presented at the 10th Australasian Higher Education Evaluation Forum, (November 2010, Lincoln, New Zealand).
- Kember, D., Leung, D. Y. P., & Kwan, K. P. (2002). Does the use of student feedback questionnaires improve the overall quality of teaching? *Journal of Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(5), 411-425.
- Penny, A., & Coe, R. (2004). Effectiveness of consultation on student ratings feedback: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(2), 215-253.
- Smith, C. (2008). Building effectiveness in teaching through targeted evaluation and response: Connecting evaluation to teaching improvement in higher education. *Journal of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 517-533.
- Spiller, D., & Ferguson, P. (2011). Student evaluation: Do lecturers value them and use them to engage with student learning needs? Paper presented at the *Education in a changing environment 6th International conference: Creativity & engagement in higher education*, Salford, UK.
- Stein, S. J., Spiller, D., Terry, S., Deaker, L., Harris, T.K., & Kennedy, J. (2012). Unlocking the impact of tertiary teacher's perceptions of student evaluation. Ako Aotearoa, New Zealand. (In press).

**Appendix 1 Paper and Teaching Appraisal Rubrics
The Paper**

Pedagogical Area	Questions	Excellent 1 – 1.5	Very Good 1.6 – 2.0	Satisfactory 2.1 – 3.0	Unsatisfactory 3.1 – 4.0	Unacceptable 4.1 – 5.0
Outcomes/goals	1. I received accurate information about what the paper would involve 2. The paper's objectives (learning outcomes) were stated clearly	Learning outcomes are explicitly aligned with content, teaching & learning strategies and assessment.	Alignment between learning outcomes, content, teaching & learning strategies and assessment is evident, but minor omissions.	Some alignment between learning outcomes, content, teaching & learning strategies and assessment.	Poor alignment between learning outcomes, content, teaching & learning strategies and assessment.	No explicit alignment between learning outcomes, content, teaching & learning strategies and assessment.
Assessment and resources to support learning	3. The assessment tasks were a fair test of my learning in this paper 4. I was able to access required learning resources when I needed them	Assessment facilitates relevant learning; Sets out well-defined criteria for successful completion; Provide access to excellent resources.	Assessment is linked with learning and has clear criteria for successful completion; Good resources.	Assessment has reasonable links with learning and rudimentary criteria for successful completion; Adequate resources.	Assessment has marginal links with learning and with ill-defined criteria for successful completion; Some resources.	Assessment has no link with learning and no criteria defined for successful completion; minimal resources.
Intellectual content	5. The paper was well organised and ran smoothly 6. I was given enough time to learn the things I had to learn 7. The paper was intellectually stimulating	Well crafted structure and design of the paper Organisation of the paper was explicit. Excellent balance between content and learning processes.	Coherent structure, organisation and design to the paper. Good balance between content and learning processes.	Basic structure, organisation and design to the paper. Some attention is paid to the relationship between content and learning processes.	Rudimentary structure, organisation and design to the paper. Scant attention is paid to the relationship between content and learning processes.	No structure, organisation or design to the paper. No attention is paid to the relationship between content and learning processes.
Quality of the paper	8. Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of this paper					

**Appendix 1 Paper and Teaching Appraisal Rubrics
The Teaching**

Pedagogical Area	Questions	Excellent 1 – 1.5	Very Good 1.6 – 2.0	Satisfactory 2.1 – 3.0	Unsatisfactory 3.1 – 4.0	Unacceptable 4.1 – 5.0
Communication	2. This teacher was good at explaining things 3. This teacher made it clear what they expected of me 7. This teacher was approachable when advice or help was required	Established clear expectations and builds dialogue throughout. Uses accessible language and a learner responsive pace.	Expectations are communicated. Develops dialogue between teachers and students. Accessible language and learner responsive pace.	Rudimentary expectations are established. Beginning of dialogue between teachers and students. Appropriate language and pace.	Expectations are unclear. No dialogue between teachers and students. Language is still difficult and pace imperfect.	Expectations are not communicated. No dialogue between teachers and students. Language is inaccessible and at an erratic pace.
Facilitation of learning	4. This teacher gave me helpful feedback on how I was going 5. This teacher encouraged me to get actively involved in learning tasks	Always responsive to learners and actively promotes the development of intellectual independence. Facilitates environment for reflection and practice.	Responsive to learners and develops intellectual independence. Environment provides opportunities for reflection and practice.	Aware of learners' needs and begins to encourage intellectual independence. Environment provides limited opportunities for reflection and practice.	Little awareness of learner needs and does not promote intellectual independence. Environment neglects opportunities for reflection and practice.	Ignores learner needs and stifles development of intellectual independence. Environment discourages reflection and practice.
Approach/style	1. This teacher was enthusiastic about what they were teaching 6. This teacher made the subject interesting	Excites curiosity and actively seeks dialogue and interaction. Teacher uses a range of pertinent strategies and examples.	Invites curiosity and encourages dialogue and interaction. Uses a range of strategies and appropriate examples.	Primarily transmission of information & begins to interact with students. Some variation in strategies and occasional use of examples.	Transmission of information & minimal interaction. Very limited strategies and use of examples	Monotonous transmission of information and no interaction with students
Effectiveness of teaching	8. Overall, this teacher was effective					

**Appendix 2 Paper and Teaching Appraisal Resources
The Paper**

Pedagogical Area	Questions	Short Term Professional Development		Long Term Professional Development	General Resources
		TDU Resources	University Resources		
Outcomes/goals	9. I received accurate information about what the paper would involve 10. The paper's objectives (learning outcomes) were stated clearly	<p>TDU Handbooks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tertiary teaching: Exploring our Beliefs • Introduction to Course Design • Becoming a Reflective Practitioner • Maximising Learning in Large Groups • Principles of Assessment • Assessment tasks to promote learning 	<p>Teaching and Learning Framework</p> <p>https://i.waikato.ac.nz/portal/server.pt/directory/university_plans/10622?DirMode=1</p>		<p>AKO Aotearoa</p> <p>http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/</p>
Assessment and resources to support learning	11. The assessment tasks were a fair test of my learning in this paper 12. I was able to access required learning resources when I needed them	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment: Feedback to Promote Student Learning • Assessment: Setting and Marking Assessment Tasks • Tutoring: A Guide to Getting Started • Facilitating Laboratory and Practical Classes 	<p>Teaching and Learning Plan</p> <p>http://www.waikato.ac.nz/about/corporate/tlmg/plan.shtml</p>	<p>PGCert in Tertiary Teaching</p> <p>http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/PGCERT.shtml</p>	<p>The Higher Education Academy</p> <p>http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/</p>
Intellectual content	13. The paper was well organised and ran smoothly 14. I was given enough time to learn the things I had to learn 15. The paper was intellectually stimulating	<p>Teaching Network:</p> <p>http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/tchgntwk.shtml</p> <p>TDU workshops:</p> <p>http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/staffworkshops.shtml</p>	<p>Paper Outline Policy</p> <p>http://www.waikato.ac.nz/official-info/index/docs/paper-outline-policy</p>	<p>Mentoring</p> <p>http://www.waikato.ac.nz/hrm/mentor/</p>	<p>Phil Race website:</p> <p>http://phil-race.co.uk/ (Phil was a visiting scholar at UoW in 2010)</p> <p>Stephen Brookfield website:</p> <p>http://www.stephenbrookfield.com/Dr_Stephen_D_Brookfield/Home.html</p>
Quality of the paper	16. Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of this paper	<p>TDU individual support</p> <p>TDU Library</p>	<p>Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching and Papers</p> <p>http://www.waikato.ac.nz/official-info/index/docs/evaluation-of-teaching-and-papers-policy</p>		
		<p>Further information and resources can be found at the TDU website: www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu Or contact Preetha Pratapsingh at: tduadmin@waikato.ac.nz; telephone 07 838 4839</p>			

**Appendix 2 Paper and Teaching Appraisal Resources
Your Teaching**

Pedagogical Area	Questions	Short term Professional Development		Long term Professional Development	General Resources
		TDU Resources	University Resources		
Communication	4. This teacher was good at explaining things 5. This teacher made it clear what they expected of me 8. This teacher was approachable when advice or help was required	TDU Handbooks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tertiary teaching: Exploring our beliefs • Becoming a Reflective Practitioner • Teaching Strategies to Promote the Development of Students' Learning Skills • Teaching International Students • Maximising Learning in Large Groups • Assessment: Feedback to promote student learning • Assessment: Setting and Marking Assessment Tasks Teaching Network: http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/tchgntwk.shtml	Teaching and Learning Framework https://i.waikato.ac.nz/portal/server.pt/directory/university_plans/10622?DirMode=1 Teaching and Learning Plan http://www.waikato.ac.nz/about/corporate/tlmgplan.shtml Paper Outline Policy http://www.waikato.ac.nz/official-info/index/docs/paper-outline-policy	PGCert in Tertiary Teaching http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/PGCERT.shtml Mentoring http://www.waikato.ac.nz/hrm/mentor/	AKO Aotearoa http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/ The Higher Education Academy http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ Phil Race website: http://phil-race.co.uk/ (Phil was a visiting academic at UoW in 2010)
Facilitation of learning	6. This teacher gave me helpful feedback on how I was going 7. This teacher encouraged me to get actively involved in learning tasks	TDU workshops: http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/staffworksops.shtml TDU individual support	Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching and Papers http://www.waikato.ac.nz/official-info/index/docs/evaluation-of-teaching-and-papers-policy	Peer Observation http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/observations.shtml	Stephen Brookfield website: http://www.stephenbrookfield.com/Dr_Stephen_D_Brookfield/Home.html
Approach/style	2. This teacher was enthusiastic about what they were teaching 7. This teacher made the subject interesting				
Effectiveness of teaching	9. Overall, this teacher was effective	TDU Library			
		Further information and resources can be found at the TDU website: www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu Or contact Preetha Pratapsingh at: tduadmin@waikato.ac.nz ; telephone 07 838 4839			

Appendix 3 Letter to participants

16 March 2012

Dear Michele,

You are receiving this letter as part of the research project looking at interpretation of appraisal data and linkages to professional development around teaching. We would like to take this opportunity to thank you for taking part in this research project, and to explain about the next step in the project.

This part of the project is to provide you with information which will enable you to make informed choices around professional development activities. Enclosed with this letter are a number of documents, including your appraisal results and rubrics for the interpretation of the appraisal. The data for the appraisal questions has been aggregated under the relevant pedagogical areas. For each of these areas rubrics have been developed, in line with the University's Teaching and Learning Framework. These rubrics outline what excellent to poor teaching activity would look like for each of the pedagogical areas. This makes it easier to align professional development offering and opportunities.

So for example, for your papers the scores are listed below:

Paper code	Pedagogical Areas							
	Outcomes/goals	Assessment and resources to support learning	Intellectual content	Quality of the paper	Communication	Facilitation of learning	Approach/style	Effectiveness of teaching
MCOM239/339-11A (HAM)	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.1	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.8
MCOM585-11A (HAM)	1.5	1.6	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.1

Paper appraisal

Teaching appraisal

The rubrics document on the next page outlines for you what each of the scores means in terms of teaching practice. For example, if you look at the rubrics sheet, the scores for MCOM585 have been marked onto the sheet using a thick line. This clearly indicates that, for Outcomes/goals and Intellectual content your teaching practice is excellent, however for Assessment and resources to support learning there is potential for further work.

We would really appreciate hearing your views about the process and the use of rubrics and would like to contact you at the end of July to arrange an interview.

If you have any questions please contact me or your departmental representatives on this project Cheryl Cockburn-Wootten and Michele Schoenberger-Orgad.

Kind regards,



Trudy Harris,
Teaching Developer (Evaluation & Quality)