

TPD CATALYST

Reviewer Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria

Two major goals of the TPD Catalyst are to provide high-quality TPD curricula and resources, and to disseminate these resources in a highly efficient manner, for the sake of authors, reviewers, and end users alike. Thus, the submission and review guidelines will hold authors to a rigorous standard, while streamlining the publication process as much as possible.

Review Process

- Submissions go to the Editor-in-Chief, who assigns an Editor to oversee the review.
- The Editor oversees the review. They...
 - ...assign two Reviewers (from a pool of those previously approved by the Editor-in-Chief)
 - ...provides the materials for the submission and relevant scoring rubrics (for the submission type)
- Reviewers evaluate the submission for all criteria via the relevant rubric.
 - For *each criterion*, reviewers will determine if the submission is “Publishable” as is, if there are “Revisions Needed”, or if it is “Unfit for the TPD Catalyst” (beyond reasonable revision expectations)
 - For anything less than “Publishable,” reviewers will briefly justify why (for the Editor to review)
 - Questions (and decisions) concerning the rubric may be made in consultation with the Editor
- The Editor makes a decision for publication, revision, or rejection.
 - The Editor analyzes the rubric scores and justifications (when relevant) from both reviewers
 - Submissions will only be published in the TPD Catalyst once they are deemed “publishable” for *all criteria by both reviewers*
 - In cases of discrepancies between reviewers:
 - Unresolved ties between reviewer opinions default to the lower scoring level of the rubric (e.g. a “Revisions Needed” takes precedence over a “Publishable”)
 - The Editor *may* reach out to reviewers for further context beyond their written justifications, and direct collaboration to come to consensus between all three parties is permitted
 - Based on reviewer justifications, however, the Editor may decide that reaching out to them is unnecessary and that defaulting to the lower score (for the relevant criteria) is sufficient
- The Editor communicates a decision to the Author.
 - If publication is recommended, the Editor updates the author and proceeds with the logistics of digital publication (in collaboration with the Editor-in-Chief)
 - If revisions are necessary, the Editor will communicate what needs to be updated, and authors will have an opportunity to resubmit for review by the same Editor and Reviewers
 - If a submission is rejected, the author is encouraged to revisit the Author Guidelines and contemplate future possible submissions

Evaluation Criteria

There are three different options for authors to submit to the TPD Catalyst: a (1) Curriculum Module, (2) TPD Assignment, or (3) Evidence-based Teaching Resource. While there is overlap between review criteria, each option should be evaluated according only to the descriptions provided in its respective rubric (below).

See all three rubrics below:

- [Option 1: Curriculum Module](#)
- [Option 2: TPD Assignment](#)
- [Option 3: Evidence-based Teaching \(EBT\) Resource](#)

OPTION 1: CURRICULUM MODULE

| Criteria | Unfit for Catalyst | Revisions Needed | Publishable! |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>Learning Outcome and Alignment</p> | <p>There is not sufficient evidence of backward design nor clear alignment between the curriculum and a learning outcome (even implicitly). To align the content to an outcome from the Topic Index would require more redevelopment than is reasonable for revisions of this specific submission.</p> | <p>There is evidence of backward design overall, but the alignment could be improved.</p> <p>The outcome may need to be worded verbatim from the Topic Index (or else approved by the Editor). If the outcome is only implicit, it needs to be stated explicitly in the module.</p> <p>The curriculum generally works towards the stated outcome, but some pieces may need to be revised or removed to maintain total alignment; there may be superfluous content that does not clearly help TAs achieve the stated outcome, or content that best addresses a different outcome(s) from the Index.</p> | <p>A learning outcome from the Topic Index is explicitly stated in the curriculum.</p> <p>The content and activities directly align to that single outcome: it's clear that every step of the curriculum is a logical "chunk" that works towards the overall stated goal. There is no superfluous or unaligned content within the module.</p> |
| <p>Curricular Materials</p> | <p>No support materials are provided for facilitators to use directly in their TPD (e.g. only a description of the activity, not the necessary materials to do it).</p> <p>If materials are provided, the curriculum may not contain a formative assessment activity.</p> | <p>Slides may need to be submitted in the ECB template format. The formatting may need to be improved in places to be more polished or consistent; it may need work on the part of end users to meet high standards for use and display of materials.</p> <p>Materials are provided, but more may be needed for facilitators to deliver the curriculum as envisioned. (For example, handouts may be invoked in the notes but not provided.) Some aspects may need revision or clarification for facilitators and/or TAs to comprehend and benefit from them.</p> <p>A formative assessment is included, but it could be improved to better engage and assess TAs in their learning (e.g. clearer, more active and/or collaborative, better scaffolded, etc.).</p> | <p>Slides are submitted in the ECB Template provided. The formatting is polished, consistent, and may be proudly displayed by end users.</p> <p>The submitted materials are sufficient to deliver the curriculum: all presentation slides and supplemental materials (e.g. worksheets) are provided.</p> <p>In addition to any content covered, the curriculum includes at least one formative assessment (in the form of an active and collaborative learning activity) where TAs can work together to reflect on and apply what they know about the aligned outcome.</p> |
| <p>Facilitator Notes</p> | <p>No facilitator notes are provided, or they require more redevelopment than is reasonable for revision of this specific submission.</p> | <p>Facilitator notes are included, but they need revision to be appropriately helpful to prospective facilitators.</p> <p>It may not be totally clear how some aspects of the curriculum will be presented or facilitated. Notes for the activity may need more detail on setup or how to frame it, the logistics of facilitating active portions,</p> | <p>Facilitator notes are detailed, providing clear instructions for delivering all aspects of the curriculum as envisioned by its author.</p> <p>It's clear to an outside reader how each "chunk" will be presented; for activities, there are explicit guidance on how they will be setup/framed, how any logistics will work, and how to</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>and/or how to synthesize the content by the end of the activity or module.</p> <p>There may be cases where more insights concerning specific challenges and strategies for facilitating the curriculum would benefit facilitators.</p> <p>In general, the author may need to do more to set other facilitators up for success when implementing the curriculum.</p> | <p>debrief them (when necessary) to synthesize contributions, provide closure, and leave TAs with actionable teaching strategies related to the outcome by the end of the module.</p> <p>As relevant, the notes contain insights for prospective facilitators on how to prevent and respond to challenges that may come up in the facilitation.</p> <p>Overall, it's clear that the author has implemented this curriculum, learned from it, and done their best to set up other facilitators for success.</p> |
| Scholarly Rigor and Role Modeling | <p>The curriculum may not challenge TAs to perform at a level expected of college and university teaching, or it may not appropriately role model the kinds of effective and evidence-based practices we seek to instill in our TAs. Achieving these goals would require more redevelopment than is reasonable for a revision of this specific submission.</p> | <p>The curriculum is appropriate for TAs at the college and university level, but it could realistically challenge them more deeply to foster more growth.</p> <p>The curriculum may need to address its aligned outcome more comprehensively, push TAs to engage with it in a more thoughtful or critical way, or leave them with more practical strategies to implement in their own teaching.</p> <p>The curriculum attempts to role model effective teaching, but it could be improved to better “walk the talk” when teaching about teaching. The design or facilitation may benefit from a greater mix of methods, or more deliberate implementation of evidence-based teaching strategies to serve as a better role model for TAs.</p> | <p>The curriculum sets up participants to achieve its learning outcome at a level expected of TAs at the college and university level.</p> <p>TAs are challenged to interrogate their prior beliefs, knowledge, and teaching practices (related to the aligned outcome) in a way that facilitates meaningful growth in themselves and their colleagues. When relevant, they are left with practical strategies related to the topic that they can directly implement (or easily adapt) in their own teaching.</p> <p>The curriculum clearly role models some of the effective and evidence-based teaching practices we aim to instill in our TAs (i.e. astute TAs will be able to learn about effective teaching from the design and execution of the TPD itself).</p> |
| Accessibility and Inclusion | <p>There are issues with the curricular design and/or delivery that may cause reasonable reviewers and users to justifiably deem it likely that some TAs will be marginalized, excluded, or unable to fully benefit from the TPD (due to no fault of their own). Fixing these inequities would require more redevelopment than is reasonable for a revision of this specific submission.</p> | <p>There is an apparent effort to make the TPD curriculum and environment both accessible and inclusive, but reviewers and users may have reasonable concerns related to some of the nine principles of Universal Design for Instruction (UDI).</p> <p>Specific revisions related to those principles will make it less likely that some TAs will be marginalized or unable to fully benefit from the TPD.</p> | <p>There is an evident effort to make the TPD curriculum and environment accessible and inclusive for a diverse community of TA identities, experiences, and abilities.</p> <p>(Authors and Reviewers are both encouraged to consult the nine principles of Universal Design for Instruction [UDI] for specific facets to consider when evaluating curricular accessibility and inclusion.)</p> <p>In general, proactive strategies make it unlikely that select TAs will be marginalized from the curriculum.</p> |

OPTION 2: TPD ASSIGNMENT

| Criteria | Unfit for Catalyst | Revisions Needed | Publishable! |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Facilitator Context | <p>There is no context provided for facilitators beyond the assignment instructions for TAs, or it would require more redevelopment than is reasonable for this submission to make it effective for practitioners.</p> | <p>A summary is provided for facilitators (beyond the instructions), but it needs more clarity and/or detail to make it appropriately helpful to them.</p> <p>There may be predictable implementation challenges that are not addressed, and/or revisions could focus more on these challenges and proactive strategies to address them.</p> <p>Overall, the summary may need more information about what the assignment is, when and why to use it, or how to ensure it's a successful experience.</p> | <p>The description for TPD facilitators is clear and appropriately thorough. It is evident what the assignment is and why it's useful for TAs to complete.</p> <p>Significant implementation challenges are addressed, and the author provides proactive solutions to minimize them; at minimum, it provides advice for framing the experience and generating TA buy-in.</p> <p>Overall, the summary reads like pointed advice from a seasoned practitioner who has successfully facilitated the assignment.</p> |
| TA Instructions | <p>There are no instructions for completing the assignment that could be provided directly to (or adapted for) TAs, or they are too cursory for a reasonable revision of this specific submission.</p> | <p>TA instructions are provided, but they may need to be improved so that TAs better understand what the assignment is and how exactly to complete it. The instructions may need more detail, clarity, or concision.</p> <p>Between the facilitator context and assignment instructions, there may be a need for more deliberate strategies to generate TA buy-in.</p> <p>Overall, these instructions cannot be given directly to TAs, or a lot of work may be required on the part of facilitators to effectively implement the assignment.</p> | <p>Instructions are detailed while remaining concise; all steps and necessary logistics are provided clearly.</p> <p>In at least some way (either via framing as described in the facilitator context, or in the instructions themselves) care is taken to generate TA buy-in.</p> <p>Overall, there is little chance TAs will be confused about what the assignment is, why it's helpful, or how exactly to complete it. Thus, the assignment instructions could be given directly to TAs (or easily adapted for individual contexts).</p> |
| Rubric | <p>Evaluation criteria (in the form of the rubric template) is not provided, or conveying how to evaluate the assignment would require too much redevelopment for this specific submission.</p> | <p>Evaluation criteria are provided (in the form of the rubric template), but they could be more useful for TAs and/or TPD facilitators. (For assignments scaffolded into multiple graded stages, the submission may need more rubrics to clarify how each stage will be evaluated.)</p> <p>The <i>criteria</i> (rows) may need revision: important criteria may be missing, superfluous criteria may need to be consolidated into others, or a different mix of criteria may result in a better balance of specificity and efficiency for rubric users.</p> <p>The descriptions of the <i>mastery levels</i> (columns) per criteria may</p> | <p>Evaluation criteria are provided in the form of the rubric template. (For assignments scaffolded into multiple stages, a rubric is explicitly provided for each graded stage.)</p> <p>The <i>criteria</i> (rows) are the "right" priorities for evaluating the assignment; they allow key priorities to be separated out for users to effectively differentiate the levels of performance, while being few enough for the rubric to not be overly burdensome.</p> <p>The descriptions of the <i>mastery levels</i> (columns) per criteria are detailed, clear, and concise. They guide TAs towards the specific features that differentiate</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>need greater detail or clarity. They may not adequately guide TAs towards the features that differentiate mastery from the steps leading up to it (for one or more criteria).</p> <p>Using the rubric may result in highly skewed grades, or not allow for appropriate differentiation between levels of performance.</p> | <p>mastery from the steps leading up to it (for all criteria).</p> <p>Overall, TAs will know what is expected of them and how the assignment will be graded, and facilitators will be able to use the rubric to grade TA submissions fairly, effectively, and efficiently.</p> |
| Learner Impact and Scaffolding | <p>It is not clear how this assignment will benefit TAs, or the experience (and accompanying materials) require more development and/or scaffolding than is reasonable for a revision of this specific submission.</p> | <p>More effort could be made to clarify how this will be useful for TAs in their growth as teachers, or more care could be taken in the design and scaffolding to ensure that TAs achieve those stated benefits.</p> <p>The assignment may benefit from more strategic scaffolding by breaking it up into multiple (or more) stages, modifying their sequencing, or by better integrating the smaller steps of the overall experience.</p> | <p>There is a clear purpose for this assignment: completing it will benefit TAs in one more essential aspects of their growth as teachers.</p> <p>The experience is scaffolded in a way that TAs acting in good faith are highly likely to achieve these benefits and to grow in their teaching.</p> |
| Accessibility and Inclusion | <p>There are issues with the assignment that may cause reasonable reviewers and users to justifiably deem it likely that some TAs will be marginalized, excluded, or unable to fully benefit from the TPD (due to no fault of their own). Fixing these inequities would require more redevelopment than is reasonable for a revision of this specific submission.</p> | <p>There is an apparent effort to make the TPD assignment both accessible and inclusive, but reviewers and users may have reasonable concerns related to some of the nine principles of Universal Design for Instruction (UDI).</p> <p>Specific revisions related to those principles will make it less likely that some TAs will be marginalized or unable to fully benefit from the TPD.</p> | <p>There is an evident effort to make the TPD assignment accessible and inclusive for a diverse community of TA identities, experiences, and abilities.</p> <p>(Authors and Reviewers are both encouraged to consult the nine principles of Universal Design for Instruction [UDI] for specific facets to consider when evaluating curricular accessibility and inclusion.)</p> <p>In general, proactive strategies make it unlikely that select TAs will be marginalized from the full assignment experience.</p> |

OPTION 3: EVIDENCE-BASED TEACHING (EBT) RESOURCE

| Criteria | Unfit for Catalyst | Revisions Needed | Publishable! |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Topic / Issue | The submission does not have clear focus, or it is overly redundant with EBT resources already published in the TPD Catalyst. Fixing these issues would require more redevelopment than is reasonable for a revision of this specific submission. | <p>There is a need for this EBT resource in the TPD Catalyst, but it could be improved to be maximally helpful.</p> <p>It may need a more clearly defined topic or issue to be more useful, or for its usefulness to be more obvious to eventual users.</p> <p>The topic may need to be revised or redirected to better complement existing resources, or else it may work best to merge this content with a prior EBT resource (as a credited supplement or revision).</p> | <p>The resource is crafted around a well-defined topic or issue in college or university teaching. It is obvious to users what it will cover and how it will be helpful to them.</p> <p>There is a need for this resource as its own entry in the TPD Catalyst: it fulfills an important gap in EBT resources that is not otherwise addressed, or it addresses a topic from a novel enough perspective to warrant its own entry.</p> |
| Alignment and Scope | There are serious disconnects between the stated topic and the content included, beyond what is reasonable for a revision of this specific submission. | <p>The insights and methods described are mostly aligned to the topic or issue, but they could be improved in one or more respects.</p> <p>Important aspects of the topic may be omitted; conversely, some information may be superfluous, redundant, or better suited to a resource on a different topic.</p> | <p>The insights and methods described are directly related to the stated topic.</p> <p>The resource provides a <i>comprehensive</i> and <i>cohesive</i> analysis of the topic or issue. Everything belongs and nothing essential is missing.</p> |
| Clarity and Practicality | The insights or methods may need far more detail, clarity, justification, or practicality to make them helpful to users. Addressing these concerns would require more redevelopment than is reasonable for a revision of this specific submission. | <p>In places, the content may need to be expanded, clarified, reorganized, or better justified to be most insightful and helpful.</p> <p>The resource may need to deal less in generalities, conveying more advice as <i>actionable</i> strategies that readers can directly apply (or easily adapt) to their own teaching.</p> | <p>Advice on the topic is clear, pointed, and practical: it is easy to understand, focused, well-organized, and detailed while remaining concise.</p> <p>It provides users <i>actionable</i> teaching strategies that they can directly apply (or easily adapt) to their own teaching.</p> |
| Scholarly Rigor | Reviewers or users may reasonably argue that the content is out of step with contemporary inclusive and evidence-based practices. Fixing these issues would require more redevelopment than is reasonable for a revision of this specific submission. | Reviewers or users may have some concerns about the content's consistency with contemporary inclusive and evidence-based teaching practices, but these can be reasonably resolved by specific revisions. | Reviewers and users will reliably agree that the content is consistent with contemporary inclusive and evidence-based practices. |
| Accessibility and Inclusion | Reviewers and users may have serious and justifiable concerns about the content. It may contain advice that is counterproductive or even marginalizing for certain individual or institutional contexts; it may perpetuate biases or misconceptions that negatively impact the educational goals of the discipline and higher education as a whole. | <p>The content could be improved in one or more ways, to make it more widely accessible and inclusive across diverse teacher, student, course, and institutional contexts.</p> <p>Reviewers and users may have reasonable concerns related to some of the nine principles of Universal Design for Instruction</p> | <p>As issues of accessibility and inclusion pertain to specific aspects of the topic, the resource conveys tried-and-true strategies for engaging and supporting the diversity of learner identities, experiences, and abilities.</p> <p>The resource is also mindful of the diversity of teachers who may use it. While no teaching advice is</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>(UDI), as they pertain to the insights and advice discussed in the resource.</p> <p>More effort may need to be made to address variation in how some aspects of the topic may apply to different educational settings than the author’s primary context.</p> | <p>likely to apply equally in all educational settings, there is an obvious effort to provide insights that are inclusive and relevant across the diversity of teacher, course, and institutional contexts.</p> <p>(Authors and Reviewers are both encouraged to consult the nine principles of Universal Design for Instruction [UDI] for specific facets to consider when evaluating educational accessibility and inclusion.)</p> |
|--|--|---|--|