OBJECTIVE OF THIS GUIDE:
To provide a detailed explanation of the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) Local Evaluation Committee, including their processes, responsibilities, and expectations.

DEFINITION:
The Local Evaluation Committee is responsible for the local operations of the Co-Curricular Record (CCR). The Local Evaluation Committee evaluates activity submissions and determines if an activity is approved, denied, or returned for further review, and may defer submissions to the Institutional Evaluation Committee if needed. They confirm and recommend validators, and prepare information for formal appeals when needed. The Student Development Officer (SDO), Student Organizations & CCR acts as the CCR Local Administrator who has the appropriate systems authority to upload information for an activity.

ROLE OF LOCAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
Under the guidance of the CCR Chief Executive and CCR Local Administrator, members of the Local Evaluation Committee evaluate activity submissions and determine if an activity is approved, denied, or returned for further review.

BASIC STRUCTURE:
## CCR ROLE DEFINITIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Validator: U of T Staff or Faculty Member** | • Validate participation to completion  
• Maintain attendance record/system/database/etc.  
• Assist submitter to fill out application (if needed)  
• Exercise professional judgment  
• Hear informal appeals  
• Advocate at the program level |
| **Reviewer: SDO - Student Organizations & CCR** | • Optional step: local expert; CCR Local Administrator may also be Reviewer  
• Screen submissions before it goes to the Local Evaluation Committee and help submissions succeed  
• Assist students to find validators for activities  
• Knowledge of co-curricular curriculum/matrix of activities  
• Validate if validator cannot |
| **CCR Local Administrator: SDO - Student Organizations & CCR** | • Input decisions of Local Evaluation Committee  
• Gather submissions  
• Organize schedule for Local Evaluation Committee  
• Report to the Local CCR Chief Executive  
• Systems expert  
• Validate if reviewer/validator cannot  
• Assigned other duties as required  
• Update Local Evaluation Committee list  
• Liaise with Implementation Committee |
| **Local Evaluation Committee** | • Evaluate submissions and determine if an activity is approved, denied, or returned to reviewer  
• Recommend validators and confirm validators  
• Defer submissions to Institutional Evaluation Committee if needed  
• Appoint CCR Local Administrator(s) who has the appropriate systems authority to upload information for an activity and designate the validator  
• Prepare information for formal appeal  
• Committee is representative  
• Conduct three year reviews as identified by the Institutional Evaluation Committee  
• Membership can be condensed, expanded, delegated at the discretion of the CCR Chief Executive  
• May consult with colleagues or CCR Coordinator |
| **Local CCR Chief Executive: Assistant Dean, Students & International Initiatives** | • Appoint Local Evaluation Committee  
• Sit in on appeals at the Local Evaluation Committee level  
• Sit on Institutional Evaluation Committee, or appoints someone to sit  
• Assigned other duties as required, such as marketing and communication  
• Communication and makes recommendations to the Institutional Evaluation Committee  
• Advocate at the local level for the CCR |
| **Institutional Evaluation Committee** | • Hear submissions for CCR activities that the Local Evaluation Committee either needs support or does not want to make the decision on an annual basis, review activities that have been accepted or denied to ensure consistency  
  • Initiate three year review, and then review submissions from Local Evaluation Committees  
  • Gatekeepers of internal best practices |
| **CCR Resolution Board** | • Hear formal appeals in the appeal process  
  • Formally respond to the applicant and Local Evaluation Committee and provide in camera/confidential feedback to the Local Evaluation Committee  
  • Provide recommendations to the Advisory Committee on appeals and provide an annual report on decisions made  
  • Anonymous case reports posted online or upon request |
| **Implementation Committee** | • Heavily systems driven in the first year  
  o Consolidate feedback on the system and advocate for updates  
  • Conduct the training of the criteria, evaluations, etc.  
  o Liaise with CCR Local Administrator  
  • People who have extensive knowledge of the CCR and can be used as a resource  
  • Promotion, communication, and marketing  
  • Define and implement the Phases of the CCR  
  • Made up of 2-3 people from each of the working groups  
  • Exercise discretion on behalf of the Advisory Committee, as set by the Advisory Committee  
  • Progress reports for the Advisory Committee |
| **Advisory Committee** | • Maintain the (institutional) integrity through high level strategic policy direction to the CCR Resolution Board, Implementation Committee, Institutional Evaluation Committee  
  • Gatekeepers of cross-institutional best practices  
  • Act as a resource for the CCR Resolution Board  
  • Could potentially act as the CCR Resolution Board  
  • Advocate at the institutional level for the CCR  
  • Develop Terms of Reference for CCR positions/boards and appoint membership |
UTM LOCAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE:

Under discretion of the Local CCR Chief Executive, the UTM Local Evaluation Committee is made up of:

- Local CCR Chief Executive (Assistant Dean, Students and International Initiatives, Student Affairs)
- CCR Local Administrator & Reviewer (Student Development Officer - Student Organizations & CCR, Department of Student Life)
- Four student representatives
- Four staff members (not including the Local Chief Executive or Local Administrator)
- One faculty member

Staff, faculty, and student representatives will rotate on a two-year term, meaning two members of the student and staff constituencies on the committee will return each year, creating consistency with expectations year to year.

SELECTION OF LOCAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

When searching for new staff or faculty committee members, the Local CCR Chief Executive and the CCR Local Administrator will first review the current committee to understand the representation across the multitude of departments. The Local CCR Chief Executive will contact departments without current representation to be represented on the committee. If the committee positions still are not filled, the Local CCR Chief Executive will send out an e-mail call out to all staff or faculty to see if other staff or faculty members are interested.

When searching for student representatives, positions will be posted through the Career Learning Network (CLN). Positions will run on a two-year term, unless otherwise stated. Fourth year, or graduate students in their final year will not be excluded from consideration for the posted positions. Students who are selected to be on the Local Evaluation Committee will have demonstrated commitment to improving the student experience and previous experience with the CCR.

Those who are new to the committee must meet for a CCR orientation with the CCR Local Administrator to gain basic training on the CCR and learn about the responsibilities of the Local Evaluation Committee.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Terms of Reference
The main responsibility of the Local Evaluation Committee is to evaluate submissions based on a number of criteria found in the evaluation checklist. The committee will meet on average once a month to go through the submissions and discuss any questions, comments, or concerns. Based on the committee’s discussion they will decide to approve, deny, or suggest edits. The CCR Local Administrator will then communicate the committee’s decision to the validator who submitted the opportunity. If the committee recommends edits before approval, the committee will look at the submission again once the validator makes the necessary edits.
**Time Commitment**
The Local Evaluation Committee meets approximately once a month based on the number of submissions. The meeting will be administered by the CCR Local Administrator who is responsible for setting up the meeting, and giving the committee the necessary information to help them make informed decisions. Committee members will be required to review the submissions before attending the Local Evaluation Committee meeting. The CCR Local Administrator will distribute the information to the committee approximately one week in advance of the meeting. Depending on the number of submissions the individual review could take up to one hour and the Local Evaluation Committee meetings go from one-two hours.

**GENERAL TIMELINE:**

1. **Validators (Staff/Faculty)** submit a CCR submission.
2. CCR Local Administrator/Reviewer reviews the submission and communicates any suggestions/edits to make before submitting to the committee.
3. Once the CCR Local Administrator/Reviewer has at least 4-5 submissions, they communicate a meeting day/time/location to the Local Evaluation Committee.
4. At least one week before the meeting, the CCR Local Administrator/Reviewer distributes the submissions to the committee for review.
5. The Local Evaluation Committee members review the submissions then come prepared to the committee meeting to talk about any comments/suggestions/concerns.
EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR CCR LOCAL COMMITTEE:

In approving submissions the Local CCR Committee should be evaluating the following:

1. Are there intentional learning outcomes/competencies/skills?

   Learning and development outcomes must be embedded in every recognized activity and must be clearly outlined for students. These activities should allow students to reflect on the knowledge, skills, and values acquired. They must also provide the opportunity for intentional learning and furthering development.

2. Does the activity provide students with the opportunity for active engagement?

   Students must play an active role in their learning and the activities must be clearly linked to desirable learning outcomes. Students must participate in an activity beyond listening and retaining information, and demonstrate higher-level learning/participatory action as defined in the validation process requirements.

3. Description of the role/position/activity to appear on the Co-Curricular Record:

   This is the MOST CRITICAL question to focus on. This will appear on the actual record. Please be sure that it is written in PAST tense so it makes sense to external audiences. First sentence should briefly describe the activity, with the second and third sentences describing the student’s role in the activity. This should be no longer than 300 characters.

4. Must have chosen up to six of the most relevant competencies and describe how the student will acquire and demonstrate these competencies:

   Students will select up to three competencies that will appear on the actual record. Check to see what competencies have been selected and see if there is a reasonable correlation between the competencies chosen and the description of how the student will acquire these competencies. Please ask yourself if the explanation refers to “how” the students will develop or refine the specific competency. Usually this includes specific examples of roles or tasks.

5. This activity/program offers training, reflection assessment/evaluation:

   Each activity needs to have a reflection component described in the submission. This can be as simple as a debrief discussion at the end of an activity, a guided reflection, a transition report, a meeting, etc..

6. Does the activity outline what is required from the student to have this activity/program validated? (number of hours, meetings, activities, etc.).

   Check to see if there is some level of reasonable specification, which means students shouldn’t be required to attend 10/10 meetings or 2/10. This will be dependent on the activity, but the goal is that each activity will have opportunity for learning and development and this question is to ensure that this occurs.
EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR CCR LOCAL ADMINISTRATOR/REVIEWER:

In advance to sending the submissions to the committee, the CCR Local Administrator/Reviewer should be making necessary edits through communicating to the validator for the following (along with the Evaluation Checklist for the Local Evaluation Committee):

Minimum Criteria Requirements:

1. Is there clear attachment to the University with a recognized faculty or staff member?
   
   An activity is considered ‘attached’ when it is recognized by the University and there is an accepted University of Toronto validator. There are valuable experiences outside the university that contribute to a student’s development, however only activities that are clearly attached to and recognized by the University of Toronto may be validated on the CCR, which bears the University seal.

2. Does the activity meet the validation process requirements?
   
   Activities eligible for the CCR must have a recognized validator, which must be a U of T staff or faculty member. Activities that occur on an annual basis must be reviewed by the validator each Fall to ensure that contact information, activity descriptions and competencies are updated.

3. Activity/Program Name
   
   This will be on the record. Please ensure that this is capitalized and that the role/position is not included.

4. How do students sign up for this activity/program?
   
   The submission should note how/when/where to sign up.

5. Description and requirements/intended audience of activity/program:
   
   This is where the applicant can broadly describe the program, and note the intended audience. For instance, is this program for students in a particular year, program, department, or campus? What kinds of skills or previous experiences should students have?

6. Title of role/position to appear on the Co-Curricular Record:
   
   This will be on the record. Please ensure that this is capitalized, and that the name of the activity/program is not included. For example, Correct: Organizer vs. Wrong: Leadership Conference Organizer.