

# Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

Teaching Evaluation Criteria: Working Document

February 29, 2016

Approved by Provost's office – June 2021

## Preamble and General Procedures

Teaching and teaching-related activities (such as participation in CTL workshops or other forms of professional development related to teaching) will be the sole basis on which Sessional Lecturers shall be reviewed and considered for promotion. Research and administrative work shall not be considered. Candidates shall be assessed using SET scores, the head's performance reviews, course outlines, letters of reference, and any teaching dossier information provided by the candidate. The latter may include written comments from students, evidence of professional development related to teaching, sample assignments, sample grading rubrics, or other materials related to teaching. In the case of sessional lecturers having course assignments outside the philosophy department, the standards herein are understood to apply to courses taught in the philosophy department. Performance in other departments or for other programs will be evaluated by the standards of those departments or programs.

In total, there are seven criteria that may be used in evaluating Sessional Lectures. They are listed below together with the possible sources of data (not taken to be exhaustive). The overall SET instructor score is included in the assessment of some of these criteria, as is reference to the department mean instructor scores. The way that (a) the mean instructor score will be calculated and (b) the department means will be calculated are discussed at the end of this document.

Evaluation according to the criteria mentioned below is subject to contextual factors and special considerations. See the end of the document for an example of how such considerations could become relevant. The discussion there is not meant to be exhaustive of the relevant contextual factors that could come into play.

Adherence to the requirements of the collective agreement constitutes a necessary condition for a successful review at any level. These include (but are not limited to) activities such as making oneself available to students outside of class (for example, through regular office hours). Unusual patterns of withdraw, or documented and well-founded student complaints also would mitigate strongly against a successful review at any level.

## Sessional Lecturer III

With respect to Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, listed below, candidates will be expected to score Good or higher to be promoted to Sessional Lecturer III. They will be expected to score Good or higher with respect to at least one of Criteria 5 or 6 as well. With respect to Criterion 7, they will be expected to score Very Good to Outstanding.

Over and above performance reviews, candidates for Sessional Lecturer III will be evaluated using at least two further sources of information: a teaching dossier and SET scores. Other evidence may be used if applicable. Candidates shall provide the committee with a teaching dossier in which information relevant to assessing Criteria 1 through 7 will be included.

Subject to special considerations outlined at the end of this document, promotion to Sessional Lecturer III shall *normally* require that the mean SET instructor score not fall below the relevant department mean in *each* of the relevant categories (introductory and senior). There is no requirement to teach at all levels. An instructor's scores in introductory courses will be compared to the department mean for introductory courses; an instructor's scores in senior courses will be compared to the department mean for senior courses. Overall instructor scores are especially relevant in assessing for Criteria 2, 4, and 7. Candidates for Sessional Lecturer III will provide evidence of having undertaken activities related to their professional development as teachers. With respect to Criterion 7, where a score of very good to outstanding is expected, increases in student interest (as assessed by SET scores or other available information) will be looked at carefully. Provided

## Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

there are no extenuating contextual factors, increases in student interest (as measured by SETs) will be expected in more than 2/3 of the courses taught.

### Sessional Lecturer II

With respect to Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 listed below, candidates will be expected to score Good or higher to be promoted to Sessional Lecturer II. Criteria 5 and 6 will only be used if the applicant requests that they used. In the event that one of Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 or 7 receives a score of adequate, a score of Good or higher on Criteria 5 or 6 could compensate for one sub-Good score. A score of less than adequate on any of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 7 precludes promotion to SL II.

Over and above performance reviews, candidates for Sessional Lecturer III will be evaluated using at least two further sources of information: a teaching dossier and SET scores. Other evidence may be used if applicable. Candidates will provide the committee with a teaching dossier in which information relevant to assessing Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 will be included (and information relevant to Criteria 5 and 6 could be included at the applicant's discretion).

Subject to special considerations outlined at the end of this document, promotion to Sessional Lecturer II shall *normally* require that the mean SET instructor score not fall below the midway point between 5.0 and the relevant department mean in each of the course levels (introductory or senior) in which the instructor has taught. There is no requirement to teach at all levels. For example, if the relevant department mean for introductory courses is 5.9, then instructor scores for SL II should not normally fall below 5.45 (midway between 5.0 and 5.9). As above, introductory courses are compared to introductory courses, and senior courses are compared to senior courses. Overall instructor scores are especially relevant in assessing for Criteria 2, 4, and 7. With respect to Criterion 7, as well as stressing the SET instructor score, increases in student interest (as assessed by SET scores or other available information) will be looked at carefully. Provided there are no extenuating contextual factors, net increases in student interest (as measured by SETs) will be expected in more than 50 percent of the courses taught.

### Sessional Lecturer I

With respect to Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 listed below, candidates will be expected to score Adequate or higher to be hired at this rank. Criteria 5 and 6 will only be used if the applicant requests that they used. A score of less than adequate on any of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 7 would preclude an applicant from being hired at this rank. For the purpose of review, it would be considered less than adequate performance.

Over and above performance reviews, candidates for Sessional Lecturer I will be evaluated using at least two further sources of information: a teaching dossier and SET scores. Other evidence may be used if applicable. Candidates will provide the committee with a teaching dossier in which information relevant to assessing Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 will be included (and information relevant to Criteria 5 and 6 could be included at the applicant's discretion).

Subject to special considerations outlined at the end of this document, *normally*, the mean SET instructor score for both introductory and senior levels shall not fall below 5.0. As above, introductory courses are compared to introductory courses, and senior courses are compared to senior courses. Overall instructor scores are especially relevant in assessing for Criteria 2, 4, and 7. With respect to Criterion 7, mean instructor scores *below* 5.0 would *normally* be considered sufficient for ranking the applicant as less than adequate.

# Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

Criterion 1: Design and planning of learning activities		
<b>Planning, development and preparation of learning activities</b> , learning resources and materials for a course, course or degree program; including coordination, involvement or leadership in curriculum design and development		
Indicative Standards	Data Sources	UCAPT Categories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Preparation of course materials                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Planned learning activities designed to develop the students' learning</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Sound knowledge of the course content and material</li> <li>▪ Course outline clearly details learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment</li> </ul>	<p><b>Possible Data sources from relevant sections in UWindsor Teaching Dossier template:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Course outlines (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>)<sup>1</sup></li> <li>▪ Sample course material (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>, and appendices)</li> <li>▪ Peer feedback (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> <li>▪ Peer review of course materials by course/course coordinator (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> <li>▪ Evidence of Adoption of teaching/curriculum materials by others (A4, <i>Teaching-Related Activities</i>, A5, <i>Teaching-Related Publications and Other Contributions</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible data found in SET Questions:</b></p> <p><b>Course outlines</b></p> <p>B1. How effective was the course outline in communicating goals and requirements of the course? Learning outcomes alignment</p> <p>B2. How consistently did the stated course goals match what was being taught in the course?</p> <p><b>Organization of class</b></p> <p>A1. Presented material in an organized, well-planned manner</p> <p><b>Course materials</b></p> <p>B8. How well did the instructional materials (readings, audio-visual materials, etc) facilitate your learning?</p> <p>B9. How well did the instructional activities (lectures, labs, tutorials, practica, field trips etc) facilitate your learning?</p> <p>B10. How reasonable was the level of difficulty of the course material?</p> <p>B11. How reasonable was the volume of the work required in the course?</p>	<p><b>Consistent with UCAPT categories:</b></p> <p>A. Course outlines B. Organization of class C. Preparation for classes J. Appropriateness of material presented H. Quality of instructional materials I. Competency in course subject matter</p>

<sup>1</sup> Alphanumerics refer to the section in which this question is taking up in the 5-page teaching dossier brief. Relevant samples and documentary evidence may be contained in appendices to these sections as per the Teaching Dossier Guidelines.

# Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

Criterion 2: Teaching and supporting student learning		
Quality undergraduate teaching, including: lecturing, classroom, on-line, workshop, or other teaching activities. Being available to students for individual consultation.		
Indicative Standards	Data Sources	UCAPT Categories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Close attention to student learning</li> <li>▪ Clarity of communication and explanation</li> <li>▪ Stimulation of interest</li> <li>▪ Encouragement of appropriate student-faculty interaction</li> <li>▪ Encouragement of appropriate student-student interaction</li> <li>▪ Supports students to develop and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes</li> </ul>	<p><b>Possible data sources from relevant sections in UWindsor Teaching Dossier template:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teaching statement or philosophy (A1, <i>Teaching Philosophy</i>)</li> <li>▪ Teaching practices summary (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>)</li> <li>▪ Sample course activities and/or lessons (A2, <i>Teaching Practices, Appendices</i>)</li> <li>▪ Peer review of course materials by course/course coordinator (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)Peer review of classroom teaching by colleague (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> <li>▪ Student comments (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> <li>▪ Teaching awards or nominations (B3, <i>Teaching Awards or Nominations</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Relevant SET Questions</b></p> <p>A1. Presented material in an organized, informed manner            A2. used instructional time well            A3. explained content clearly with appropriate use of examples            A4. was a clear and effective speaker            A5. communicated enthusiasm and interest in the course material            A6. stimulated your interest in the subject and motivated your learning            A7. attended to students' questions and answered them clearly and effectively            A8. was open to students' comments and suggestions            A9. was sensitive to students' difficulties            A10. Was approachable for additional help            A11. Was accessible to student for individual consultation (in office hours, after class, open-door, by e-mail, phone)            A12. overall effectiveness of the instructor</p> <p>B13/B14. Your level of enthusiasm for taking this course at the time of initial registration/at the conclusion of the course</p>	<p>D. Clarity of Communication</p> <p>E. Ability to stimulate student interest</p> <p>F. Responsiveness to student questions and suggestions</p> <p>H. Quality of Instructional Materials</p> <p>**</p> <p>(i) effectiveness in promoting students' academic pursuits and stimulating interest in continued study of discipline</p>

## Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

Criterion 3: Assessment and giving feedback to students		
Design and execution of assessment tasks that are aligned with student learning outcomes and the provision of appropriate and timely feedback.		
Indicative Standards	Sources of Evidence	UCAPT Categories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality of assessment tools                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clarity</li> <li>▪ Alignment with learning outcomes</li> <li>▪ Appropriate level of difficulty</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Timely feedback is provided to students</li> <li>▪ Constructive feedback is provided to students</li> </ul>	<p><b>Possible data sources from relevant sections in UWindsor Teaching Dossier template:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teaching statement/philosophy (A1, <i>Teaching Philosophy</i>)</li> <li>▪ Teaching practices (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>)</li> <li>▪ Course outlines (showing alignment) (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>, appendices)</li> <li>▪ Sample assessments (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>, appendices)</li> <li>▪ Tools used in marking (e.g. rubrics) (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>, appendices)</li> <li>▪ Peer review of assessments and student work (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> <li>▪ Peer review of assessments and student work by course/course coordinator (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> <li>▪ Sample feedback/ comments to students (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>, appendices)</li> <li>▪ Development of assessment tools used by others (B4, <i>Teaching-Related Activities</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>SET Questions</b></p> <p>A10. Was approachable for additional help</p> <p>A11. Was accessible to student for individual consultation (in office hours, after class, open-door, by e-mail, phone)</p> <p>B4. How well did the methods of evaluation (e.g., papers, participation, assignments, tests) reflect the subject matter</p> <p>B5. How fair was the grading of work?</p> <p>B6. How timely was the grading of student work?</p> <p>B7. How helpful were comments and feedback on student work?</p>	<p>Quality of evaluation procedures</p>

# Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

## Criterion 4: Developing effective environments, student support and guidance

Activities related to the creation of an engaging learning environment for students. Including; supporting transition, and the development of learning communities that account for and encourage equity and diversity.

Indicative Standards	Sources of Evidence	UCAPT categories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Creates effective learning environments (in classroom/ online/ etc.)</li> <li>▪ Directs students to appropriate support and services</li> <li>▪ Demonstrates respect and requires students to demonstrate respect for others</li> <li>▪ Availability for consultation (e.g. email, online, face-to-face or telephone)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Possible data sources from relevant sections in UWindsor Teaching Dossier template:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teaching statement/philosophy (A1, <i>Teaching Philosophy</i>)</li> <li>▪ Teaching practices summary (A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>)</li> <li>▪ Teaching Development (A3, <i>Teaching Development</i>)</li> <li>▪ Course outlines and early course materials or welcomes including LMS use (A2, <i>Teaching Practices, Appendices</i>)</li> <li>▪ Peer observation of class (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> <li>▪ Sample feedback/ comments to and from students (A2, <i>Teaching Practices, Appendices; C, Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>SET Questions</b></p> <p>A8. Was open to students' comments and suggestions            A9. Was sensitive to student difficulties            A10. Was approachable for additional help            A11. Was accessible to students for individual consultation            A12. overall effectiveness of the instructor            B12. The value of the overall learning experience was</p>	<p>F. Responsiveness to students' questions and suggestions</p> <p>K Availability to students</p>

# Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

## Criterion 5: Integration of professional activities with teaching and in support of learning

### 1: Teaching and learning research incorporated into teaching practice

Indicative Standards	Sources of Evidence	UCAPT categories
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Engagement in professional development related to teaching and learning (including engagement in teaching and learning scholarship related to discipline and/or participation in teaching and learning conferences/ forums)</li> <li>▪ Incorporates teaching and learning scholarship into teaching practice and curriculum development</li> </ul>	<p><b>Possible data sources from relevant sections in UWindsor Teaching Dossier template:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teaching Development (A3, <i>Teaching Development</i>)</li> <li>▪ Generated record of CTL workshop and course engagement from CTL registration data base (A3, <i>Teaching Development, Appendix</i>)</li> <li>▪ Participation in American (or other) Philosophical Association pedagogy workshops</li> <li>▪ Excerpts from course/course materials demonstrating incorporation of current T &amp; L research into teaching activities (A3, <i>Teaching Development, Appendix</i>)</li> <li>▪ References and letters from peers (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> </ul>	

# Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

## Criterion 6: Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development

Criterion 6: Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development	
Indicative Standards	Indicative Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Engages in professional development activities related to teaching and learning</li> <li>▪ Participation in teaching related professional development</li> <li>▪ Self-evaluation leading to changes in teaching practice</li> </ul>	<p><b>Possible data sources from relevant sections in UWindsor Teaching Dossier template:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teaching statement/philosophy and teaching practices -- examples of the impact of the change in practice, evidence of reflective practice ((A1, <i>Teaching Philosophy</i>; A2, <i>Teaching Practices</i>)</li> <li>▪ Generated record of CTL workshop and course engagement from CTL registration data base (A3, <i>Teaching Development, Appendices</i>)</li> <li>▪ Student surveys, comments and feedback (C, <i>Teaching Feedback</i>)</li> <li>▪ Evidence of changes in student, peer evaluation (A3, <i>Teaching Development</i>)</li> <li>▪ Details of roles or involvement in teaching and learning related activities(B4, <i>Teaching-Related Activities</i>)</li> <li>▪ Details of contribution to the professional development, mentoring of others, and outcomes (B4, <i>Teaching-Related Activities</i>; B5, <i>Teaching-Related Publications and Other Professional Contributions</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>CV Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Professional development or other initiatives undertaken, duration, changes made as a consequence (A3, <i>Teaching Development</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>SET Questions</b></p> <p>A8. Was open to students' comments and suggestions            A9. Was sensitive to students' difficulties</p>



# Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

Criterion 7: Professional and overall effectiveness		
Indicative Standards	Indicative Evidence	UPCAPT CATEGORIES
<p><b>Professional Qualities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is aware of and consciously developing professional qualities of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking responsibility for teaching role</li> <li>• Demonstrating effective preparation and prioritisation</li> <li>• Responding positively to opportunities and new approaches</li> <li>• Communicating effectively in both formal and informal contexts</li> <li>• Application of professional ethical practices in work and in teaching contexts</li> <li>• Approaching teaching with enthusiasm, passion and confidence</li> <li>• Demonstrating resilience and perseverance in the face of obstacles</li> <li>• Demonstrating self-reflective evaluation of practices and relationships</li> <li>• Demonstrating commitment and interest in students and their learning</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Possible data sources from relevant sections in UWindsor Teaching Dossier template:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Letters of reference and/or thanks (<i>C, Teaching Feedback, Appendices</i>)</li> <li>▪ Industry/professional awards (<i>B3, Teaching Awards or Nominations</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>CV Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Professional development undertaken, including CTL (<i>A3, Teaching Development</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>AAU Head Evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the candidate's effectiveness in promoting students' academic pursuits and stimulating interest in continued study of the discipline (<i>A2, Teaching Practices</i>)</li> <li>▪ the candidate's day-to-day availability to students; and the "demands" placed on him/her by students and the candidate's willingness to assist students outside of formal class hours (<i>A2, Teaching Practices</i>)</li> <li>• statement regarding any investigated student complaints, unusual patterns of withdrawal from candidate's classes (<i>A3, Teaching Development</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>SET Questions</b></p> <p>A5. Communicated enthusiasm and interest in the course material</p> <p>A6. stimulated interest in the subject matter and motivated learning</p> <p>A12. overall effectiveness of the instructor</p> <p>B13/14. Your level of enthusiasm for taking this course at the time of initial registration/at the conclusion of the course</p>	<p>I.B) AAU Head's Evaluation</p>

# Philosophy Sessional Lecturer Evaluation Criteria

## Department Means

Above, there are references to *department means*. This section outlines how they are to be computed. “Introductory courses” designates first and second year courses; “senior courses” designates third and fourth year courses. The department mean for introductory courses will be arrived at by computing the mean average instructor score for all sections of first and second year courses (except for 34-226) taught by regular fulltime faculty. The department mean for senior courses will be arrived at by computing the mean instructor score for all sections of third and fourth year courses taught by regular fulltime faculty. The standards below are defined relative to the department means, which will be recalculated after every performance review (so the standard is reset after every review). To insure that Sessional Lecturers know what standard they will be held to, they shall be provided with the department means for introductory and senior courses for the five year period *before* the period under review. If there has been a change in the relevant department means *during* the period under review, that will be taken into consideration only if it is in the interests of the individual under review. The mean instructor scores for the candidate will be computed using the candidate’s SET instructor scores obtained *after* the previous review (or in the case of a first review, since the initial appointment).

## Contextual Factors and Special Consideration

Special consideration will be given for first time preparations. It is understood that these courses are not always fully representative of an instructor’s abilities. Also, special consideration shall be given for courses where (a) the mean regular fulltime instructor score for the course is 10% or more below the department mean for the level of that course and (b) that course makes up a disproportional part of a sessional lecturer’s teaching load. For example, if the mean regular fulltime instructor score for course 34-1xx is 5.2, and the first year department mean is 5.9, and 34-1xx makes up more than 33% of an instructor’s assigned courses, then that shall be taken into consideration. If the applicant believes there are other contextual factors worthy of consideration, these should be raised in consultation with the Department Head and should be included in the Teaching Dossier.