

Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology
RTP CRITERIA FOR FACULTY SESSIONAL LECTURERS

TEACHING CRITERIA

Introduction

This document outlines the procedures, criteria, and standards for advancement in Teaching Sessional Lecturers I (SL) to Sessional Lectures II

The criteria described in this document are evaluated according to a seven-point scale ranging from extremely poor to outstanding as follows:

Basic RPT Evaluation Scale.	Points.
<i>Outstanding</i>	7
<i>Very Good</i>	6
<i>Good</i>	5
<i>Adequate</i>	4
<i>Poor</i>	3
<i>Very Poor</i>	2
<i>Extremely Poor</i>	1

The Department's Renewal, Tenure, Promotion, and (RTP) Committee will use the UCAPT Form as the basis for its recommendations for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion, in the following flexible manner to assess the candidate holistically:

- Excellence (Very Good/Outstanding: 6-7 on 7-point scale)
- High Competence (Good/Very Good: 5-6 on 7-point scale)
- Competence (Adequate/Good: 4-5 on 7-point scale)
- Competence not shown (Extremely Poor/Poor: 1-4 on 7-point scale)

In the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology, a favorable recommendation for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion for Sessional Lecturers from I to II must conform **Competence** in the 7 criteria in Section 4.

The Department recognizes the limitations of the validity and reliability of the SET scores in the assessment of teaching and will take into consideration the nature of courses taught. In general, therefore, possible data sources for evaluations of a candidate's teaching will include:

- (a) Relevant sections in UWindsor Teaching Dossier template on teaching statement/philosophy; teaching practices; course outlines; sample course material; peer feedback or review of course materials; student comments and supervision; teaching awards or nominations; pedagogical

publications and participation in professional development workshops; and adoption of teaching/curriculum materials by others.

(b) SET Questions and scores.

And (c) AAU Head's evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness in promoting students' academic pursuits and stimulating interest in continued study of the discipline; his or her day-to-day availability to students including the demands placed on him or her by students and his or her willingness to assist them outside of formal class hours; and any investigated student complaints and/or unusual patterns of withdrawal from classes.

Evaluation Procedure

1. The candidate is encouraged to submit a teaching dossier that:

1.1 Describes his or her teaching philosophy, practices and development in a statement of teaching approach; and describes his or her teaching assignment/student supervision, teaching-related activities and teaching-related publications and other professional contributions in a statement of teaching contributions.

1.2 Includes at least one annotated course outline that articulates how the course design realizes, assesses, and aligns with the approved learning outcomes.

1.3 Elaborates on contextual factors of the teaching assignment, such as, number of assistants, lab hours, and/or training provided to assistants; developed- or substantially-revised courses; levels of teaching engaged in; courses inside or outside areas of core expertise; number of departments taught in; mix of courses, whether online/face-to-face, required/optional, large/small enrolment, or experiential learning; and courses that are of an unusual nature in their programs or the number of new preparations within the period under review.

2. The candidate's SET scores will normally be in the 'adequate' to 'good' range (i.e., 4.5 to 5.0) or above. Consideration will be given to the type of courses and/or the demonstrated efforts by the candidate to improve or be creative with pedagogy.

3. The candidate is encouraged to have a review of their teaching undertaken by the Centre for Teaching and Learning, a departmental colleague or other professional through a peer-collaboration network for the purposes of advancement.

4. The candidate's teaching excellence using the 7-point scale described above will be assessed with the following seven criteria.

4.1 Planning, development and preparation of learning activities, including learning resources and materials for a course, and coordination, involvement or leadership in curriculum design and development. Elements may include the preparation of course materials; planned learning activities designed to develop students' learning; sound knowledge of the course content and

material; and detailed learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment in course outlines.

4.2 Teaching methods that enhance student learning, including capabilities for lecturing and instructing in classroom, on-line and/or in-field undergraduate and graduate teaching, and supervision of student research. Indicative standards include a learning-centred approach to teaching; demonstrated understanding of specific aspects of effective teaching and learning support methods; clarity of communication and explanation; stimulation of interest; encouragement of appropriate student-faculty interaction; encouragement of appropriate student-student interaction; and support for students to develop and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes.

4.3 Assessment and feedback to students, including design and execution of assessment tasks that are aligned with student learning outcomes, and the provision of appropriate and timely feedback. Indicative standards include quality and clarity of assessment tools; alignment with learning outcomes; appropriate level of difficulty; and timely and constructive feedback for students.

4.4 Developing effective environments, student support, and guidance, including activities for the creation of an engaging learning environment for students that supports transition and the development of learning communities that account for and encourage equity and diversity. Indicative standards include the creation of effective learning environments in classroom/online/work placement etc.; direction of students to appropriate support and services; demonstration of respect for students and from students to others; and availability for consultation via email, online, face-to-face or telephone.

4.5.1 Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities in support of learning. Indicative standards include an engagement in professional development related to teaching and learning related to discipline and/or participation in teaching and learning conferences/forums; and incorporation of teaching and learning scholarship into teaching practice and curriculum development.

4.5.2 Inclusion of discipline-based research in the curriculum and engagement of students in pedagogically-sound discipline-based research. Evidence may include the use of current disciplinary research in curriculum and teaching activities; development of learning activities and course work that supports student engagement in research; and development of student understanding of the research culture and research skills of the discipline.

4.5.3 Incorporation of professional, community and/or work-based practice and experiences into teaching practice and the curriculum. Evidence may include the use of authentic case studies, and integration of community experience and/or partnerships in teaching.

4.6 Improvement-oriented self-assessment and continuing professional development. Evidence may include an engagement in professional development activities related to teaching and

learning; participation in teaching-related professional development; and self-evaluation leading to changes in teaching practice.

4.7.1 Professional and personal effectiveness. Evidence for professional qualities include management of the teaching role; demonstration of effective preparation and prioritisation; commitment to continuing professional development in discipline; positive responses to opportunities and new approaches; effective communication in both formal and informal contexts; and application of professional ethical practices in work and in teaching contexts.

4.7.2 Professional and personal effectiveness. Evidence for personal qualities include an approach to teaching with enthusiasm, passion and confidence; demonstration of resilience and perseverance in the face of obstacles; time management of self and work to ensure others are not delayed in their work; self-reflective evaluation of practices and relationships; and commitment and interest in students and their learning.

Schedule

According to Article 55:11 of the Collective Agreement, a “Sessional Lecturer 1 ... will not be eligible for promotion for five (5) years from the date of appointment as a Sessional Lecturer under this Article 55”. Note that advancement from SLII to SLIII has no corresponding schedule in 55:11. Regardless, the annual contract for almost all SL begins on September 1 of an academic year, and so, a candidate for advancement will submit their application prior to September 15 for an advancement to take effect in the subsequent academic year.

Note finally that “advancement from Sessional Lecturer II (sic) shall be on the recommendation of the AAU on the basis of job derived criteria developed by the AAU with regard to teaching duties of Sessional Lecturers and approved by the Provost” (55:07), and the SAC AAU’s criteria are the ones described in this document. These procedures used to evaluate teaching performance of SL in the AAU are the same as for evaluating the teaching performance of faculty members in the AAU (55:07).