

## Philosophy Department Rubric for Appendix H (2024)

<b>Posted Course/Tutorial:</b>		
<b>Date of Assessment:</b>		
<b>Name of Candidate:</b>		
<b>Information Provided:</b> <i>Ex. PCAF, CAF, CV, Dossier, Ref, Official File, Evals</i>		
<b>A. i. Does the candidate have the required academic and/or professional qualifications as posted?</b> <i>If No, then the PTAC is required to discontinue the evaluation.</i>		
<b>A. ii. Does the candidate have the relevant qualifications and experience to teach the course?</b> <i>If No, then the PTAC is not required to continue the evaluation.</i>		
<b>Section B – Total 50 points</b>		
<b>B.(i) Up to 30 points for “Currency and mastery of the subject matter”</b>		
Additional degrees, past course syllabi, professional experience, scholarly activity, creative work, and other discipline-specific activities can be considered in this category. <i>Each assessment factor must be relevant to the posted course</i> and no assessment tool used to determine currency and mastery of the subject matter may rely exclusively on one criterion. (Appendix H notes). These values must be discrete values as in the table below (i.e., 30, 20, 15, 10, 0). No partial values.		
<b>Level</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Assessment Factors Relevant to the Posted Course</b>
Excellent	30	Demonstrates evidence of at least <b>three</b> of the following, <i>in the posted course’s field</i> :
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one published peer-reviewed monograph or edited/co-edited collection</li> <li>• At least three peer-reviewed articles or book chapters</li> <li>• At least one of the above publications is in marginal and/or non-Euro-Western Philosophy</li> <li>• At least four academic conference presentations (excluding commentaries)</li> <li>• Major external funding for research received during or after PhD</li> <li>• Dissertation</li> <li>• Post-doc</li> </ul>
Very Good	20	Demonstrates evidence of at least <b>two</b> of the following, <i>in the posted course’s field</i> :
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one published peer-reviewed monograph or edited/co-edited collection</li> <li>• At least two peer-reviewed articles or book chapters</li> <li>• At least one of the above publications is in marginal and/or non-Euro-Western Philosophy</li> <li>• At least three academic conference presentations (excluding commentaries)</li> <li>• Dissertation</li> <li>• Post-doc</li> </ul>

Good	15	Demonstrates evidence of at least <b>one</b> of the following, <i>in the posted course's field</i> :
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One peer-reviewed article or book chapter</li> <li>• Two academic conference presentations (excluding commentaries)</li> <li>• Dissertation</li> <li>• Post-doc</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	10	Evidence of <b>one</b> or more of the following, <i>in the posted course's field</i> :
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One academic conference presentation (excluding commentaries)</li> <li>• One or more book reviews published in a peer-reviewed academic journal</li> </ul>
Poor/No Evidence	0	Does not meet the criteria for "Satisfactory"
<b>B.(ii) Up to 10 points for "Previous teaching or tutorial or lab experience in the posted or similar or substantially similar* course(s)"</b>		
<p>The PTAC will award full points for Laurier seniority points in the posted course as well as partial points for courses taught elsewhere. Partial points may also be awarded for relevant teaching in another delivery mode (e.g., tutorials, labs, online) taught at Laurier or elsewhere.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full points for Laurier seniority points: 1 Laurier seniority point per same or substantially similar* course</li> <li>• Partial points: 0.5 point per similar* or substantially similar* course elsewhere, or similar* course at Laurier</li> </ul> <p>This section allows for partial points for the table; they do not need to be discrete as in B. (i).</p>		
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Assessment Factors Relevant to the Posted Course</b>
		Candidate has seniority points as defined by the Collective Agreement, in the posted course or a <i>substantially similar*</i> course. (Max 10)
		Candidate taught <i>similar*</i> or <i>substantially similar*</i> course at another recognized post-secondary institution. Candidate taught <i>similar*</i> course at Laurier. (0.5 each)
<b>B.(iii) Up to 10 points for "Ability to perform the duties of the course"</b>		
<p>This may include an assessment of the candidate's ability, from courses taught at Laurier or elsewhere, to teach in a specific format (e.g., lecture, lab, tutorial, seminar) or modality (e.g., online, hybrid), various class sizes, or with specific equipment or platforms; and to develop course materials including learning objectives, student assessments, etc. Considering the creativity of the applicant's course design(s), the sophistication and diversity of their course material(s), experience with relevant modalities and class sizes, and the applicant's success in identifying and achieving their pedagogical objectives, the following scores shall be awarded:</p> <p>These must be discrete values as in the table below (as determined by Philosophy): i.e. 10, 6, 3, 0; no partial values.</p>		
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Assessment Factors Relevant to the Posted Course</b>
	10	Fulfills <b>all</b> of the following aspects of course delivery:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same year level</li> <li>• Same format (lecture, seminar)</li> <li>• Same modality (in-person, remote, hybrid)</li> <li>• Similar class size</li> <li>• Appropriate course materials relevant to posted course</li> <li>• Very good course evaluations for the past 4 years in posted or substantially similar* course</li> </ul>

	7	Fulfills <b>four to five</b> of the following aspects of course delivery:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same year level</li> <li>• Same format (lecture, seminar)</li> <li>• Same modality (in-person, remote, hybrid)</li> <li>• Similar class size</li> <li>• Appropriate course materials relevant to posted course</li> <li>• Good or very good course evaluations for the past 4 years in posted or substantially similar* course</li> </ul>
	3	Fulfills <b>three</b> of the following aspects of course delivery:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same year level</li> <li>• Same format (lecture, seminar)</li> <li>• Same modality (in-person, remote, hybrid)</li> <li>• Similar class size</li> <li>• Appropriate course materials relevant to posted course</li> <li>• Good or very good course evaluations for the past 4 years in posted or substantially similar* course</li> </ul>
	0	<b>Fewer than three</b> of the above aspects of course delivery.
<b>Total Score for Section B</b>		<i>If the score after b) is less than 25, then the PTAC is not required to continue the evaluation.</i>
<b>Section C - Teaching qualifications (not specific to the course). Total 30 points</b>		
<b>C.(i)A.</b> Total WLU seniority points, <b>other than in the posted course or a substantially similar* course</b> (only include seniority points not already counted in section B.(ii); Note: C.(i) and (ii) taken together can be a max 15 points only.		
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>WLU Seniority points in philosophy courses NOT similar* or substantially similar* to posted course</b>
		One point per seniority point.
<b>C.(i)B.</b> If A is less than 15 points:		
<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Philosophy courses taught elsewhere NOT similar* or substantially similar* to the posted course (max. 10 in this section. C(i)A and C(i)B cannot add up to more than 15 points).</b>
		One point for each philosophy course taught elsewhere at a recognized post-secondary institution that is NOT similar* or substantially similar* to the posted course.
<b>C.(ii) Assessment of teaching skills, including teaching-related transferrable skills demonstrated outside a teaching context.</b>		
The assessment of the candidate’s teaching experience shall be based on the candidate’s CV, student course surveys under Article 19, or the equivalent from another institution, and any other information submitted by the candidate. No assessment of teaching qualifications may rely exclusively or primarily on student questionnaires or student opinions. These values must be discrete values as in the table below (i.e., 15, 10, 0). No partial values.		

Level	Score	Assessment Factors Relevant to Teaching Skills, Including Teaching Related Transferable Skills
Very Good	15	Fulfills <b>at least three</b> of the following aspects:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching workshop facilitation</li> <li>• Substantive statement of teaching philosophy</li> <li>• Teaching certificate(s), degrees</li> <li>• Teaching award(s)</li> </ul>
Good	10	Fulfills <b>two</b> of the following aspects:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching workshop facilitation</li> <li>• Substantive statement of teaching philosophy</li> <li>• Teaching certificate(s), degrees</li> <li>• Teaching award(s)</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	5	Fulfills <b>one</b> of the following aspects:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching workshop facilitation</li> <li>• Substantive statement of teaching philosophy</li> <li>• Teaching certificate(s), degrees</li> <li>• Teaching award(s)</li> </ul>
Poor/No Evidence	0	Fulfills none of the above aspects
<b>Total Score for Sections B and C</b>		<i>If the total score after b) and c) is less than 40, then the PTAC is not required to continue the evaluation.</i>
<b>Section D - Other relevant qualifications. Total 20 points</b>		
D. These include, additional degrees or professional qualifications; community engagement; development of educational materials; equity, diversity, and inclusion experience; Indigenous knowledge systems; pedagogical development; post-doctoral experience; professional development and/or experience. Qualifications and experience under this section must be directly relevant to the course advertised. A candidate's CV, candidate application, and any other relevant materials provided by the candidate may be considered in this category. These values must be discrete values as in the table below (i.e., 20, 15, 10, 0). No partial values.		
Level	Score	Assessment Factors Relevant to Posted Course
Very Good	20	Fulfills <b>four or more</b> the following aspects:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional university degrees (not counted in above sections)</li> <li>• Professional qualifications (not counted in above sections)</li> <li>• Community engagement</li> <li>• Contributions to academic/cultural life of students (organizing special events, trips, conferences, etc.)</li> <li>• Service to the profession (editorial and referee work, active position/work in professional organizations [not simply membership], organizing conferences, workshops, advisory boards, etc. (not counted in other sections)</li> <li>• Student and/or colleague mentorship</li> <li>• Equity, diversity, and inclusion experience and/or training</li> <li>• Indigenous knowledge systems experience and/or training</li> </ul>
Good	15	Fulfills <b>three</b> of the following aspects:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional university degrees (not counted in above sections)</li> <li>• Professional qualifications (not counted in above sections)</li> <li>• Community engagement</li> <li>• Contributions to academic/cultural life of students (organizing special events, trips, conferences, etc.)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service to the profession (editorial and referee work, active position/work in professional organizations [not simply membership], organizing conferences, workshops, advisory boards, etc. (not counted in other sections)</li> <li>• Student and/or colleague mentorship</li> <li>• Equity, diversity, and inclusion experience and/or training</li> <li>• Indigenous knowledge systems experience and/or training</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	10	Fulfills <b>two</b> of the following aspects:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional university degrees (not counted in above sections)</li> <li>• Professional qualifications (not counted in above sections)</li> <li>• Community engagement</li> <li>• Contributions to academic/cultural life of students (organizing special events, trips, conferences, etc.)</li> <li>• Service to the profession (editorial and referee work, active position/work in professional organizations [not simply membership], organizing conferences, workshops, advisory boards, etc. (not counted in other sections)</li> <li>• Student and/or colleague mentorship</li> <li>• Equity, diversity, and inclusion experience and/or training</li> <li>• Indigenous knowledge systems experience and/or training</li> </ul>
Limited	5	Fulfills <b>one</b> of the following aspects:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional university degrees (not counted in above sections)</li> <li>• Professional qualifications (not counted in above sections)</li> <li>• Community engagement</li> <li>• Contributions to academic/cultural life of students (organizing special events, trips, conferences, etc.)</li> <li>• Service to the profession (editorial and referee work, active position/work in professional organizations [not simply membership], organizing conferences, workshops, advisory boards, etc. (not counted in other sections)</li> <li>• Student and/or colleague mentorship</li> <li>• Equity, diversity, and inclusion experience and/or training</li> <li>• Indigenous knowledge systems experience and/or training</li> </ul>
Poor/No Evidence	0	Fulfills none of the above aspects
<b>Total Score:</b>		
<b>Section E - Comments for the Dean's Consideration:</b>		
<p>Awarding of a course is subject to a Member's success in meeting the duties and responsibilities in Article 16. In this section, the PTAC may submit comments or express concerns regarding the candidate. If the Member has failed to maintain a record of satisfactory teaching and/or has failed to satisfy all requirements under Article 16, it is expected that there will be evidence that progressive consultations with the Member have failed to address concerns. Has the PTAC identified an anomaly or trend in student course survey results that has caused concern? If yes, provide details, including evidence of consultations with the Member, if applicable.</p>		
<b>E.i. Comments for the Dean's Consideration:</b>		

<b>E.ii. Comments on Student Course Surveys:</b>
--

**Clarifications:**

\***Very good teaching evaluations** = above Departmental mean.

\***Good teaching evaluations** = at or not significantly below Departmental mean

\***Definitions for B.i and B.ii:**

**“Substantially similar” course** = same course as regards content & year-level & mode of delivery (though course code and/or title may differ)

**“Similar” course** = cases such as: online version of lecture course or vice-versa; same content & mode of delivery but considerably different level; non-Philosophy course with very similar content, methodology, level & mode of delivery as PP course: e.g. Brantford CT122 is “similar” to our PP203.

**NB:** We do not count even as merely “similar” the following sorts of cases: tutorial teaching; TA-ing; practical ethics course for theoretical ethics or vice-versa; distinct areas within practical ethics (e.g. medical ethics won't count for business ethics); history courses in different historical era; 1st year/intro courses in different areas (e.g. PP110 ≠ PP111).