

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

FACULTY OF SCIENCE

GUIDELINES TO BE USED BY THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE FOR THE APPLICATION OF THE APT
MANUAL

Approved by
THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE COUNCIL
Date: May 5, 2005

Approved by
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Date: April 21, 2005

Reviews

June 9, 1993 Striking Committee
September 27, 1993 Executive Committee
January 21, 1994 Dean's Advisory Council
February 7, 1994 Dean's Advisory Council
May 16, 1994 Dean's Advisory Council
July 22, 1994 Striking Committee
September 27, 1994 Executive Committee
October 11, 1994 Faculty of Science Council
April 11, 1995 Executive Committee
April 25, 1995 Faculty of Science Council
March 25, 1996 Executive Committee
April 26, 1996 Faculty of Science Council
September 6, 1996 Executive Committee
October 11, 1996 Faculty of Science Council
April 8, 1997 Executive Committee
April 22, 1997 Faculty of Science Council
September 23, 1997 Dean's Advisory Committee
September 30, 1997 Executive Committee
October 14, 1997 Executive Committee
October 21, 1997 Faculty of Science Council
October 8, 1998 Faculty of Science Council
April 20, 1999 Executive Committee
April 29, 1999 Faculty of Science Council
August 25, 2000 Executive Committee
September 26, 2000 Executive Committee
October 17, 2000 Faculty of Science Council
September 5, 2001 Executive Committee
September 19, 2001 Faculty of Science Council
December 9, 2003 Faculty of Science Council

Reviews continued

April 21, 2005 Executive Committee
May 5, 2005 Faculty of Science Council

I.	INTRODUCTION	
4		
II.	FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 3: CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, TENURE, MERIT ASSESSMENT AND PROMOTION.	Page 5
	A. General Criteria for Evaluations	Page 5
	B. Guidelines for the Interpretation of the General Criteria	Page 6
	i. Teaching Activity	Page 7
	ii. Research Activity	Page 7
	iii. Service Activity	Page 9
	C. Effects of Leaves on Evaluations	Page 10
	i. Evaluation including Leave Period	Page 10
	ii. Evaluation excluding Leave Period	Page 11
	D. Guidelines for Transfer Between Professorial Stream	Page 11
	i. Transfer from Instructor to Professoriate	Page 12
	ii. Transfer from Professoriate to Instructor	Page 12
III.	FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 4: PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT.	Page 13
	A. Normal Procedures	Page 13
	B. Extraordinary Procedures for Expedited Spousal Hiring	Page 13
	C. Guidelines relating to Adjunct Professors	Page 14
	i. Requirements for First Appointment	Page 14
	ii. Evaluation	Page 15
	iii. Reappointment	Page 15
	D. Guidelines for Appointment and Reappointment of Faculty Professors	Page 16
	i. First Appointment as Faculty Professor	Page 16
	ii. Annual Reporting	Page 16
	iii. Reappointment	Page 17
IV.	FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 5: APPOINTMENT REVIEW AND RENEWAL	Page 18
	A. General Criteria for Appointment Review	Page 18
	B. Guidelines for Appointment Review	Page 19
	C. Guidelines for Heads/Directors in Soliciting Advice for the Tenure Review Process	Page 19
	D. Guidelines for Academic Appointment Review Committee (AARC)	Page 20
V.	FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 6: MERIT ASSESSMENT AND PROMOTIONS.	Page 22
	A. General Statements Concerning Merit Increments	Page 22
	B. Performance Expectations	Page 22
	i. Professorial Stream	Page 22
	ii. Instructor Stream	Page 23
	iii. Awarding 0.0 for Unsatisfactory Performance	Page 23

C. Promotions	Page 23
i. General Criteria for Promotion in the Professorial Stream	Page 23
ii. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor	Page 24
iii. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor	Page 24
iv. Promotion in the Instructor Stream	Page 25
D. Annual Assessment for the Professorial Stream	Page 25
E. Annual Assessment for the Instructor Stream	Page 26
F. Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) Process	Page 26
i. Departmental Committees to advise Heads on Recommendations to the Faculty Promotions Committee	Page 26
ii. Composition of the Faculty Promotions Committee	Page 27
iii. FPC Deliberations	Page 28
Appendix I Summary of Procedures	Page 30
A. Merit Increment Recommendation Process	Page 30
i. Documentation from a Staff Member	Page 30
1. Annual Report	Page 30
2. Supplementary	Page 30
ii. Documentation from the Department Head/Director	Page 30
B. Promotion Process	Page 31
C. Tenure Process	Page 35
Appendix II Policy on Teaching Evaluation	Page 38
Appendix III Guidelines for a Teaching Dossier	Page 39

I. Introduction

The General Faculties Council (GFC) document: "Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff" (December 2004), provides procedures to be followed in making appointments and in the award of merit increments, tenure and promotion. Referred to as the APT Manual, this document also specifies that each Faculty shall establish guidelines appropriate to their Faculty and that such guidelines be approved by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). Guidelines developed are to be periodically reviewed by the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) to ensure consistency with the University regulations as expressed in the APT Manual. Any modifications developed by the FPC must be approved first by the Executive Committee and then the Faculty Council prior to implementation.

This document describes in detail the guidelines established by the Faculty of Science in evaluating performance in accordance with the APT Manual. It should be read in conjunction with the General Promotions Committee (GPC) document: "Manual of Policy and Procedures for the Annual Assessment of Academic Staff (Salary Increments and Promotions)" (December 2004)

II. FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES RELATED TO APT SECTION 3: CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, TENURE, MERIT ASSESSMENT AND PROMOTION

A. General Criteria for Evaluations

Academic staff of the University are expected to be active in three major areas:

- a. Teaching
- b. Research
- c. Service

The Faculty of Science has traditionally used performance in these three areas in arriving at recommendations regarding the award of merit increments, tenure and promotion. Teaching and research are of greater importance than service. However, involvement and competence in service will be considered in judging an individual's overall performance, and there is an expectation that involvement in service will be appropriate to their rank. In addition, a high level of professional conduct will be expected of all academic staff at all times.

The Faculty recognizes that a diversity of career patterns may exist, for example, because of regulations of external granting agencies, such as the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research (AHFMR), Canada Research Chair, Alberta Informatics Circle of Research Excellence (iCORE), and Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) Industrial Chair programs, the normal activities of academic staff may be modified for all or a part of the reporting period. For purposes of assessment for merit increment, promotion and tenure the Faculty will make every attempt to judge fairly an individual's unique performance, while recognizing that the primary responsibilities to the University are teaching, research and service. Academic staff are advised to discuss career development on a regular basis with their Head/Director. Such discussions should make it possible for academic staff to develop their careers along lines which are self-fulfilling and also offer optimal service to the Faculty. For those in the instructor ranks, the relative importance of the three areas depends entirely on the nature of the assigned duties. Assignment of these duties is the responsibility of the Head/Director and should be communicated in writing from time to time as these duties may change, with a copy to the Dean.

Performance in these three areas is evaluated annually by the Head of the Department and where appropriate by Directors of programs. The amount of time and effort devoted to each of the three activities may change as a staff member progresses through the academic ranks and in accordance with any agreed adjustment to the relative weighting of duties approved by the Head/Director and Dean. The Head/Director of Department shall take into consideration the increasing expectations for performance with progressive rank when making the annual recommendation for merit increments (APT Manual 3.6-3.11). Considerations for promotion and for merit increment by the Faculty Promotions Committee the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) will be guided by the Head's/Director's recommendations. For tenure considerations the Academic Appointment Review Committee (AARC) will consider all three components of an applicant's contributions over their career, but with particular emphasis on contributions at the University of Calgary, and will consider recommendations from the Head/Director, a summary of input to the Head/Director of commentary on the application, as well as confidential letters of reference.

Academic staff are responsible for meeting the deadlines published by the Faculty for submission of materials. In the case of annual assessment activity not reportable in the calendar year because of conditions outside the control of the staff member, it will be accepted during the following year's assessment.

B. Guidelines For The Interpretation Of The General Criteria

i Teaching Activity

A primary function of the University is to facilitate learning by students. Success in this depends in part upon the teaching effectiveness of the academic staff. From the APT Manual (3.2.2):

“Teaching performance and effectiveness shall be evaluated on a regular basis. Such evaluation should consider all ways a teacher addresses the responsibility and interacts with students. In addition to interactions in the contexts noted in Sections 3.2.1, evaluation of teaching should consider the extent of innovation, preparation, reflection of current knowledge, level of interest, direction, and encouragement demonstrated by the academic appointee. Participation in teaching development programs, and/or seeking expert help in the improvement of teaching, will be viewed as an indication of commitment to teaching.”

a. Professorial and Instructor Streams

Effectiveness in teaching may be achieved in a number of ways, but at a minimum will include (1) knowledge appropriate to the level of instruction and (2) the effective transmission of that knowledge. Additional activities which contribute to teaching effectiveness may include:

- Involvement in courses at both undergraduate and graduate levels;
- Improvement to existing courses and programmes;
- Introduction of a new course;
- Development of procedures and/or apparatus for demonstrations and exercises in experimental science with appropriate documentation for users;
- The application of current technology for the improvement of teaching. This may include, for example, new software for computer-assisted learning, multi-media applications, or the transmission of lectures and course material by electronic networks;
- Mentoring of colleagues to improve quality of teaching;
- The supervision of undergraduate research projects;
- The supervision of graduate students;
- Participation in graduate student examination committees
- General accessibility to students.
- Supervision of post-Doctoral Research Associates and Research Assistants

b. Responsibilities of Heads/Directors in Evaluating Teaching Activity

Individuals should be able to present evidence of their contributions to, and accomplishments in, teaching. This will be required for applications for promotion or tenure. An effective way to document teaching activities is to prepare a teaching dossier. Guidelines for this are provided in Appendix III. The responsibility to assemble such a dossier when applying for promotion or tenure rests with the individual. It should be noted that GPC 5.1.6.4 allows for the use of a multi-year teaching dossier as part of the annual assessment process.

For purposes of evaluation (promotion, tenure, merit), it will be the responsibility of the Head /Director to summarize and augment information provided in an individual's teaching dossier for FPC and AARC. Documentation on teaching effectiveness should include evidence of the activities listed above as well as

written evaluations by students, including but not limited to the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI). Student ratings or evaluations must not be the sole basis for the evaluation of teaching performance (APT 3.2.3). Other evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:

- Nomination for and receipt of teaching awards and prizes
- Assessment by peers of the academic staff members teaching by attending lectures, seminars and colloquia;
- Evaluation by knowledgeable colleagues of instructional materials, assignments and examinations produced by the academic staff member;
- Documentation of the extent to which the individual contributes to the educational goals of the Department;
- Satisfactory completion of formal training taken to improve teaching effectiveness.
- Unsolicited student comments.

Heads/Directors are expected to seek information and input from other sources when staff members are teaching in other Faculties or areas, and/or are involved in leading major University initiatives.

ii Research Activity

As noted in APT 3.3.1:

Research, scholarship and other creative activities constitute a major University function. The primary concern of the individual and the University shall be the importance of high-quality work.

The character of the research or scholarly activity differs between the instructor and professorial ranks, but the activities are not mutually exclusive.

a. Professorial Ranks

As a research-based university, The University of Calgary is dedicated to both the seeking and the dissemination of knowledge. The principle is to regard the impact of the work, valuing most highly new knowledge, which has been subjected to a review process and widely disseminated. For those faculty in the professorial ranks, these activities may include:

- Work published in refereed professional journals. Of all the criteria listed here to judge the research contribution of faculty, the one used most extensively is the quality and quantity of published work in refereed journals of international repute. In some areas, for example in some subfields of computer science, publications in prestigious refereed conference proceedings are replacing the journal article as the primary mode of dissemination of scholarship. Heads/Directors should note when this is the case when providing an evaluation;
- A technical report to a private or government agency, published or unpublished by that agency, where evidence of peer review is provided;
- The receipt of significant research awards, either individual or as part of a collaboration, will be acknowledged as an indication of impact of the individual in the larger research community;
- The award of sustained research grants and contracts from a private, provincial, national or international peer-reviewed body. Such awards will be accepted as peer recognition of the value of research carried out by the individual;

- Award of prizes, fellowships and scholarships arising from research endeavours are another indication of peer recognition;
- Invitations to deliver scholarly talks or major addresses to one's peers are a measure of leadership in the field;
- Participation in and the presentation of papers at national/international conferences/workshops;
- The authorship of a book is a time-consuming activity and may reflect considerable research expertise in the topic area. In particular, a senior level book, to be used at the graduate level or as a reference book, generally demands considerable research effort. Some texts may be better evaluated as significant contributions to teaching, rather than research;
- Other forms of documented peer recognition which may measure scholarly achievement, e.g., election to the Royal Society, etc;
- Publications related to university level teaching, e.g., a textbook, research paper, laboratory exercise;
- Obtaining patents can be an indication of scholarly activity.

b. Instructor Ranks

In the instructor ranks research or scholarly activity "...will normally include, but not go beyond, the scholarship required to maintain currency in pedagogy and content in the discipline" (APT 3.9.2 and 3.10.3). When interpreting these articles in the Faculty of Science it is understood that the scholarship required to maintain currency in the field may include forms of "scholarly research", but is not restricted to this activity. Instructors and senior instructors may become involved in the development and dissemination of new teaching procedures, including inquiry based and blended learning, laboratory experiments and lecture demonstrations. These activities may require a high level of scholarly activity and original research if they are to be effected in a creative manner. Thus, scholarly activity in connection with assigned teaching duties is likely to be an important component of the duties of instructors and senior instructors, and should be documented appropriately for their Department Head/Directors.

Other scholarly activity, as is approved by the Head/Director, will also have a beneficial effect on professional careers and is encouraged, but shall not replace teaching development activities. Such scholarly activity may be evaluated, for example, on the basis of publications in refereed journals, books, or published reports, as outlined for those individual in the professorial ranks.

c. Responsibilities of Heads/Directors in Evaluating Research Activity

It is the responsibility of the Head/Director to evaluate, through consultation with colleagues and the use of expert opinion in the field when necessary, the quality of the research or scholarly activity of an individual.

- It is also the responsibility of the Head/Director to make a judgement as to what constitutes a full-length refereed paper. For example, an invited talk published, in full, in refereed conference proceedings, may qualify as the equivalent of a full-length paper as against, say, a conference abstract or a short contribution which is only informally, if at all, refereed. When preparing any evaluation of scholarship, the Head/Director should indicate an equivalence as appropriate to the discipline for those components being weighted as highly as journal publications;
- The Faculty of Science recognizes the value that collaboration may bring to research projects, whether from student-supervisor interaction, from interdisciplinary projects, or from interaction with disciplinary colleagues at the local, national or international levels. There is no

fixed formula used to evaluate an individual's contribution to a multiple author publication. Heads/Directors must be cognizant of each situation. At times an explanation of the contribution by an individual to a research publication is required in order to evaluate scholarship and its impact. For this reason, it is important that faculty members provide their Heads/Directors with the information needed to assess their individual contributions.

- In the case of evaluating reports to a private or government agency, care must be taken to avoid double counting of technical reports, contributions to conferences, abstracts, or invited talks if subsequently published in refereed journals as well;
- In evaluating the quality and impact of research activity the Head/Director can use supplementary information (e.g. copies of reviews of books written, reprinted by the academic staff member). (See Appendix I)

iii Service Activity

The level of service activities may differ greatly with academic rank and within a rank depending on both the initiative of the individual and on opportunities presented to the individual. Newly appointed academic staff should devote themselves mainly to establishing a sound base in the teaching and research duties assigned by the Head/Director.

The value of service will be assessed in terms of both the willingness to serve and on the quantity as well as the quality of the activities. Factors to be considered include the scope of the activity (from departmental to international), the weight of responsibility carried in the role or office held, the leadership abilities required or demonstrated, the expertise required, the nature of the assignment to the role (appointed, invited, elected, volunteered), the amount of time the role entails, the distinction brought to the unit or the University as a whole, and the relationship of the service role to the individual's role as an academic staff member. Service contributions are considered under the major headings of: university, faculty and department committees, offices and committees of academic societies, and professional service to the field. A general list of internal and external service activities includes:

Internal service:

- Holding of a major administrative office (Provost and Vice-President, dean, Head/Director and associate of any of these);
- Chair of a university, faculty or department committee;
- Membership on a university, faculty or department committee;
- Review and evaluation of peers for purposes of promotion, merit or awards;
- Service to the university, faculty, department or a student organization;
- Mentoring of colleagues or students in teaching and research. External service related to the profession:
- Review and evaluation of manuscripts and of grant applications for outside agencies.
- Involvement at some official level in national and/or international professional organizations;
- Involvement in community profession-related education programs, e.g. Science Hotline;
- Consultation and professional services to government, to public agencies, and to individuals in the staff member's capacity as an academic;
- Service on public boards, commissions and committees representing the University or discipline;
- Involvement in media productions and other presentations designed to inform the public about matters in science;
- Peer recognition through, for example, election to scholarly societies, national/international grant selection committees of peer-reviewed agencies like NSERC or CIHR, or any form of award in recognition of the quality of service will be noted as a significant service contribution;

- Service to developing countries in the area of professional programs.

The Head/Director will make every effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the service provided by the individual to each of the different communities. This must be done in the context of APT statements about service including APT (3.4.4):

“Other service to the community that flows from the discipline or that accrues through other distinguished service to the University or the community may be acknowledged when it brings distinction to the University.”

and APT (3.4.6): “Outside Professional Activity for remuneration shall not normally be counted as service for the purposes of assessment.”

Participation in non-scientific community affairs will generally be given less weight.

C. Effects of Leaves on Evaluations

Activity (teaching, research, service) undertaken while on any leave can and should be reported by the individual as part of any evaluative process. This is irrespective of whether the leave is paid or unpaid. Even in the latter case, there may be contributions to teaching, research and service associated with the term of unpaid leave and this may bring credit to the University. Contributions made while on leave should therefore be recorded, including the submission of an annual report for the annual assessment process

An academic staff member must not be penalized during the evaluative process for being on leave. **Especially caution must be exercised in the promotion and/or tenure process to not penalize an individual because of the effects of leaves at any stage in their career.**

In the annual assessment process, care must be taken to accommodate evaluations where: 1) the evaluation is carried out for the entire year, including the leave period; and 2) only the non-leave period is evaluated.

i Evaluation Including Leave Period

The principle of GPC 7.3 is that individuals should be evaluated with respect to the activities set out by the terms of the leave, and with normal expectations for the balance of the period under review.

Sabbatical leaves provide release from normal teaching expectations, and an individual should not be penalized for not teaching during the leave. However, it may be that some aspect of the sabbatical leave makes a contribution to teaching under the criteria outlined in Section II.B.i. Such contributions should be reported on the annual report, and evaluated. Sabbatical fellowships are frequently awarded in order to permit an individual to undertake a larger project, to visit other institutions in order to broaden the research base and enter new collaborations, or to finalize manuscripts for submission to journals (or the equivalent). Consequently, when assessing scholarship activities care must be taken to consider the broader contexts covered in Section II.B.ii bearing in mind that the scholarship produced during the leave is most likely to appear and be evaluated in subsequent years. It is important that individuals relate their research activities to the approved sabbatical project to assist in the evaluation of their scholarship for the period of the leave. During the period of a sabbatical there is no formal requirement for university service. Service contributions, for example to the profession or national bodies, may continue during a sabbatical, and these

contributions should be reported and included in the assessment.

The terms of a **Secondment** provide for non-standard expectations for scholarship, teaching and service. The principles elucidated in the evaluation of performance while on sabbatical should be adapted to the evaluation of the performance of a faculty member on secondment.

The terms of secondment may call for evaluation of activities particular to the nature of the secondment. Heads/Directors should attempt to get timely input from the agency to which a member is seconded, and the overall performance evaluated with respect to the terms of reference.

ii Evaluation Excluding Leave Period

In this category is included situations where the assessment is prorated based on non-leave period(s) of time (e.g. parental or sick leave over one month) and not-prorated (e.g. unpaid leaves).

- Academic staff on unpaid leave are not eligible for merit increments for the period of unpaid leave (GPC 7.4 and 7.5). Evaluations and merit recommendations therefore consider only the non-leave period and are not pro-rated. For example, an individual who was on a leave without pay for 3 months is only eligible to receive .75 of a notional merit increment recommendation.
- Academic staff on paid leave will have their merit increment pro-rated. GPC 7.3.1.1 provides an algorithm for evaluating the merit increment by prorating the individual's accomplishments over the entire year. This article provides that the evaluation shall first be carried out as if the faculty member was not on leave, and then adjusted according to the following example:

"If a staff member's total contributions were assessed as 0.8 for the entire year, but were actually accomplished in 9 months, the prorated increment would be 1.0 (0.8 divided by .75 1.06 rounded)"

We interpret this to mean that the individual was on parental or sick leave for 3 months of the reporting period, and the total production for the entire year would have been evaluated at 0.8 if the leave is ignored. There are some obvious problems with this algorithm stemming from the problem of small denominators.

For example, an individual on leave (e.g. sick leave) for 11 months of a year judged to have merited 0.4 for the year would translate into 4.8 merit increments which is clearly unreasonable. That same individual being judged to have merited 0.0 for the year also seems unreasonable. The underlying principle of not penalizing an individual must be respected, and reasons provided for deviations from the proposed algorithm.

D. Guidelines for Transfer Between Professorial Streams

APT 3.11 discusses potential transfers between the instructor and professorial streams. Such a transfer can be requested by an academic staff member, but the Department Head in consultation with the Dean and members of the Department will determine whether it is desirable to support such an application. Part of the basis for this decision will be the impact on the Department's staffing plan with respect to research and teaching activities. If the request is supported by the Head, this will be forwarded to the Dean and then to

FPC for deliberation.

Allowed transfers are:

Instructor to Assistant Professor
Senior Instructor to Associate Professor
Assistant Professor to Instructor
Associate Professor to Senior Instructor

The general criteria to be used by FPC will be:

1. Each case will be decided individually on its own merits
2. The individual has a demonstrated track record of excellence in teaching
3. The transfer is to be based on academic merit and not on the length of service
4. The individual meet the academic and/or performance commensurate with the expectations for the new rank

In addition there are criteria specific to the types of transfer under consideration:

Instructor to Professoriate:

- Careful attention will be paid to the impact on the teaching capabilities on the Department
- The individual must have a demonstrated track record of excellence in research and service appropriate for the rank to which the transfer is being sought.

Professoriate to Instructor:

- The nature and duties of the new position must be clearly specified. These must have been agreed to by both the individual and Department Head.
- The individual must have demonstrated a strong commitment to development (e.g. curriculum reform, pedagogical initiatives) in instructional activities.
- A positive recommendation will in large part be dependant on the individual's teaching excellence.

Following a positive recommendation by FPC the Dean will consider action under APT 3.11.4.

III. FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES RELATIVE TO APT SECTION 4: PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT

A. Normal Procedures

Faculty selection procedures for academic appointments (teaching and research) will conform to the APT manual instructions in Section 4. The Dean will obtain authorization to initiate an academic selection process after consulting with Departments to determine whether a vacancy should be filled or if a new position will be established. The Dean will define the rank and approve the nature of any vacancy to be filled.

The Academic Selection process will consist of:

1. An Academic Selection Committee, chaired by the Dean or the Dean's delegate (normally the relevant Head/Director). This committee will consist of a minimum of the Head/Director, two (2) full time faculty members from the Department, one (1) member from another department in the Faculty and one (1) academic appointee from outside the Faculty. The academic appointee from outside the Faculty will provide an external perspective on the process. Both genders shall be included in the Committee. A Student representative may be named to the selection committee. All members will have full voting rights. In addition, the Dean will appoint a representative who will act as an observer. If the observer is other than one of the individuals named to the formal committee, they will not have voting rights.
2. The Academic Selection Committee shall adhere to all requirements of Section 4.3.7.c-j of the APT Manual. As part of its information gathering, the Committee shall establish mechanisms and document its efforts to allow input from all available members of the department and to take into account informed student opinion (APT 4.3.7.a.iv). The Committee shall document its efforts to comply with employment equity policy (APT 1.2.4). At the conclusion of its deliberations, the Academic Selection Committee shall make a recommendation to the Dean. The Head/Director may separately make a recommendation to the Dean. The Committee report to the Dean shall include the mechanisms for obtaining input from the department members and for obtaining informed student opinion.

B. Extraordinary Procedures for Expedited Spousal Hiring

Re: (APT 4.8.13 a) The term "organizational unit" shall be read as "Department" or "Program" (in the case of appointments to programs such as Environmental Science, or Earth Science), as appropriate to the context.

Re: (APT 4.8.13.b) When a joint appointment to more than one department is proposed, the "Destination Unit" shall include all the Departments concerned.

For an appointment to a program, the "Destination Unit" will include the program members together with the Department(s) to which the individual would be assigned.

The Dean(s) of the Destination Faculty(ies) shall determine which "organizational units" are affected under the provisions of this subsection.

C. Guidelines Relating to Adjunct Professors

Individuals not affiliated with a Department in the Faculty of Science may seek Adjunct status in that Department upon recommendation of the Department's Head and approval by the Dean. The purpose of awarding adjunct status is described in the APT Manual:

- 3.13.1 Adjunct or Clinical appointees shall be persons with substantial experience in a profession or discipline who are from outside a Department, Division, or Faculty and who agree to contribute to the educational experience of students on a recurring basis through active participation in the academic programs of a Department, Division, or Faculty.

Adjunct status is awarded at the rank of Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor or Adjunct Full Professor. It is a Term Certain appointment held without remuneration for a period of three years, continuously renewable upon satisfactory performance.

Duties of the individual seeking adjunct status are to be negotiated with the Head of the Department and must be stipulated in the letter of appointment (ATP 3.13.2). Examples include graduated student supervision (APT Manual 3.13.3), performance of professional service, and instructing course(s). Specific expectations and requirements are detailed on a Department basis by the Adjunct Appointment Document (AAD) for that Department.

i Requirements for First Appointment

The responsibility for the appointment process rests with the Department and its AAD must detail the process involved. For Faculty approval the following must be completed:

- 1) The criteria of the APT manual and the Faculty of Science Guidelines for interpreting the APT manual should be applied to determine the rank to which a candidate would be appointed were the appointment one to the ongoing academic faculty. In the case of an adjunct appointment for an individual holding an academic appointment at this or another institution, the adjunct appointment would normally be at the same level as the academic position held. **N.B.** Appointment of a member of faculty at The University of Calgary in another department or division requires approval of the Dean(s) in which the units are situated. Prior to initiating the Departmental approval process, the Head/Director should obtain permission of the Dean(s) involved.
- 2) Documentation in support of an adjunct appointment should clearly specify any duties and conditions expected of the individual. There should also be a statement of the potential value the appointment would bring to teaching and research at the University. There should also be a statement about the benefit to the nominee, because appointments in this category should be mutually beneficial to both the adjunct and the University.
- 3) Documentation required by the Department will include the following:
 - a) A letter of nomination by a tenured academic staff member of the Department which includes:
 - i. a statement addressing the rank of the appointment,
 - ii. a statement of the benefit to teaching and research at the University of the

- proposed appointment,
- iii. a statement of how the nominee satisfies the other criteria of APT 3.13.1,
- iv. a statement of the benefit to the nominee of adjunct status in the Department,

- b) An up-to-date *c.v.* of the nominee,
 - c) Three letters of reference, one of which may be internal to the university.
- 4) The process for review of nominations either by a committee or the full department must be specified. The review would result in a recommendation to the Head/Director as to whether to proceed with the application and if so, at what rank the appointment should be made.
- 5) In the event that granting adjunct status to an individual necessitates a contract with the individual's primary organization, the Dean will be responsible for negotiating the contract.
- 6) When the decision to recommend adjunct status is positive the Head/Director will forward to the Dean's office:
- a) a signed and completed AE1 form,
 - b) a draft copy of the letter of offer from the Dean, which details the rank, the expected duties and conditions of the appointment, (template available from the Dean's office), and
 - c) the documentation required in point 3) above.

If the Dean approves of the proposed appointment, the Dean's office will forward the letter of offer to the individual for signature. Once this has been signed and returned the material will be forwarded to Provost and Provost and Vice-President (Academic) area for approval.

ii Evaluation

No annual report is required at the Faculty level of adjunct appointees. Therefore, there is no annual assessment made to Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC). Because of the finite time period of the appointment, no considerations of promotion will occur during the appointment period.

iii Reappointment

An adjunct professor may be considered for reappointment for a further three-year term. Reappointment is not automatic and the Department's AAD must specify the process by which an individual can seek reappointment. The process must start no later than six months before the end of the term. Requested documentation must include:

- 1) A report on the contributions of the applicant to the Department
- 2) An evaluation of the contributions by the Head of the Department, in consultation with the principal contacts of the adjunct in the Department
- 3) Justification for change in rank, if that is being requested

- 4) An updated CV
- 5) A statement about the nature of the relationship with the Department, proposed for the renewal period

The reappointment should be reviewed as per AAD guidelines and, if positive, forwarded to the Dean. Required documentation to the Dean is as specified from a first appointment excepting 6c) is replaced with the material specified in 1-5 above. Note that new letters of reference are not required for the Faculty process, although they may form part of the Departmental review process. If the Dean approves of the proposed reappointment, the Dean's office will forward the letter of offer to the individual for signature. Once this has been signed and returned the material will be forwarded to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) for approval.

D. Guidelines for Appointment and Reappointment of Faculty Professors (Not referred to in APT Manual)

i First Appointments as Faculty Professor

- a. The Head/Director of Department may nominate a retiring member of Faculty for an appointment as Faculty Professor. The nomination would normally be for a term of three years. Consideration for such an appointment is not automatic and is quite separate from consideration for Professor Emeritus status. Normally a recommendation for appointment as Professor Emeritus would be made in conjunction with the nomination for appointment as Faculty Professor.
 - Recommendations should be supported by evidence of an ongoing independent research program. Normally this program would have to be well supported by a granting council or other external funding.
 - Confirmation by the applicant of the proposed role in support of senior undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral supervision must accompany the nomination. **(N.B.** A Faculty Professor is not permitted to serve as instructor of record for any course offered for degree credit unless the individual is also granted a separate Term Certain appointment that conforms to the requirements of the Collective Agreement between the Board of Governors and the Faculty Association and to the provisions of the Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff.)
 - The Head/Director must confirm that space requirements for the research program of the Faculty Professor can be accommodated for the duration of the appointment. Priority for space rests with regular ongoing appointments.
 - The nomination should address how the appointment as Faculty Professor would contribute to the development of the Department and Faculty research plan.
- b. Nominations should be made by the deadline for submission of materials for the annual FPC process. If the c.v. and merit history of the candidate is not available to FPC because of consideration of Emeritus status; this information should also accompany the nomination.
- c. FPC will consider the application and make a recommendation to the Dean regarding the merits of the proposal.

ii Annual Reporting

While there is no obligation to complete the Annual Report form required of ongoing faculty appointments, Faculty Professors will be required to report annually to the department about scholarship and contributions to graduate programs. (A department may also request further information about projected space requirements, and other factors to inform its planning process.)

iii Reappointment

A retired member of faculty who has been appointed as a Faculty Professor may be considered for nomination for reappointment, for a further term, normally of 3 years duration. There is no obligation for a Head/Director to make such a recommendation, and if it is made, department priorities may require a change in space allocation. The nomination by the Head/Director to the Dean should address the points listed for consideration of a first appointment, and should comment on the contributions made by the individual during the appointment as Faculty Professor. The case must be clearly made that reappointment is aligned with the research plan of the Department and Faculty, and that the priorities for assignment of space to ongoing faculty have been met.

IV. FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 5: APPOINTMENT REVIEW AND RENEWAL

Unless appointed 'with Tenure', academic staff undergo a probationary period. The Initial Term appointment portion of the probationary period is (APT 5.4.2) "...to provide a period of mutual appraisal for the University and the academic appointee." Toward the end of the Initial Term, the academic staff member may request to be considered for renewal of the Initial Term for a period of two more years (APT 5.6.6) except in the cases of Associate Professors (APT 5.4.3), full professors (APT 5.4.3) or Senior Instructors (APT 5.4.4). Eligible individuals will be notified and will be advised of the renewal process (see Appendix 1 for sample letter). During the penultimate year of the renewal (or earlier if required by the appointment rank) the academic staff member will be notified and advised of the tenure review process (see Appendix 1 for sample letter).

It is the responsibility of the applicant to supply the information requested for the review process. It is the responsibility of the Head/Director to provide an assessment of the performance of the individual in teaching (section 11.B.i.b), research (section 11.B.ii.c) and service. The Head/Director will then provide the Dean the complete application package including their assessment.

An academic staff member may request tenure review at any point. However, as the granting of tenure normally commits the University to the individual for a full academic career, the decision must not be made in haste. The full duration of the probationary period normally should be used to assess the performance and the future promise of the individual. **Tenure before the expiry of the probationary period should be limited to the very exceptional cases.** These exceptional cases may result from such outstanding performance by the individual that their quality and promise is beyond doubt, or from prior contributions and achievements at this or other institutions, provided that an accurate evaluation of such performance can be obtained.

Requests for renewal are in the first instance reviewed by the Dean. The Dean may then:

1. refer the request to AARC
2. in the case that the Dean concurs with a Head's recommendation that renewal be granted, the Dean may so advise the Provost & Vice President (Academic). The academic staff member will be asked whether they agree with by-passing AARC as required by APT 5.6.10.

Applications for tenure are reviewed by AARC in all cases.

Overlapping salary scales may be used to link promotion with tenure. For individuals initially hired at the Assistant Professor level, the granting of tenure normally will be considered in the fifth year in the same academic year as consideration for promotion to Associate Professor. Because the expectations for granting of tenure increase with rank, if promotion is to be considered before the penultimate year of the probationary period, it may be appropriate that early tenure be considered simultaneously. The converse need not be true; that is, tenure may be granted without promotion.

A) General Criteria for Appointment Review

Neither renewal of Initial Term nor tenure on the completion of the probationary period is the right of a staff member, but must be earned through effectiveness and competence in the three (3) areas outlined in Section II.A.

An individual in the professorial stream must have demonstrated continued effectiveness as a teacher and must have produced sustained high-quality research. The standards achieved in teaching and research should be of a calibre, which would indicate that the applicant has the potential for greater achievements and recognition in the discipline. An individual in the instructor stream must have fulfilled the requirements of their job description, establishing a program of scholarship to maintain currency in the discipline while providing evidence of good teaching. Expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service depend on the rank at the time of consideration of granting tenure. Expectations increase with rank. While primary emphasis is placed on the quality of the contributions to teaching and scholarship, it is expected that service commensurate with the rank and conditions of appointment will be in evidence. In all cases, the individual should have demonstrated that their continued presence will be an asset to their Department/Program. See Sections 5.7.5.2 and 5.7.5.3 of the APT Manual.

B) Guidelines for Appointment Review

Appendix I provides sample letters detailing the items the academic staff member must provide their Head/Director for consideration of renewal of initial term and for appointment with tenure.

i) **Renewal of Initial Term**

Letters of reference are **not required**. If AARC is asked to review the application it is guided in its deliberations by APT 5.7.5 and Section II.B

ii) **Tenure review: professorial ranks**

Letters of reference from authorities in the applicant's discipline are a crucial part of the documentation. The academic staff member and the Head /Director must each supply the names (and contact information- see Appendix 1) of at least **four** referees from outside the University. The Chair of AARC will solicit at least three **confidential** letters of reference, including at least one from each of the lists of the applicant and the Head/Director. After consultation with the Head/Director, the Chair of AARC may solicit referees reports from other individuals, as needed, in order to ensure there are at least 3 letters available to the Committee. Expert opinions from a minimum of two authorities in the field of research from outside the university will be sought to ascertain the quality of research and future promise.

iii) **Tenure review: instructor rank**

The requirement for external referees will be met by obtaining referee's reports from at least two members of the academic staff of the University from outside the Faculty who are recognized for superior teaching abilities. As for the professorial ranks, the applicant and Head/Director will each furnish the names of at least four potential referees, disclosing any connections or collaborations. The Chair of AARC will solicit at least three referee's reports, with at least one from each of the two lists. After consultation with the Head/Director, the Vice Dean may solicit referees reports from other individuals, as needed, in order to ensure there are at least 3 letters available to the Committee.

C) Guidelines for Heads/Directors in Soliciting Advice for the Tenure Review Process

Before completing a recommendation concerning tenure under Section 5.6.19, the Head/Director shall solicit advice on each candidate for tenure and invite appropriate individuals to provide signed written comments on the application.

1. At least three weeks prior to the date set for submission of the Head's/Director's recommendation to the Faculty, each tenured member of the department shall be informed of the names of those individuals who are being considered for tenure.
2. By the deadline for supplying research materials, c.v., etc., the applicant may supply a list of tenured academic staff from outside the applicant's Department who have direct knowledge of the applicant's academic work. The Head/Director may select from this list and consult with others as well, but these individuals shall not be the recommended referees supplied with respect to 5.6.13 or 5.6.16. The Head/Director must provide the applicant with a list of all those whose advice was sought.
3. A copy of the materials submitted for consideration by the AARC (c.v., teaching dossier, examples of relevant scholarly productions) shall be kept secure and made available only to the individuals identified in bullets 1. and 2. above.
4. Under no circumstances shall the Head/Director disclose the contents of letters solicited from referees, which are confidential to the Academic Appointment Review Committee (APT 5.6.15).
5. The Head/Director shall consider only signed submissions from those consulted through parts 1. and 2.
6. The Head/Director shall maintain the comments received in confidence. A fair summary of the advice received shall be included in the Head's/Director's assessment prepared under Section 5.6.18.f.

When filling in the relevant section of the application form based on the applicant's submitted material, the referees' letters, information from the consultation process and the Head's/Director's own evaluation, the Head/Director shall take care to provide a fair summary of commentary while protecting the confidentiality of the referee's reports (APT 5.6.15) and the advice solicited under APT 5.6.18.

D) Guidelines for Academic Appointment Review Committee

The composition of the Faculty of Science's AARC follows APT 5.7.4 with the following modifications:

- 1) the Dean's delegate as Chair of Academic Appointment Review Committees will be the Vice Dean (Planning and Research) (APT 5.7.4.1a).
- 2) The Faculty Academic Affairs Committee consisting of the elected members of The Faculty of Science Executive Committee and the Vice Dean (Planning and Research), as chair, shall draw up annually a list of at least two academic appointees who have tenure from each department in the Faculty and at least two tenured faculty members from outside the Faculty of Science. The Dean (or delegate) will select members for each AARC from the names on this list. (APT 5.7.4.1b)
- 3) The Dean (or delegate) will select one student member for each AARC from the list of undergraduate and graduate student members of Faculty Council to serve as a voting member. Attendance of the student member is not mandatory for the business of an AARC to proceed. (APT 5.7.4.1 f)
- 4) The Dean will appoint one or two academic members, at least one of whom must be in attendance for the Academic Appointment Review Committee to meet. (APT 5.7.4.1c and 5.7.4.2 iii)

- 5) Faculty of Science Council does not wish to require participation of external members of a relevant profession on AARC's. (APT 5.7.4.5)

V. FACULTY OF SCIENCE GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 6: MERIT ASSESSMENT AND PROMOTIONS

A. General Statements Concerning Merit Increments

The award of merit increments is based on an individual's performance during the twelve-month period defined by the Annual Report required in the Faculty of Science. The Department Head's/Director's recommendations for merit increments shall be reviewed at the annual FPC hearings. The merit increment has to be earned through meritorious achievements and is by no means an automatic right of the individual, nor is it a simple reflection of seniority based on the years of service.

For Faculty members holding positions which require emphasis on research as opposed to teaching and/or service, their research performance should receive an appropriately increased weighting in the merit assessment process. Examples of such positions are University Professorship, NSERC UFA, NSERC IRC, CRC, iCore and AHFMR. In general, expectations will have been specified in the terms of the appointment.

It shall be the responsibility of the Head/Director to provide information on the staff member's activities using the guidelines from Section II and the information provided by the staff member.

B. Performance Expectations

i Professorial Stream

Scholarship: Members are expected to be active in scholarship in each reporting period. Refereed publications reported according to the standard set for a department, (i.e. by method (a), appeared, or method (b) accepted or appeared) in the reporting period provide evidence of meritorious performance. However, some research projects may take time to reach publication, either because of the nature of the research, or the refereeing process. For that reason failure to publish in any one period does not by itself constitute unsatisfactory performance. **It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of scholarly activity and to report on research, in progress, in the annual report, to justify a satisfactory rating in this category.** Expectations increase as faculty members progress through the ranks.

Teaching: Except where precluded because of a leave, secondment, or administrative appointment, faculty members are expected to make a contribution to the teaching mission of the university in each reporting period. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of contributions through the Annual Report, and/or submission of a teaching dossier, to supplement the information available to the Head/Director through surveys, peer evaluation, etc. should the member wish it taken into consideration to justify a satisfactory ranking. (See Section II.B.i)

Service: The faculty does not require formal service in the first two years of newly appointed assistant professors. Following that, service expectations increase with rank, except for those precluded from service because of a fellowship, leave, secondment, or other arrangement approved by the Head/Director and Dean. Some evidence of departmental, faculty, and/or professional service is normally expected of Associate Professors. More, in terms of quantity and/or in terms of importance of service is expected of Full Professors, who are expected to provide role models for their more junior colleagues. It is the responsibility of the Faculty member to document sufficient contributions to service to justify a satisfactory ranking in this category. See Section II.B.iii for guidelines on evaluation of service.

ii Instructor Stream

Scholarship: Instructors are required to show evidence of scholarship to maintain currency in the field in order to meet the standard of satisfactory performance. Production of teaching related materials, as well as contributions to research and other forms of scholarship may provide evidence of meritorious performance.

Teaching: Because teaching is a core feature of the appointment, satisfactory performance requires more than a minimal contribution in this area, using the criteria set out in Section II.B.i.

Service: The amount of service required of an instructor will vary with the teaching load. Senior Instructors are expected to make some contribution to the Department, Faculty, or outreach and other professional service contributions. (See Section II.B.iii).

iii Awarding 0.0 for Unsatisfactory Performance

Because successive awards of 0.0 for Unsatisfactory Performance by GPC may lead to dismissal, Heads/Directors must apply the criteria for each applicable category with care. **If, in the absence of any extenuating circumstances, a faculty member's performance in any one of the areas is not found to be satisfactory, a recommendation of 0.0 for Unsatisfactory Performance shall be considered.** When making such a recommendation the Head/Director shall inform the faculty member in writing, as well as the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) before the meeting of the Faculty Promotions Committee. (APT 6.2.16)

In the event it appears that FPC is considering recommending an increment of zero to an academic staff member whose Head/Director did not recommend zero, the staff member must be provided a letter detailing clear reasons as to why FPC is considering a recommendation of zero. The individual is given one week to respond and is invited to appear before FPC.

Failure to promote a staff member at the ceiling of a rank is not in itself considered as evidence of unsatisfactory performance.

An award of 0.0 to an individual at the ceiling of a rank is not in itself considered as evidence of unsatisfactory performance. It would be expected that a shadow increment for merit indicating at least satisfactory career progress would accompany the annual Head's/Director's assessment. (See GPC 5.1.6.1)

C. Promotions

i. General Criteria for Promotion in the Professorial Stream

Promotion from one rank to another in the professorial stream shall be based on the individual's performance in the three areas outlined in Section II. Promotion is neither automatic nor based on the number of years of service.

In considering a possible promotion, the individual's entire record of achievement in each of the three areas will be scrutinized. In the case of Faculty members supported through external programs such

as NSERC UFA, NSERC IRC, CRC, AHFMR, iCore etc., the criteria for promotion should be followed, but achievements in research should be given an increased weighting.

No particular numerical weight or formula can be attached to any of the three areas, but in general, teaching and research are to be considered more important than service.

The opinion of knowledgeable tenured colleagues within the Department and the University may also be sought regarding the individual's competence and co-operation. Evidence from both students and peers (testifying to the individual's teaching effectiveness) must also be available.

ii. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

1. Criteria

The individual must demonstrate competence and promise in teaching and research. At this stage of their career, the faculty member is expected to devote most of his/her time to these two functions. A record of competent and willing service is expected, although major service contributions are not necessarily required at this level.

2. Evaluation

Teaching will be evaluated by the criteria listed in Section II.A and II.B.i. It is the responsibility of the Head/Director to carefully document, by assessment instruments, through signed reports by peers who have seen the candidate teach (See APT 6.3.5), through signed written expressions from students (See APT 6.3.8), and/or personal observation, and by information provided by the individual, the quality of the individual's teaching. An individual whose teaching effectiveness is poor cannot expect promotion.

The individual is expected to take an active part in research and scholarly activities (Section II.B.ii). There is an expectation of research publications in refereed journals of international repute or equivalent scholarly publications and participation in national/international conferences. Research productivity is expected to be sustained.

It is expected that the service portion of an Assistant Professor's duties will normally be low to enable the individual to establish a research program. Willingness to participate in the service functions of the Department is, however, an asset and will be given positive consideration.

iii. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

1. Criteria

The individual must demonstrate high quality in teaching at all levels including proficiency in graduate student education (supervision, examination, training).

The individual must demonstrate high quality and mature scholarship as evidenced by national and international recognition of their research.

The individual is normally expected to have contributed significant service to the Department and the University. Contributions to professional organizations on the national/international level will also be valued.

These criteria are explained in more detail in Section II.

2. Evaluation

Promotion to Professor requires evidence of scholarly achievements and effectiveness in teaching superior to that required for promotion to the Associate Professor rank. The individual is expected to perform as a high quality teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate student levels.

The evaluation of the quality of research and scholarship will be done according to Section II.B.ii. In promotion to the rank of Professor, a minimum of three confidential letters of reference must be obtained from international experts in the field, external to the University, testifying to the quality of the individual's research and their national/international stature. The advice of knowledgeable colleagues within the Department may also be sought and, where appropriate, from colleagues in other departments.

By this stage in one's career, an individual will be expected to be well known and a respected member of the professional community at the national/international level.

The individual is normally expected to participate in the committee structure within the Department, the Faculty and the University, since a Professor is expected to play an active leadership role on various committees.

iv. Promotion in the Instructor Stream

As for the Professorial ranks promotion is covered by APT 6.3. In addition to the Head's/Director's recommendation, an individual seeking a change in rank shall provide a c.v., and teaching dossier, which will document contributions to teaching, and information about service contributions. FPC will look for evidence that the individual can perform the duties of the higher rank well. This may include superior ability as a teacher, a creative approach to the teaching function, and proof that they are capable of initiating and participating in a wide variety of teaching activities. Evidence of this will take the form of new developments and creative approaches to the teaching of assigned courses. There must also be evidence that the individual is thoroughly familiar with the current status of the discipline or one or more specialized areas thereof.

D. Annual Assessment for the Professorial Stream

Assistant Professor: The establishment of a research and scholarship program is very important at this stage. Competence in undergraduate and graduate teaching and in graduate supervision is also important with higher expectations for teaching performance expected with progression through the rank. Requirements for service will normally be low with no formal expectation in the first two years, and at least some form of service at the department and/or professional levels expected by the fourth year. Performance that is satisfactory in all components, but exceeds basic expectations in some components (for expectations at this rank) in scholarship or teaching will be considered for increments in the range 0.6 to 1.2. If there is evidence of scholarly activity and meritorious teaching, outstanding contributions in one or more areas may be rewarded with increments in excess of 1.2. No particular numerical weight or formula can be attached to any of the three areas, but in general,

teaching and research are to be considered more important than service. When making recommendations, scholarship and teaching contributions should be given equal weighting.

Associate Professor: An established research and scholarship program, a sound record of teaching, and an increased level of service are expected. Competence in undergraduate and graduate supervision is important. Expectations in all categories increase with progression through the rank. An Associate Professor presenting evidence of satisfactory performance in all areas along with ongoing scholarly activity and good teaching may be considered for increment ratings in the range 0.6 to 1.0 for the overall performance. If the overall contribution is also outstanding in some components, it may bring a recommendation in excess of 1.0. No particular numerical weight or formula can be attached to any of the three areas, but in general, teaching and research are to be considered more important than service. Contributions to scholarship and teaching will normally carry equal weighting.

Professor: At this rank, a high level of research and scholarly productivity, participation in graduate teaching and high quality teaching is expected. Competence in undergraduate and graduate supervision is important. As senior academics, a substantial involvement in university-related service is normally expected. Professors should be good role models for junior academic appointees in all three areas, and outstanding in some respect.

Expectations in all categories increase with progression through the rank. A Professor presenting evidence of satisfactory performance in all areas along with ongoing scholarly activity and good teaching may be considered for increment ratings in the range 0.6 to 0.8 for the overall performance.

If the contribution is also outstanding in some components, it may bring a recommendation in excess of 0.8. No particular numerical weight or formula can be attached to any of the three areas, but in general, teaching and research are to be considered more important than service. Contributions to scholarship and teaching will normally carry equal weighting.

E. Annual Assessments for the Instructor Stream

Instructor and Senior Instructor: Primary duties relate to teaching. Scholarship to maintain currency in the field is expected. Service requirements may increase through these ranks. Increment recommendations (in the range 0.6 to 1.0) will be considered for instructors who exceed the basic standard for satisfactory teaching, and whose performance in one or more areas is strong. If the contribution to teaching and teaching scholarship is strong, and performance in some areas is outstanding, consideration of an award in excess of 1.0 will be made. Research, serving on graduate student committees and the supervision of graduate students is not a requirement for meritorious or outstanding performance, but may be considered because of its support of currency in the discipline and the integration of research into our curricula.

F. FPC Process

i. Departmental Committees to Advise Heads on Recommendations to the Faculty Promotions Committee

Biological Sciences

The Head does not seek advice from a committee.

Chemistry

The Head does not seek advice from a committee.

Computer Science

The Head seeks advice from a committee with respect to annual evaluations and merit recommendations. The committee is not asked to give advice on applications for promotion.

- a) The departmental evaluation and merit committee reviews the annual reports, USRI results, summaries of Faculty Teaching surveys, and summaries from peer review of teaching as well as other materials provided to the Head by the members of the department. The committee provides advice to the Head about recommendations for merit increments and the contents of the evaluation form provided to the Faculty Promotions Committee, (and copied to the individual faculty members). The committee provides this advice for all faculty members except the members of the committee (and the Head). The Head shall chair the meeting.
- b) The committee consists of the Head and three members of the Department appointed by the Head. Both genders must be represented.
- c) The recommendations for the three appointed members of the committee shall be prepared by the Head, who may seek appropriate advice from *individuals* under 6.2.1 of the Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff.
- d) Discussions of the committee may be informed by advice obtained by the Head under 6.2.1 of the Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff. No other additional advice will be solicited *by the committee*.
- e) The committee shall include both genders, and both genders shall be represented at any meeting of the committee. In order to meet, the Head plus at least 2 of the 3 appointed members shall be present.
- f) In addition to the materials detailed in 6.2.11 f) of the Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff, the committee shall have available the results from the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction, the Head summary of Faculty of Science Student Surveys, as well as any summary materials provided from peer review or other sources that have been provided to the faculty member.
- g) The Committee will **not** be asked to provide advice to the Head about recommendations for promotion.

Following 6.2.12 of the Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff, the Head is solely responsible for the recommendation to the Faculty Promotions Committee; that is, the advice of the committee shall not be binding on the Head. Also, the Head may seek further advice, under article 6.2.1 before finalizing the recommendations.

Geology and Geophysics

The Head does not seek advice from a committee.

Mathematics and Statistics

The Head does not seek advice from a committee.

Physics and Astronomy

The Head does not seek advice from a committee.

ii. Composition of the Faculty Promotions Committee

The composition of the Faculty of Science's FPC follows APT 6.4.4 with following modifications:

- 1) One of the Dean's designates will normally be the Vice Dean (Planning and Research) who will act as secretary to FPC. Faculty of Science Council does not wish to require participation of Contingent Term or Limited Term academic staff. (APT 6.4.4.d)
- 2) The Dean (or delegate) will select one student from the list of the undergraduate and graduate members of Faculty Council to serve at each morning or afternoon session of FPC as a voting member of FPC. Attendance of the student member is not mandatory for the deliberations of the FPC to proceed. There shall be an information session for potential student members of the FPC at which the Dean (or delegate) informs students about the confidentiality requirements, rules about conflict of interest, and the need to abstain if a matter arises for which the student has not had the opportunity to become sufficiently familiar with the documentation. (APT 6.4.4.e)
- 3) Academic members representing both genders shall be included on the Committee. The Dean shall appoint one or more academic staff members to the committee (APT 6.4.4 f). Because both genders must be included among the voting academic staff (APT 6.4.3 d), the Dean may use one or more of these appointments to include members of the gender not represented. All Dean's appointees under this provision are voting members.

iii. FPC Deliberations

Prior to the actual FPC meeting each member will have access to the assessment form and annual report for each academic staff member in the Faculty. At the meetings promotions/appointments are dealt with first in the following order:

Promotion to Full Professor
Promotion to Associate Professor
Promotion to Senior Instructor
Professor Emeritus and Faculty Professor Appointments

In each case the appropriate Head summarizes the application and may make a motion recommending the promotion/appointment. If seconded, FPC discusses the application after which a vote is taken. Simple majority rules.

The assessment for awarding merit increments is done in the following order:

Instructors
Senior Instructors
Assistant Professors
Associate Professors
Full Professors (Range A and B)

Full Professors (Range C and D)

In each case the appropriate Head is expected to quickly summarize the performance and reasons for their recommendation.

If FPC agrees with the recommendation the next individual is considered. FPC may however discuss the possibility of raising the recommendation or lowering the recommendation. In the latter case a formal motion is required with simple majority necessary for passing the motion. In the event FPC is considering lowering an individual's recommended merit increment to 0.0, the discussion is halted and the individual is notified (Section V.B.iii and APT 6.4.16).

Finally, appeals of the Head's recommendations are heard by FPC. Note that the appellants assessment is not discussed during the process described above. The appellant may appear in person. After the interview the appellant and Head leave the room and a formal motion is required to change the Head's recommendation. If the appeal is denied, FPC may then consider whether the recommendation is at the appropriate level or should be decreased.

Appendix I: Summary of Procedures

The following is a summary and definition of the minimum documentation required for the various categories discussed in this document. The documentation mentioned here is for normal procedures.

A. Merit Increment Recommendation Process

i. Documentation from a Staff Member

1. Annual Report:

Each year a staff member is required to submit an Annual Report to the Department Head/Director. The reporting period in the Faculty of Science is January 1 to December 31.

2. Supplementary Information

The staff member may be required to submit an up-to-date CV, or other supplementary information (e.g. preprints) to the Department Head/Director for the purpose of annual assessment. The staff member may submit an up-to-date Teaching Dossier documenting contributions to teaching for the purpose of assessment.

ii. Documentation from the Department Head/Director

Each year the Department Head/Director shall review the annual performance of the staff member. After such a review the Head/Director shall complete a Head's/Director's Recommendation Form for submission to FPC. A copy of the completed form must be given to the staff member at the same time as it is submitted to FPC.

B. Promotion Process

The following sample letters detail the requirements for promotion in the professorial stream.

Sample letter 1

Date: 1

To: Dr.
Department of

From: Sandy Murphree
Vice-Dean (Planning and Research)

Re: Promotion to Associate Professor

It is necessary for me to take action to seek the required assessments for any faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor. Should you wish your case to be considered at the Faculty Promotions Committee meetings in February, you should seek an early opportunity to discuss the matter with your Department Head. The relevant criteria are outlined in the APT Procedures Manual (June 200X), from which the following is extracted:

3.7.2 Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires evidence of teaching effectiveness, recognized research attainment or equivalent professional attainment and a satisfactory record of service.

3.7.2 When the teaching function is assessed, evidence of effective performance respecting graduate programs and the supervision of and involvement with graduate students shall be considered, where appropriate.

The following procedures will apply:

1. Potential candidates should confirm in writing to their Department Head by Friday, January 7, 200x whether or not they wish to be formally considered at FPC in February.
2. An individual electing to be considered should submit to the Department Head also by Friday, January 7, 200x:
 - A. an up-to-date curriculum vitae.
 - B. copies of up to five items (reprints, preprints, etc.) which you wish to be considered by the committee. This is optional; never-the-less, it is usually desirable to provide a representative sample of major contributions or copies of recently completed material. I certainly recommend that you do so.
 - C. documentation of your teaching activities and evaluations (the Teaching Dossier). You should consult the Faculty of Science Guidelines for the Application of the APT Manual.
3. The Department Head will submit all the information you provide to me by Friday, January 21, 200x.
4. Prior to the convening of F.P.C., the Department Head will be required to submit a letter of assessment of the case, and a copy of this letter will be made available to you by your Head by January 28, 200x.

I would like to stress that it is the individual's responsibility to inform the Department Head in writing by **Friday, January 7, 200x** if he or she wishes their case to be formally considered and to supply the necessary information outlined in point 2. above by the same date. This should be recognized as a firm deadline.

Individuals will ordinarily wish to discuss their possible candidacy with the Department Head before making a decision. It is the Head's responsibility to be available for such discussions. However, a potential candidate should assume initiative for arranging a mutually agreeable time. Some Department Heads and individuals have off-campus commitments, and consequently, such arrangements should be made as soon as convenient. In addition, it is perhaps appropriate to reassure faculty members that Dean Boorman and I are always willing to discuss any problems with them confidentially.

Potential candidates are advised to consider very carefully their decisions whether to initiate the formal process of consideration or not. **Experience has shown that premature requests for consideration can be unwise (refer to the attached excerpt from Guidelines to be Used by the Faculty of Science for the Application of the APT Manual, February 11, 200x)** and that it is in the individual's best interests to apply only when it is felt that the case would impress the Faculty Promotions Committee positively. In this respect the advice of the Department Head and senior colleagues can be very useful.

I hope that the foregoing provides adequate clarification of procedures. Please contact me if have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Sandy Murphree

Encl.

cc: Dr. xxxx, Department Head
Prof. xxxxxx, President, TUCFA

Sample letter 2

Date:
To: Dr.
Department of
From: Sandy Murphree
Vice-Dean (Planning and Research)

Re: Promotion to Full Professor

It is necessary for me to take early action to seek the required assessments from eminent external referees for any faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion to full professor. I am writing to all Associate Professors earning above \$77,100, which is 0.5 increment below the floor of Full Professor on the 2004-2005 salary scale to advise them of the procedures. Should you wish your case to be considered in the spring, you should seek an early opportunity to discuss the matter with your Department Head. The relevant criteria are outlined in the APT Procedures Manual (June 2003), from which the following is extracted:

Section 3.8, Article 3.8.1

“The rank of Professor is reserved for those who, in the opinion of their colleagues, within the University and beyond, are outstanding in their discipline.

Section 3.8, Article 3.8.2

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of teaching effectiveness. When the teaching function is assessed, evidence of effective performance respecting graduate programs and the supervision of and involvement with graduate students shall be considered, where appropriate.”

You should also be aware of the procedures and extensions of the criteria found in the Guidelines used by the Faculty of Science for the Application of the APT Manual, updated February 11, 200x.

The following procedures will apply:

1. Potential candidates should confirm in writing to their Department Head by Monday, November 15, 200x whether or not they wish to be formally considered at FPC in February with a copy of the letter to the Vice-Dean (Planning and Research).
2. An individual electing to be considered should submit to the Department also by Monday, November 15:

- A. An up-to-date curriculum vitae.
- B. The name and addresses (current phone numbers, e-mail addresses, FAX numbers, rank, institution/company, year and institution of highest degree) of three eminent external referees. Please identify the position these referees currently hold and why they should be considered as eminent. An individual wishing to be reconsidered should propose a new slate of referees. This list should include at least two names that were not on the original slate. The Head of the Department will also nominate at least four referees in all cases. The names of his/her nominees will be made available to the candidate.

Any connection with the applicant must be disclosed. Quoting from the Guidelines To Be Used By The Faculty of Science For The Application Of The APT Manual, Appendix 1, Section B 3(vi):

“Normally, the proposed referees should not be collaborators, former colleagues, or supervisors. Deans are required to justify selecting any referee not at “arms length”. Also, justification may be required for selection of any referee not at the level of “full” professor, or its equivalent.”

- C. Copies (reprints, preprints, etc.) of any scholarly work which they wish to have attached to their curriculum vitae for the information of the Faculty Promotions Committee which will consider the case.
- D. 6 envelopes labeled with the candidate’s name to include the following material for distribution to referees:
 - up-to-date curriculum vitae
 - copies of reprints of up to five items which the candidate wishes to have forwarded to referees. (A copy of anything sent to referees should also be included in the materials provided for FPC in the article above.)

Provision of such material for referees is not mandatory. FPC has taken the view in the past that a case for promotion should rely mainly on the reputation and recognition already established by known work in the field, but a candidate may consider it appropriate that a referee have copies of selected important contributions or in some cases, copies of recently published work which may not yet be widely known. Referees will be furnished with a copy of the curriculum vitae submitted.

- E. Documentation of your teaching activities and evaluations (the Teaching Dossier). You should consult the Faculty of Science Guidelines for the Application of the APT Manual.
3. The Department Head will submit all necessary information to me by November 26, 200x. I will send an acknowledgement to the candidate and then proceed to contact referees.
 4. Prior to the convening of the Faculty Promotions Committee, the Department Head will be required to submit a letter of assessment of the case, and a copy of this letter will be made available to you by your Department Head by January 28, 200x. Department Heads will have access to the reports of external referees prior to writing their own assessment and recommendation.

I would like to stress that it is the individual’s responsibility to inform the Department Head in writing by November 15, 200x if he or she wishes their case to be formally considered and to supply the necessary information outlined in point 2. above by the same date. This should be recognized as a firm deadline.

Individuals will ordinarily wish to discuss their possible candidacy with the Department Head before making a decision. It is the Head's responsibility to be available for such discussions. However, a potential candidate should assume initiative for arranging a mutually agreeable time. Some Department Heads and individuals have off-campus commitments, and consequently, such arrangements should be made as soon as convenient. In addition, it is perhaps appropriate to reassure faculty members that Dean Boorman and I are always willing to discuss any problems with them confidentially.

Potential candidates are advised to consider very carefully their decisions whether to initiate the formal process of consideration or not. Experience has shown that premature requests for consideration can be unwise and that it is in the individual's best interests to apply only when it is felt that the case would impress referees and the Faculty Promotions Committee positively. In this respect the advice of the Department Head and senior colleagues can be very useful.

I hope that the foregoing provides adequate clarification of procedures. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Sandy Murphree
Vice-Dean (Planning and Research)

Encl.

cc: Dr. , Department Head
Dr., President, TUCFA

C. Tenure Process

The following sample letters detail the requirements for renewal of Initial Term and appointment with tenure.

Sample letter 1

Date:

1

To: Dr.
Department of

From: Sandy Murphree
Vice-Dean (Planning and Research)

Re: Application for Appointment 'with tenure'

Our records show that your 'initial term' appointment will expire on June 30, 200X. Continuation of your appointment beyond this date will require a recommendation to that effect from the Dean, acting on the advice of an Academic Appointment Review Committee.

For consideration by such a committee to take place, the following procedures will apply:

By December 1, 200X:

You must submit your letter of intent, and updated curriculum vitae and a list of referees through your Head of Department, to Dr. Sandy Murphree, Chair, Academic Appointment Review Committee (See attached APT Manual 5.6.11 and 5.6.13). The list should include the names, addresses, current phone numbers and FAX numbers of at least four authorities in the field of research from outside the University. It is also necessary that you identify any present or past relationship with the referees suggested;

By February 2, 200X:

You must submit a formal application (original and a copy) for appointment 'with tenure' to your Department Head by February 2, 200X (such application should be made by completing page one of the attached form) and please attach the following:

1. an up-to-date curriculum vitae;
2. any reprints or other material (particularly that relating to teaching effectiveness) which you wish to be made available to the Academic Appointment Review Committee;
3. five envelopes labelled with your name each containing copies of your c.v. and reprints, preprints, etc., which you wish to be sent to referees;
4. documentation of your teaching activities and evaluations (i.e. a "teaching dossier"). You should consult the Guidelines to be used by the Faculty of Science for the Application of the APT Manual (see attached).

The general principle to be applied in the subsequent deliberations is that cause must be shown in order to justify a positive decision. For this reason you should make sure that all information which you consider relevant to your case has been forwarded both to the Department Head and to the Vice-Dean (Planning and Research) for inclusion in your file.

The Department Head will submit the completed application with attachments to the Vice-Dean (Planning and Research) by February 2, 200X. After soliciting advice from members of the department, as prescribed in APT 5.6.18 and the Guidelines to be used by the Faculty of Science for the Application of the APT Manual, and after reviewing the referee reports that will be solicited from authorities in the field (See APT 5.6.19 and the Guidelines) the Head will complete an assessment and recommendation by April 15, 200X, which the Head should discuss with you. A finalized recommendation will be forwarded to the Vice-Dean (Planning and Research) by April 22, 200X with a copy to you. An academic appointee may formally respond to the Head's assessment prior to May 2, 200X. The response shall be in writing and will be submitted to the Head and the Dean. The response shall be included in the documentation submitted to the Academic Appointment Review Committee.

An Academic Appointment Review Committee will then consider your application. According to 5.7.6.1 of the Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff Manual the Committee will be required to make one of three possible recommendations, namely:

1. That your appointment be continued 'with tenure';
2. That your 'initial term' appointment be extended for one year;
3. That your appointment be allowed to lapse.

No recommendation to allow your appointment to lapse will be forwarded without an opportunity being given for you to appear before the Committee. This opportunity will also be provided should it become apparent during the Committee's deliberations that a decision may be reached that is less favourable to you than the written recommendation of the Department Head. Before September 1 you will be notified in writing of the specific recommendation being forwarded to the Vice-President (Academic), and you will be free to appeal against this recommendation.

For your information, I have enclosed a copy of the Faculty of Science Guidelines for the Application of the APT Manual.

Sincerely,

Sandy Murphree
Vice-Dean (Planning and Research)

Sample letter 2

1

Date:

To: Dr.
Department of Mathematics and Statistics

From: Sandy Murphree
Vice-Dean (Planning and Research)

PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL

Our records show that your 'initial term' appointment will expire on June 30, 200X. Continuation of your appointment beyond this date will require a recommendation to that effect from the Dean, acting on the advice of an Academic Appointment Review Committee or under Section 5.6.10 of the Procedures for Appointment, Promotions and Tenure of Academic Staff Manual.

You would normally apply for a two-year renewal of that Initial Term appointment. In certain circumstances you may consider applying for Early Consideration for Tenure under Section 5.4.9 of the Procedures for Appointment, Promotions and Tenure of Academic Staff Manual, but if you are considering such action you should first discuss it with your Department Head. In the event you decide to proceed with a request for Early Consideration for Tenure, please notify your Head and Dr. Sandy Murphree, Chair, Academic Appointment Review Committee by December 1, 200X, submitting a letter of intent, curriculum vitae, and a list of referees. (See attached APT Manual sections 5.6.11 and 5.6.13. and Guidelines to be used by the Faculty of Science for the Application of the APT Manual).

For consideration of an application to **renew your initial term contract**, the following will be required (original and a copy):

1. you must submit a formal application to your Department Head by April 1, 200X (such application should be made by completing page one of the attached form);
2. an up-to-date Curriculum vitae;
3. any reprints, preprints or other material (particularly that relating to teaching effectiveness) which you wish to be made available to the Academic Appointment Review Committee or the Dean;
4. documentation of your teaching activities and evaluations (i.e. a "teaching dossier"). You should consult the Guidelines to be used by the Faculty of Science for the Application of the APT Manual.

The general principle to be applied in the subsequent deliberations is that cause must be shown in order to justify a positive decision. For this reason you should make sure that all information which you consider relevant to your case has been forwarded both to the Department Head and to the Vice-Dean (Planning and Research) for inclusion in your file.

The Department Head will complete the evaluation (page two of the application form) and is required to discuss the evaluation with you by April 15, 200X. You are entitled to a copy of the completed evaluation, including specific recommendations being made. The Department Head will submit the completed application to the Vice-Dean (Planning and Research) with a copy to you by April 22, 200X.

An academic appointee may formally respond to the Head's assessment prior to May 2, 200X. The response shall be in writing and will be submitted to the Head and the Dean. The response shall be included in the documentation submitted to the Academic Appointment Review Committee.

The Dean may then refer the application to an Academic Appointment Review Committee, or proceed with a recommendation to renew your appointment under Section 5.6.10 of The Procedures for Appointment, Promotions and Tenure of Academic Staff.

If your application is referred to an Academic Appointment Review Committee, that committee will be required to make one of two possible recommendations to the Dean, namely:

- (i) That your 'initial term' appointment be renewed for two years;
- (ii) That your appointment be allowed to lapse.

No recommendation to allow your appointment to lapse would be forwarded without an opportunity being given for you to appear before the Committee. Before September 1 you will be notified in writing of the specific recommendation being forwarded to the Vice-President (Academic), and you will be free to appeal against this recommendation.

For your information, I have enclosed a copy of the Guidelines to be used by the Faculty of Science for the Application of the APT Manual.

Sincerely,

Sandy Murphree
Vice-Dean (Planning and Research)

Encl.

cc: Dr. Head, Department of

Appendix II

A. Policy on Teaching Evaluation

- a. A teaching questionnaire will be completed on a regular basis as required by G.F.C. (APT Manual 3.2.2 & 3.2.3). Normally the Universal Student Ratings Instrument will be administered in each course. The Faculty survey will also be administered, normally in at least one section for each faculty member in a two-year period.
- b. The USRI and Faculty Questionnaire will be administered through the Head's/Director's office and the instructor will not be involved or present during the process. The person administering the questionnaire will count the number of responses and write this on the envelope in which the sheets are filed. The person who administers the questionnaire will initial the envelope.
- c. If the instructor initiates the Faculty Questionnaire, the results will be provided to the instructor only after the final grades for the course have been submitted. If the Head/Director initiates the questionnaire, the results will be provided to the Head/Director. In the latter case the Head/Director shall provide the actual results to the individual. The Head/Director may also provide a written summary of the results.
- d. In most instances, the results of the Faculty Questionnaire shall be confidential between the Head/Director (and, if required, the Dean) and the instructor. Permission of the individual shall be obtained before these results are shown to individuals other than the Head/Director and/or Dean. When the results of the USRI are reported to the Head/Director and Dean, a copy shall be made available to FPC.

Appendix III

Guidelines for a Teaching Dossier

Introduction

Various one-time and periodic processes, which affect an academic staff member's career, involve consideration of an individual's teaching effectiveness.

The issue arises as to the method by which an academic staff member establishes their teaching performance and effectiveness. It is important to note that evaluations by students are by themselves insufficient documentation, not just in promotion and tenure processes, but in the annual assessment process as well. This is clearly stated in the APT Manual in part:

3.2.1 *“Although the evaluation of teaching may not be based solely on evaluations by students, such evaluations are one fact on which the evaluation of teaching shall be based. Student evaluations shall be required for all academic appointees (Teaching and Research) on a regular basis.”*

Section II.B.i and Appendix I specify that information about an individual's teaching activities are to be documented in a **teaching dossier**.¹ In its broadest sense a teaching dossier is the equivalent to an NSERC Personal Data Form (100), which allows an individual to document their contributions in the research area. Hence, one definition of a **teaching dossier** is:

A **teaching dossier** is a summary of an academic staff member's major teaching accomplishments and strengths. It is partly historical (e.g. courses taught, students supervised), partly promotional (e.g. for the tenure process or for nomination for a teaching award), partly evaluative (providing information for assessment), a partly reflective (e.g. self evaluation of successes and failures).

From the Faculty of Science perspective it is important to emphasize that the purpose of a teaching dossier is not simply an administrative necessity. As a reflective document it is hoped that it will provide a written forum for an academic staff member's introspective view of their teaching activities. This ultimately implies that there is no definitive format which must be followed by all individuals. However, there are certain elements which the Faculty of Science suggests be part of a teaching dossier in order to facilitate its use in evaluative procedures.²

¹ Indeed it should be noted that even for the annual assessment process individuals are allowed to submit a multi-year teaching dossier for consideration ([GPC Manual 5.1.6.4](#))

² For further suggestions and information references such as below should be consulted:

CAUT Shore, B., S. Foster, C. Knapper, G. Nadeau, N. Neill, and V. Sim. The CAUT Guide to the Teaching Dossier: Its Preparation and Use, Canadian Association of University Teachers, 1986.

Dalhousie, O'Neil, C. and A. Wright. Recording Teaching Accomplishment: A Dalhousie Guide to the Teaching Dossier, Office of Instructional Development and Technology, Dalhousie University, 1993.

Guelph www.tss.uoguelph.ca/resources/teachers/packageTd.html

University of Alberta www.ualberta.ca/%7Euts/UTS/dossier.htm

University of Victoria web.uvic.ca/terc/resources/publications/teaching.htm

Waterloo www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infotrac/tdossier.html

It is important to be succinct in describing one's teaching activities for much the same reason that NSERC has a page limit for their Personal Data Form. The Faculty of Science recommends a maximum of ten (10) pages (not inclusive of Appendices) be allotted. Suggested sections to be included in the teaching dossier are:

1. **Teaching Philosophy:** This is perhaps the most difficult portion of the teaching dossier to write. It provides the academic staff member with a forum to describe their beliefs, ethics, style and values as they pertain to the teaching process. Questions one might consider addressing include:
 - What are my commitments to teaching?
 - How do students best learn in my discipline?
 - By what mechanisms do I attempt to facilitate the learning process?
 - How do my teaching activities contribute to the Department/Program discipline goals?
2. **Teaching Contributions:** This section is the primary history section of the dossier. It should include your complete teaching record (as distinct from NSERC requirements). Examples of categories to document:
 - Courses taught
 - Undergraduate Projects Supervised
 - Graduate Theses Supervised
3. **Courses Developed/Modified:** It is important to detail what are commonly the extensive efforts necessary to develop and or modify courses. This primarily should be in prose with reference to relevant syllabi included in the Appendices.
4. **Description of Efforts to Improve Teaching:** In general teaching effectiveness is a growth process and academic staff continually change their approach to improve their effectiveness and in some cases perception of quality on the part of students. Documentation of peer evaluation and a listing of teaching courses taken should be provided. As well efforts toward improving the learning experience beyond those courses directly responsible for, to include curricula evolution both within and beyond the Department/Program, should be highlighted.
5. **Recognition of Teaching Activities:** Evidence of acknowledgement of efforts such as nomination and/or being awarded teaching awards, letters of support from peers, unsolicited letters from students all provide confirmation of the academic staff member's effectiveness in the area of teaching.
6. **Appendices:** These provide the academic staff member with the opportunity to document both quantitatively (e.g. via USRI's) and qualitatively teaching efforts. Suggested items to include are:
 - Selective Course Outlines
 - Examples of Assignments and/or Exams
 - Student Ratings of Instruction Summaries (formative and summative)