

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

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	Tw [(i.)1.1(Pa1 Tm -0.001R0w
	B. Guidelines for AppointmenReview	
	C. Guidelines foHeads/Dquiructson SolicilatinAdervics for thTenedu	6.1372.1(Pag 910)]TJ T* 0.000

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

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 b

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

- 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 journal and dddddd7 Ft resttione lol evelo(.00

fixed formula used to evaluate an individual's contribution to a multiple author publication.

- 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

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

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

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

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,

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

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

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

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

B. Promotion Process

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

Sample letter 1

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

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, CTdon byanc2.4(refe)T 9-3(., and upf:ncnt Review)20. 0.03 ee,9 0 T33 0 TD5(r)-3-3 -1.095 T-1.1533 2 -0Tc [(ree

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 re

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.

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:
 - x What are my commitments to teaching?
 - x How do students best learn in my discipline?
 - x By what mechanisms do I attempt to facilitate the learning process?
 - x 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:
 - x Courses taught
 - x Undergraduate Projects Supervised
 - x Graduate Theses Supervised

3. Courses Developed/Modified: It is important to detail what are commonly the extensive efforts