

**Department of
Integrative Biology (IB)**

**Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Performance
Review**

May 2010

**Approved by Department
July 9, 2010**

**Editorial revision
April 2012**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLE 1.	FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION INTRODUCTION	3
ARTICLE 2.	DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT AND ALTERNATE CAREER PATHS	4
ARTICLE 3.	INFORMATION TO BE CONSIDERED FOR TENURE, PROMOTION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW	5
ARTICLE 4.	FACULTY ACTIVITIES	6
4.1	TEACHING	6
4.2	RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES	7
4.3	SERVICE	7
ARTICLE 5.	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION COVERING THE MOST RECENT TIME INCREMENT.	8
ARTICLE 6.	TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.	11
ARTICLE 7.	PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	12
ARTICLE 8.	DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS OF EVALUATION.	13
APPENDIX A	TEACHING DOSSIER	16

Article 1. FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION

Tenure and promotion deliberations occur annually for all eligible faculty members. All probationary faculty members are reviewed annually for the purpose of providing feedback on career development. Performance reviews are conducted for all tenure stream faculty members on a biennial basis and on an annual basis for contractually limited faculty. Tenure-track faculty members who received a performance rating of less than Good will be evaluated in the next year for the purpose of providing feedback only. The period of review for the annual and biennial deliberations is September 1 to August 31. The Department of Integrative Biology (IB) will undertake assessments according to the specifications in the Collective Agreement.

INTRODUCTION

Any evaluation of faculty must focus on the overall aims and purposes of the University. "Towards 2000: Challenges and Responses. Aims of the University of Guelph" (subsequently referred to as T2000) identifies three functions of the University. "It must educate its students (its teaching function); it must contribute to the advancement of human knowledge (its research function), and, as far as possible, it must shape its teaching and research in ways that will meet specific societal needs (its service function)." The University of Guelph Act also supports these functions and identifies "the objectives and purposes of the University" as "the advancement of learning and the dissemination of knowledge" (a useful definition of scholarship) and "the intellectual, social, moral, and physical development of its members, and the betterment of society". The responsibilities of faculty members are specified in the Collective Agreement. The pursuit of excellence in these areas of responsibility should be the objective of all faculty members.

The University of Guelph uses a system of peer evaluation of its faculty, both at the department and the college level, in determining the recommendations that will be made regarding tenure, promotion, and salary increments. The system of peer evaluation is based on three assumptions: the evaluation is necessarily a complex, difficult, and partially subjective procedure; it is a task best undertaken by the exercise of the collective wisdom of a group rather than of a single person; and it is one's peers who are in the best position to make recommendations on tenure and promotion. They are the most likely to be acquainted with the relevant performance criteria appropriate for a faculty member's field and for the department.

All aspects of a faculty member's duties, responsibilities, and contributions to the pursuit of the aims of the University may be considered by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (subsequently referred to as the Committee). This includes both the information submitted in Progress and Performance Assessment Templates for faculty reporting and further information, as outlined below (known collectively as an Assessment Portfolio), which is made available to committee members.

Following the periodic review of faculty according to the procedures outlined in the Department Guidelines document and the Collective Agreement, the Committee will provide Performance Assessment Reports, Progress Reports, Tenure and Promotion Reports and Promotions Reports to the College Committee (as appropriate) on templates established by the Provost. The reports will be signed by all members that were present for the evaluation within the Department. The College Committee will use the information from the department reports as part of their assessment of the faculty member. The Dean will provide feedback to the faculty member within fifteen days following completion of the tenure and promotion considerations by the College Committee. The letter will be signed by all members of the College Committee that were present for the relevant deliberations. The intent is to provide constructive, written feedback to each faculty member on their performance in their various areas of responsibility. This process affords an opportunity to give positive support to faculty as well as guidance and advice.

Tenure, promotion and performance reviews must be applied in the full knowledge that time is required for an incoming faculty member to develop courses, initiate research programs (including the financing, and recruitment of graduate students), and to develop a network of contacts.

Article 2. DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT AND ALTERNATIVE CAREER PATHS

The Department of IB holds that, optimally, a faculty member should make scholarly contributions to teaching and research, as well as substantial effort with regard to service to the University and society. A balance of contributions to each of these areas is expected from faculty when being considered for tenure, promotion and performance review. This is agreed to biennially in discussions and written agreements with the Dean through the Chair. For tenure, promotion, and performance reviews the evaluation of a faculty member by the Committee must be based on the written agreement regarding activities and distribution of effort. This distribution of effort for each faculty member must be declared to all members of the Committee at the time of evaluation. At the present time, each faculty member who has not reached a specific written agreement with the Dean/Chair, will be considered to have a distribution of effort consisting of approximately 45% teaching, 45% research, and 10% committee work and other services to the University and society. The distribution of effort will be stated in the appointment letter of the faculty member.

During the course of a faculty member's career, the emphasis given to his or her academic activities may change as negotiated by the faculty member and through a specific written agreement with the Dean through the Chair. For example, a faculty member may wish to negotiate an amendment to the distribution of effort for a particular biennial review period. Thus, the specific assignments of various faculty members may differ between individuals, and may vary from year to year. In the longer term, faculty may negotiate an alternative career path that emphasized one of teaching, research or service. Here, additional and sustained activity in the area of emphasis would be

expected, and the expectation of contributions to other areas would be reduced. For example, a career path that involved a major commitment to classroom teaching would likely involve additional teaching over 2 semesters per year. Such a career path might lead to high merit ratings if the quality of performance as a teacher was high. However, this by itself would not lead to tenure or promotion. It is also expected that the faculty member will have demonstrated significant scholarly activity related to teaching such as publications on teaching philosophy and methodology, teaching materials (e.g., books, lab manuals, films, slide sets, computer programs, web sites), and oral presentations to professional educators or to other user groups.

The Department as a whole has certain responsibilities for undergraduate instruction, graduate instruction, and service activities. It is the responsibility of the Chair to assign these duties to various faculty members equitably, to ensure that the responsibilities of the Department as a whole are met. Assignment of duties by the Chair will be consistent with the parameters outlined in the Collective Agreement (i.e., the teaching assignment is communicated in writing from the Dean through the Chair) and shall recognize the academic freedom of the faculty member. As much as possible, assignments will take into account the preferences of individual faculty regarding how they can best contribute to the aims and functions of the University, and to the requirements of the Department. However, it is recognized that a faculty member's preferences cannot always be accommodated.

Article 3. INFORMATION TO BE CONSIDERED FOR TENURE, PROMOTION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

For purposes of evaluation for tenure, promotion and/or performance reviews, each faculty member will provide to the Committee information and/or material relevant to her/his activities in the areas of teaching, research, and other service (Assessment Portfolio). A compilation of information must be submitted on the approved templates in electronic format. In addition, electronic copies of all articles published during the last 2 years should be submitted. This information is normally sufficient for evaluation by the Committee, but it is not intended to restrict in any way any additional information and/or material a faculty member might wish to provide for consideration. In particular, faculty with atypical duties and responsibilities or with activities not listed below may submit additional information or material. For example, faculty with a career path that involves scholarly activity in teaching and a reduced research component might wish to expand Article 4.1 below under teaching.

All material and documentation that is used by the Committee to evaluate a particular faculty member must have been seen in advance by that faculty member. The faculty member is responsible for ensuring that his/her Portfolio is complete and presented in the approved templates and is submitted to the Chair by August 15th. The Chair will meet with each probationary Faculty Member to review his/her Assessment Portfolio prior to the commencement of Committee deliberations. Such a meeting is to take place prior to the end of August.

Article 4. FACULTY ACTIVITIES

4.1 Teaching

The Department of IB encourages and fosters excellence in teaching, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Participation in teaching at both of these levels will receive consideration in deliberations about promotion, tenure and performance review.

At the undergraduate level, teaching contributions may include the following:

- classroom and laboratory involvement and delivery of course material,
- distance education involvement,
- supervising research projects,
- course and program development (e.g., content, methodology, coordination).

At the graduate level, teaching contributions may include the following:

- classroom and laboratory involvement and delivery of course material,
- participating in graduate seminars and colloquia,
- course and program development (e.g., content, methodology, coordination)
- advising graduate student research projects,
- participating in graduate advisory committees,
- participating in graduate qualifying and final examinations,
- student advising and mentoring.

Faculty are also encouraged to pursue teaching excellence by attending workshops, applying for teaching development funds and through scholarly activity. Evidence of scholarly activity includes publications on teaching philosophy and methodology, teaching materials (e.g., books, lab manuals, films, slide sets, computer programs, web sites), and oral presentations to professional educators or to other user groups.

The Department is committed to peer and student evaluation of teaching. Peer evaluation may include the following:

- evaluation by colleagues of the teaching dossier, course content and examinations,
- classroom observation by trained individuals using agreed upon protocols,
- consideration of student evaluation results,
- signed, written student comments.

A teaching dossier (minimally a statement of teaching approach and philosophy) (Appendix A) must also be made available.

Student assessment of teaching will occur at the end of each semester using an approved College Form. The form will make it clear that written comments will only be used for tenure, promotion and performance review purposes if they are signed.

All evaluation material will be made available to the faculty member before being presented to Department and College Tenure and Promotion committees.

4.2 Research, Scholarly and Other Creative Activities

The Department of IB is a research intensive department. Faculty members will typically conduct research, scholarly and other creative activities leading to scientific discoveries. While those faculty members whose career path emphasizes teaching may not necessarily be involved in laboratory research, scholarship relevant to education is expected. The specific nature of these activities will be consistent with the objectives of the University, Department and personal interests and will emphasize both originality and excellence.

Scholarship and creativity in research can be demonstrated through some or all of the following:

- refereed publications, including reviews,
- editorship or authorship of books or chapters in books,
- other publications (e.g., technical reports) derived from research and scholarly activity that provides an appropriate intellectual challenge and constitute a significant contribution to science,
- presentations (particularly invited ones) at scholarly conferences and symposia,
- development of new technology, value-added products, and patents,
- a historical record of successful applications for grants/contracts.

The Department recognizes that some types of research involve long-term experimentation and development, not leading to immediate publication. Faculty members are expected to maintain a balance of long-term and short-term activities.

4.3 Service

Faculty in the Department of IB are expected to provide service to the University, to the scientific community and to society at large.

To function as an integral part of the University's academic community, faculty should be willing to participate in committees at all levels in the University. The Department believes that such participation contributes to the operation of the University, the quality of the working environment, and the pursuit of scholarly activity. It is expected that faculty will serve in a meaningful way on committees in the Department as requested by the Chair. In addition, faculty may be asked to serve on committees at the level of the College and the University, depending on their experience or academic rank. Faculty will be assessed on the quality of their contribution to committees.

The Department is also of the opinion that service to the scientific community is an important component of faculty activity, especially for faculty with senior academic ranks. Service includes the following:

- reviewing papers submitted to journals for publication,
- reviewing book chapters, books, or grant applications,
- serving on the editorial board of journals and other scientific publications,
- organizing symposia, conferences or scientific meetings,
- serving as an officer of a scientific association,
- acting as a member of a granting panel,
- being an external examiner of theses or academic programs,
- acting as an external referee for tenure and promotion applications.

Service to society at large occurs in many forms and is considered for evaluation purposes, particularly when faculty members use their scientific expertise. Service includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- technical or scientific advisor for government agencies, industry, and non-governmental organizations,
- expert witness in legal matters,
- invited contributor to print or visual media (e.g., newspapers, magazines, television),
- invited speaker at non-scientific meetings, conferences, or symposia.

In all cases, evidence will be required of competence in the dissemination of knowledge and the application of results of scholarly enquiry for the benefit of a user group. Proficiency in service activities alone is not a basis for tenure, promotion or a high selective increment rating.

Article 5. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION COVERING THE MOST RECENT TIME INCREMENT

An overall performance rating is based on an integration of the evaluations in the areas relevant to an individual's career path. These areas can include teaching, research, and service. Contributions within these defined areas must be documented for tenure, promotion and performance evaluations leading to salary increments. Although it is not expected that all faculty will excel in all areas, it is expected that faculty show mastery in all areas appropriate to their appointment as defined by their career path. Information provided in the reporting template approved by the College relates to the previous six years, although decisions will be made primarily on the basis of the preceding two years of effort for tenure stream faculty and one year for contractually limited faculty.

Assessment of performance for the purposes of compensation (career and performance increments) will be made on a biennial basis for all faculty members, except for contractually limited faculty who are evaluated annually. The Department Committee will

assess each member's performance and report the recommendation in the Performance Assessment Report that is sent to the College Committee. The assessment includes a rating (Unsatisfactory, Improvement Required/Developmental, Good, Very Good, Outstanding) based on the criteria listed below and taking the distribution of effort into account. The method and criteria to determine the overall performance rating of each faculty member is described in Article 8.

This rating is mostly based on the two-year record of performance but must also take into account past and current records. At each meeting, the Committee will (by secret ballot) recommend one of the following overall performance ratings for each faculty member to the College Committee: The salary increment that corresponds to each performance rating is provided in the Collective Agreement.

Unsatisfactory: Performance is unsatisfactory relative to the standards of the Department and the University, in that it falls well short of expectations within the established career path and allocation of duties. The faculty member is not meeting his/her responsibilities. In the standard career path this will mean poor work in teaching and/or negligible research* outcomes.

*"Research" includes the scholarly activities associated with an alternative career path that is oriented toward education.

Improvement Required/Developmental: There is insufficient evidence of career progress to justify normal advancement. The performance falls short of "good" but cannot be deemed entirely unsatisfactory. This judgment could reflect teaching of barely acceptable quality (e.g., poor classroom performance, teaching materials less than current, persistent student complaints that have been investigated and are deemed justified), or less than satisfactory performance in assigned service/administrative duties, or negligible output of scholarly work, or all of these.

Good: A good performance by the standards of a major university that is recognized as a leader in the country and maintains high expectations of its faculty. This level of performance will show obvious career progress. Performance will more than merely "satisfactory"; otherwise there would be no reason to recognize career development. There will be no significant problems or unsatisfactory aspects in any of the areas of teaching, research*, or service.

Very Good: A very good performance relative to the high expectations of a major university recognized as leader in the country. A positive approach to service or administrative assignments is expected, as is effective discharge of these assignments.

Outstanding: A performance that stands out in cross-university terms. A positive approach to administrative assignments is expected, as is effective discharge of these assignments

Additional Guidelines:

- Each faculty member's distribution of effort will be made known to committee members before deliberations begin.
- A new faculty member (with less than one year in the Department) will normally be awarded the salary increment that is received by a member receiving a rating of Good (see Collective Agreement).
- For evaluation of faculty members who have been on Study/Research Leave during the period of evaluation, but which is not complete in that period, a rating will be assigned for that leave based on the average of the previous 3 assessments of the individual (where 3 are available). In exceptional circumstances a different rating may be assigned. The faculty member will submit a report of the outcome of the Study/Research Leave relative to what was planned. This report will be used as part of the overall evaluation of performance.
- For a faculty member who has taken paid or unpaid parental leave, the evaluation of performance shall be based on a time period during which the faculty member was not on leave.
- Performance evaluation documentation will be updated annually for contractually limited faculty, tenure-track faculty with probationary appointments and for tenure-track faculty who received ratings of less than Good at the biennial evaluation; documentation for all other faculty will be updated biennially unless they apply for tenure and promotion.
- At the conclusion of the performance evaluation, a Performance Assessment Report will be provided to the College Committee summarizing the Committee's recommendations. All members of the Committee who were present at the relevant deliberations will sign the report.
- The Performance Assessment Report will also summarize the consensus of the Committee's discussion of a faculty member's performance including perceived areas of strength and/or weakness, and may provide constructive suggestions regarding performance for the faculty member's consideration.
- The Department Chair will meet with probationary faculty, contractually limited faculty and those receiving a performance rating of less than Good within an eight-week period following the College-level evaluation to initiate discussion of their performance evaluation, their responsibilities and their distribution of effort.

Article 6. TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR - SECURING THE FIRST STAGE OF AN ACADEMIC CAREER

A faculty member may apply for the early granting of tenure and conferring of Promotion to Associate Professor once in either the third, fourth or fifth year of appointment. Such an application, including the name and full contact information of six (6) assessors, shall be made in writing by the faculty member to the Dean through the Department Chair by May 15th and must be accompanied by the Faculty Member's completed Portfolio which will include a lifetime record. The Chair and faculty member will agree on a list of acceptable external assessors and will forward this list (along with all required documentation) to the Dean by June 8th. External letters of assessment will normally be obtained from persons who are not faculty members of this University and be considered "arms length" from the candidate. The Dean will communicate with external assessors and information to assessors will be accompanied by a standard letter that has been developed and approved by the Provost. The written opinions from the external assessors will form part of the evaluations conducted by both the Department and College Committees.

The Department Committee will complete a Tenure and Promotion Report for each Faculty Member who has been considered. The Report will be signed by all members of the Committee who were present for the relevant deliberations. The completed and signed Tenure and Promotion Report and relevant recommendation will be sent to the Chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Department Committee will consider faculty for tenure and promotion with a "yes" or "no" vote (completed via secret ballot). For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to be supported, the Committee requires evidence of the faculty member's competence, maturity and independent scholarship. The Department recognizes that a faculty member's defined areas of responsibility (distribution of effort) will affect the quantity of effort in research, teaching and service.

A faculty member who has taken paid parental leave may elect to have academic decisions related to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor deferred by one year for each such leave. Such a deferral shall be granted automatically on the request of the faculty member. A faculty member who has taken unpaid parental leave may elect to have academic decisions related to tenure deferred for a time period equal to the amount of leave time taken.

The faculty member will demonstrate, in a manner appropriate for the defined distribution of effort:

- that teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level meets the expectations of fully satisfactory performance. He/she continues to demonstrate that they are an effective undergraduate teacher and contributes significantly to the graduate

program by one or more of: advising and completion of graduate students, serving on advisory or examination committees, or by teaching graduate courses. The information specified in Article 4.1 "Teaching" of this document including the teaching dossier and positive evaluations of teaching by students forms the basis of this assessment. For individuals who have negotiated a distribution of effort emphasizing education, the Committee expects excellence in teaching scholarship.

- that there is conclusive evidence of continuing scholarship and the establishment of an independent research program. Refereed publications continue to be produced beyond Ph.D. or Postdoctoral research. The greatest emphasis is usually given to papers published in refereed journals, books and chapters in books. The quality of these publications is assessed by an examination of the papers. However, the impact of the refereed papers is not the only criterion used, and all the information specified in Article 4.2 "Research" is considered.
- has made a significant contribution to service activities in the Department, College or University as listed under Article 4.3 "Service" by showing leadership and initiative.
- effective collaborations in teaching, research, and/or service with other personnel within and/or outside of the Department.

Article 7. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor will occur only on request of the Faculty Member. Such an application, including the name and full contact information of six (6) assessors, shall be made in writing by the faculty member to the Dean through the Department Chair by May 15th and must be accompanied by the Faculty Member's completed Portfolio which will include a lifetime record. The Chair and faculty member will agree on a list of acceptable external assessors and will forward this list (along with all required documentation) to the Dean by June 8th. External letters of assessment will normally be obtained from persons who are not faculty members of this University, be considered "arms length" from the candidate and are expert in the faculty member's research field. The Dean will communicate with external assessors and information to assessors will be accompanied by a standard letter that has been developed and approved by the Provost. The written opinions from the external assessors will form part of the evaluations conducted by both the Department and College Committees.

In order to be promoted to Professor a faculty member must have a continuing record of excellence and have demonstrated a high level of performance over an extended period of time. Consideration for promotion to Professor will be based on a Portfolio which contains a lifetime record of activities. Voting on promotion to Professor will be by a "yes" or "no" vote conducted via secret ballot.

The Department Committee will complete a Promotion Report for each Faculty Member who has been considered. The Report will be signed by all members of the Committee who were present for the relevant deliberations. The completed Promotion Report and relevant recommendation will be sent to the Chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

In order to be promoted to Professor a faculty member must have:

- a continuing record of effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This will be supported by positive evaluations of teaching by students and evidence of innovation, dedication and creativity in teaching as illustrated by the teaching dossier and other supporting documentation. These activities should have led to the establishment of a reputation as an excellent teacher. The information specified in Article 4.1 "Teaching" of this document including the teaching dossier and positive evaluations of teaching by students forms the basis of this assessment.
- a long-term, established and outstanding record in research scholarship. The Committee would normally expect excellence in research scholarship to be evidenced by a steady record of high quality papers published in refereed journals and the communication of research findings at scientific meetings. These publications should have led to the establishment of an international reputation. However, publications are not the only items to be evaluated, and the other items listed under Article 4.2 "Research" are also considered.
- a significant and continuing contribution to service activities as listed under Article 4.3 "Service" by showing leadership and initiative.

Article 8. DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS OF EVALUATION

The process of evaluation of faculty for Performance is described below. The Collective Agreement states that each Department must specify its method for arriving at the recommended performance rating step evaluation that is communicated to the College Committee in the Performance Assessment Report. Thus, some degree of objectivity must be described (see Method below).

In brief, each member of the Committee will evaluate each faculty member in each of the areas of effort that we deem important (i.e., teaching, research, service) and assign to each of them a performance rating, ranging from Unacceptable to Outstanding (see Article 5). The ratings will be based on each Committee member's assessment of the information provided by faculty in their Portfolio and by information provided on course evaluations. These ratings will then be used to assign an overall performance rating.

In addition to alternative career paths, where each faculty member may negotiate with the Dean via the Chair to have the weight of their distribution of effort vary from the departmental default of 45% for teaching, 45% for research, and 10% for service, short term variations in responsibilities will also be accommodated. If a faculty member reached an agreement with the Chair for a career path that emphasized one of teaching, research, or service, then additional activity in the area of emphasis would be expected, and the expectation of contributions to other areas would be reduced.

LETTER FROM THE CHAIR

On or about April 1st, faculty will be sent a letter informing them of the coming round of assessments. This confidential letter will include the following:

1. a record of the agreed upon distribution of effort used in the last assessment
2. a reminder of the deadlines for all information
3. a reminder of the required contents of the assessment Portfolio and the format (electronic) that is due August 15th
4. a reminder that requests for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor must be submitted by May 15th and be accompanied by a list of external assessors including full contact information. The list of assessors must be agreed upon with the Chair before the necessary documentation is submitted to the Dean by June 8th in the event that a faculty member intends to apply for tenure and promotion.

Faculty with either administrative responsibilities external to the Department or significant responsibilities (research and service) in organizations external to the University due to the nature of their appointment, will have a deadline on or about July 1st for the submission of their Portfolios so that written opinion on the manner in which the faculty member has discharged her/his duties can be made available to the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee. The faculty member will be provided with the opinion statement before the meeting of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee so that they have the opportunity to prepare a response that will also be provided to the Committee.

METHOD

The procedure that the Committee will follow for Performance Assessment is described below. All documents generated during this process are considered confidential and will be returned to the faculty member upon completion of the assessments, unless retention is required by the Collective Agreement.

1. All Committee members will receive the Portfolio and course evaluations for all

faculty members of the Department.

2. The Chair will divide the faculty among members of the Committee such that two Committee members take the lead role for evaluating the submitted material (specifically, research papers and/or any other detailed documentation of teaching or service effort) for the period under evaluation. If possible, at least one of the reviewers should be close to the area of research expertise of the faculty member. The Committee members should be prepared to briefly summarize the faculty member's overall achievement and comment on its substantive value.
3. Each Committee member will assess all faculty members in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service and provide the Committee with a performance rating of Unacceptable, Improvement Required/Developmental, Good, Very Good or Outstanding for each of the areas and an overall performance rating.
4. At the Committee meeting, discussion will take place regarding the activity of each faculty member, led by the two designated Committee members. Following that discussion, each Committee member will reconsider the assessments they have made in each category, and then reconsider the overall evaluation of performance.
5. The overall performance ratings will be considered by the Committee to make sure that proper regard has been given to major achievements over the longer term and to ensure that other special circumstances have been appropriately considered.
6. The final overall performance rating for all faculty members will be discussed, and voted upon through secret ballot and included in the Performance Assessment Report that is submitted to the College Committee.

FEEDBACK TO FACULTY

Faculty will receive feedback from the Dean and College Committee within 15 days after the completion of the College-level evaluation. The letter from the College Committee is signed by all members of the Committee who were present at the relevant deliberations. Where superior performance has been assessed this will be indicated by referring to specific examples that particularly impressed the Committee. Where improvement is needed, specific examples will be cited and constructive recommendations will be made indicating what the Committee might view as progress towards remedying the situation. Any responses to, or revisions of, this letter will be retained in the faculty member's official file along with the original.

Appendix A. TEACHING DOSSIER

In 1994, the University adopted a policy which states: "Part of the regular evaluation by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will be based on a teaching dossier which provides a vehicle for faculty to report teaching accomplishments. The dossier will be revised by the faculty member at least once every two years and made continuously available to the Committee. This dossier will include a teaching statement in which the faculty member provides a contextual commentary on teaching experiences and objectives. The teaching statement permits faculty to provide a context for student evaluations. The dossier may also include materials such as course outlines, assignments, instructional aids, final examinations, reports on classroom observation by peers, and measures of student achievements (such as entry-exit tests)."

The teaching dossier should reflect what the faculty member professes to be his or her core approaches, principal goals and most significant accomplishments in teaching and student learning. It allows the faculty member to provide a context in which the Committee can fairly interpret and evaluate the otherwise stark inventory of courses taught and numerical student evaluation scores. But beyond this evaluative function, the dossier should also serve as a tool faculty can use to reflect on their own teaching, and develop and describe strategies for self-improvement.

A teaching statement satisfies the minimum requirements for the teaching dossier. The teaching statement should describe the professor's philosophy or approach to teaching, and describe any special circumstances associated with his or her teaching efforts that would help the Committee to evaluate teaching performance. The faculty member may wish to include other materials such as examples of key outcomes of teaching that help characterize his or her teaching endeavors, descriptions of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching, awards, publications and consultations.

The following framework for a Teaching Dossier was derived from University of Guelph and Canadian Association of University Teachers documents concerning teaching dossier development and evaluation. This framework should be considered as a guideline and not a rigid template. In practical consideration of both the faculty member's desire to present all relevant information and the committee's workload, the core of the dossier should normally not exceed 5 pages. Additional pages of teaching outcomes may be appended.

TEACHING DOSSIER

- I. **Teaching Statement.** Comments by the faculty member on his or her teaching philosophy, goals and recent outcomes – not to exceed 3 pages.

- II. **Outcomes of Teaching** - what your students accomplished
 1. examples of student essays or other creative work
 2. publications by students on course-related work
 3. student scores on standardized or entry-exit tests
 4. undergraduate research projects supervised
 5. graduate theses supervised
 6. documentation of the effect of the professor's courses or influence on student career choice
 7. evidence of help provided to colleagues on teaching improvement

- III. **Descriptive material on current teaching practices**
 1. list of print and non-print course materials prepared for students with key examples appended
 2. information on professor's availability to students
 3. examples of innovative teaching materials
 4. steps taken to emphasize interrelatedness, relevance and international implications of the course content

- IV. **Scholarship and reflection on teaching**
 1. list of peer-reviewed and other publications associated with teaching
 2. teaching workshops or seminars presented or organized
 3. instructional innovations attempted and their effectiveness
 4. revision or development of educational materials
 5. workshops attended and how information was subsequently used
 6. participation in curriculum development
 7. use of Teaching Support Services or other faculty resources
 8. association with societies concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning

- V. **Recognition of expertise**
 1. awards received
 2. peer consultations conducted
 3. requests for other teaching consultations
 4. invitations to instruct for outside agencies