

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
CRITERIA, POLICIES and PROCEDURES for
TENURE, ASSESSMENT and PROMOTION

PREAMBLE

- I. FACULTY GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 3: CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, TENURE, MERIT ASSESSMENT AND PROMOTION**
 - A General Criteria for Evaluations
 - B Guidelines for Interpretation of the General Criteria
 - B.1 Teaching
 - B.2 Research
 - B.3 Service

- II. FACULTY GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 4: PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT**
 - A Normal Procedures
 - B Extraordinary Procedures for Expedited Spousal Hiring
 - C Guidelines for Adjunct Professor Appointments

- III. FACULTY GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 5: PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT REVIEW**
 - A Renewal of Initial Term
 - B General Criteria for Tenure Consideration
 - B.1 Teaching
 - B.2 Research (professorial ranks only)
 - B.3 Service
 - C Guidelines for Review of Applicants in the Professorial Ranks
 - C.1 Responsibilities of Candidates in the Professorial Ranks
 - C.2 Referees for Candidates Holding Professorial Appointments
 - D Guidelines for Review of Applicants in the Instructor Ranks
 - D.1 Responsibilities of Candidates in the Instructor Ranks
 - D.2 Referees for Candidates Holding Instructor Appointments
 - E Guidelines for Heads in Soliciting Advice
 - F Guidelines for Academic Appointment Review Committee
 - F.1 Composition of the Academic Appointment Review Committee
 - F.2 Committee Procedures

- IV. FACULTY GUIDELINES RELATING TO APT SECTION 6: MERIT ASSESSMENT AND PROMOTIONS**
 - A General Statement on Assessment and Merit Increments
 - B Unsatisfactory Performance
 - C Relative Weighting of Activities for Merit Recommendations
 - C.1 Criteria and Expectations
 - C.2 Teaching
 - C.3 Scholarship and Research
 - C.4 Service
 - D Promotions in the Professorial Stream
 - D.1 Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor
 - D.2 Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
 - E Promotions in the Instructor Stream

- F Composition of the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC)
 - F.1 Membership of FPC
 - F.2 Meetings of FPC
 - F.3 Appeals to FPC
- G Departmental Committees to Advise Heads on Recommendations

PREAMBLE

The University of Calgary's procedures and policies regarding appointments, appointments *With Tenure*, merit and promotions are set out in the APT Manual ("Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff" – October 2008). The present document provides detail about the procedures and policies of the Faculty of Humanities and sets forth criteria for recommending candidates for appointment, tenure, merit assessment and promotion.

It is important that these clarifications and elaborations be understood in the larger context provided by the APT and GPC ("Manual of Policies and Procedures for the Annual Assessment of Academic Staff [Salary Increments and Promotions]" – October 2005) Manuals.

This document supersedes earlier documents of the Faculty: "Faculty of Humanities Procedures and Policies Regarding Appointments *With Tenure*"; "Procedures and Policies: Faculty Promotions Committee" (1997); "Selection and Appointment Procedures" (2002); and "Faculty of Humanities Criteria, Policies and Procedures for Tenure, Assessment and Promotion" (2004).

I. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, TENURE, MERIT ASSESSMENT and PROMOTION (see APT section 3)

A. General Criteria for Evaluations

Faculty members are expected to be active in three areas:

- Teaching
- Research
- Service

Recommendations regarding the award of merit increments, tenure and promotion are based on performance in all three areas. While teaching and research are of greater importance than service, involvement and competence in service will be considered in judging an individual's overall performance. 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.

Performance in these three areas is evaluated by the Head of the Department in the regular assessment. The Department Head will take into consideration the increasing expectations for performance with progressive rank when making the recommendation for merit increments (APT Manual 3.6-3.10). Considerations for promotion and for merit increment by the Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) will be guided by the Head's recommendations. For tenure considerations the Academic Appointment Review Committee (AARC) will consider all three components of an applicant's contributions over his or her career, with particular emphasis on contributions at the University of Calgary.

Faculty members are responsible for meeting the Faculty's published deadlines for submitting materials for assessment, tenure, and promotion.

The Faculty of Humanities advises faculty members to discuss career development regularly with their Head.

B. Guidelines for Interpretation of the General Criteria

B.1 Teaching

Teaching is a primary function of the University and it must be regularly evaluated. See APT Manual 3.2.2. Documentation of teaching effectiveness includes the mandatory University teaching assessment and the Faculty of Humanities Student Opinion of Teaching questionnaire. Student ratings or evaluations must not be the sole basis for the evaluation of teaching performance (APT 3.2.3).

- oral publication in the form of conference papers
- the receipt of significant research grants and/or awards
- prizes, fellowships and scholarships
- invitations to deliver scholarly talks or major addresses to one's peers
- participation in and the presentation of papers at national / international conferences / workshops
- significant creative work (fiction, poetry, drama, etc.)
- publications related to University-level teaching

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).

The Faculty of Humanities interprets this to mean that the scholarship required to maintain currency in the field may include, but not be restricted to, traditional scholarly research. Instructors may, for example, become involved in the development and dissemination of new teaching methods. These activities should be explicitly documented in the Teaching Dossier.

c) Responsibilities of Heads in Evaluating Research

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

B.3 Service

Service will be assessed in terms of the willingness to serve, taking into account both quantity and quality. Relevant factors include the scope of the activity (from departmental to international), the weight of responsibility, the leadership abilities required or demonstrated, the expertise required, the nature of the assignment (appointed, invited, elected, volunteered), the time commitment, the distinction brought to the unit or the University as a whole, and the relationship of the service role to the individual's role as an academic staff member.

Internal service includes:

- holding a major administrative office (Provost, Vice-President, Dean, Head / Director and associate of any of these)
- serving as Chair of a University, Faculty or Department Committee
- membership on a University, Faculty or Department Committee
- review and evaluation of peers for purposes of promotion, merit or awards
- service to the University, Faculty,

“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.”

II. PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT

5. After reviewing all applications, the Selection Committee, through its Chair, will recommend in writing to the Dean that a ranked short-list of candidates be interviewed. The short-list should normally be limited to no more than three candidates. Files containing CVs and letters of reference for those on the proposed list, together with similar files for candidates close to making the proposed list, should be forwarded to the Dean at the time this recommendation is made.
6. After the Dean has approved the short-list, the Chair of the Selection Committee will normally invite candidates to the campus for interviews to be conducted in the Department by the Committee and for any other activities deemed appropriate by the Department concerned (e.g. delivery of a scholarly paper, conducting a class, meeting with graduate students, meeting with other affected disciplinary groups if applicable). The Chair is responsible for the schedule of the visits of all interviewees, and shall make every effort to give interviewees similar treatment and opportunities.
7. Prior to making a final recommendation on the candidates, the Chair of the Selection Committee shall provide an opportunity for the department to submit feedback in writing to the Selection Committee.
8. A 30-minute interview between each candidate and the Dean should be scheduled as part of the planned activities, so that the Dean has an opportunity to meet prospective appointees and to explain such things as research and scholarship leaves, increments, promotions, tenure, removal allowances, etc.
9. After making its decision about which candidate or candidates warrant an offer of appointment, the committee shall consult the APT Manual 4.3.10 on the subject of Employment Equity and act accordingly.
10. The Committee, through its Chair, will convey in writing its final recommendation to the Dean in the form of a rank-ordered list of preferred candidates. This recommendation should state whether the second-ranked candidate should be offered a job, if the first declines, etc. The Chair of the Committee should be prepared to explain the criteria used in ranking the candidates. A Committee may decide, for good reason, to recommend no candidate.
11. The Chair may express to the Dean reservations about or dissent from the Committee's recommendation, provided that the Committee is informed. Similarly, the Dean shall state, when recommending an appointment

C. Guidelines for Adjunct Professor Appointments

(based on Policy for Appointment and Reappointment of Adjunct Faculty to the Faculty of Humanities, approved by Full Council – November 2, 2006)

Adjunct appointments are intended to promote collaboration between members of the full-time academic staff of the Faculty and Adjunct appointees whose potential contribution in teaching, research and/or service is judged valuable to the Faculty as a whole. Note that Adjunct appointments may be made at any rank or title.

Adjunct appointments are normally considered first in association with a Department and such appointments will be governed by Department set policy. However, in certain cases appointment to the Faculty will be considered. This type of appointment is primarily for individuals who have already distinguished themselves in careers at the university, and who as a consequence bring a broad and useful range of relevant experience to the Faculty. Normally the candidate will concurrently hold a continuing academic appointment at the University of Calgary or another university.

Expectations:

The primary responsibility of an Adjunct will be identified at the time of appointment.

Privileges of Adjunct Professors:

During their term of appointment, appointees will be entitled to use the term “Adjunct Professor (with the appropriate rank)”. They will also have the opportunity to apply for research grants, perform research, collaborate with graduate students, prepare relevant publications, and interact with members of the Faculty.

Access to an office will be dependent on both research responsibilities and space availability. Secretarial / administrative support will not normally be available to appointees.

Terms of Appointment:

All Adjunct appointments will be made initially for a term of at least one year. Reappointments may be made for a period of up to five years. There is no limit on the number of times an individual may be reappointed.

Application for Initial Appointment:

An application for initial appointment as an Adjunct can be submitted at any time during the academic year. The application must include a current curriculum vitae, a statement of why the applicant desires adjunct status and a detaifor fe0 TDdr-1.2 TcJ-35025 Tw[.6()]TJ0i—3588d6(why theoli)66he University of Calgary or 1 Tc-2.7(r te Tc0 TwvB886 0 7

by the Head, the Dean, if the applicant concurs, will forward this recommendation to the Provost & Vice-President (Academic) without reference to an Academic Appointment Review Committee (see APT 5.6.10).

B. General Criteria for Tenure Consideration

The APT Manual requires Faculties to indicate “how accomplishments in teaching, research, and service are translated into recommendations for tenure” (3.5.4f & g). In the Faculty of Humanities the following criteria apply:

Candidates for appointment *With Tenure* must demonstrate achievement appropriate to rank in teaching, research, and service (professorial ranks), or in teaching and service (instructor ranks). Service is weighted less heavily than the other categories of achievement.

B.1 Teaching

All candidates for appointment *With Tenure* must have evidence of a good level of achievement in teaching and must demonstrate the capacity for consistently effective teaching in the future. A teaching dossier of the kind described in the Faculty’s “Policy on Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching” (see section V, A below) must accompany each tenure application. See sections C & D below. In the case of Instructors, the Academic Appointment Review Committee (AARC) pays particular attention to the comments of referees. See D.2 below.

B.2 Research (professorial ranks only)

Candidates must provide evidence of good achievement in this area. While the quantity of scholarly output may vary according to the standards of the candidate’s field, the candidate must have completed sufficient work of sufficiently high quality to assure the AARC that a continuing record of productive and valuable scholarship is to be expected in the future. In assessing this, the AARC gives weight mainly to work published or accepted for publication rather than to work in progress. AARC looks for evidence that the candidate can “bring research projects to timely conclusions” (APT Manual 5.7.5.2d) and pays particular attention to work completed while the candidate has been a faculty member at the University of Calgary. AARC considers with particular attention the comments of referees about the quality of submitted items.

B.3 Service

Candidates must demonstrate commitment to the university and/or to their discipline or field by satisfactory contributions in an area of service. See also APT Manual 3.4.

C. Guidelines for Review of Applicants in the Professorial Ranks

C.1 Responsibilities of Candidates in the Professorial Ranks

- a) On or before 1 December candidates are to submit to the Chair of the AARC a letter of intent and a current curriculum vitae. Candidates are reminded that the onus is on them to make the case for the awarding of tenure (APT Manual 5.7.5.4).
- b) On or before February 1, all academic appointees who wish to be considered for appointment *With Tenure* shall submit their application form and relevant materials to the Chair, Academic Appointment Review Committee. In order that informed student opinion be taken into account by the Academic Appointment Review Committee, candidates for tenure in the Faculty of Humanities must submit a teaching dossier including “Faculty-approved narrative student opinion surveys representative of the courses and levels of courses taught ... as well as all of the information derived from the USRI [Universal Student Rating Instrument]”. (Faculty of Humanities “Policy on Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching” – 2007, C.1)
- c) The Dean will also ask candidates to submit to the Chair copies of up to five scholarly items to be sent to referees. These items usually include published articles or chapters and texts of papers delivered at

conferences; they may include examples of work in progress. Whole books are not normally sent to referees; selected chapters may be included in the package of five items.

- d) In addition, the Dean will invite candidates to submit ancillary material (e.g. copies of books, reviews of books, off-prints of articles, letters from assessors of manuscripts, comments from chairs of committees) that will enable the Academic Appointment Review Committee to better understand and evaluate candidates' work in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.
- e) Candidates should consult APT 5.6.11 to 5.6.21, with particular attention to dates and deadlines. The deadline for the submission of complete applications is February 1 (APT 5.6.12). However, the AARC may decide to consider new relevant information submitted no later than one working day before the Academic Appointment Review Committee meets (APT 5.6.17).
- f) The Head will solicit advice from other academic staff at the University of Calgary in accordance with established departmental procedures (APT 5.6.18; see Appendix 2 for department specific procedures), and

D. Guidelines for Review of Applicants in the Instructor Ranks

D.1 Responsibilities of Candidates in the Instructor Ranks

- a) On or before December 1, candidates are to submit to the Chair of the AARC a letter of intent and a curriculum vitae. Candidates are reminded that the onus is on them to make the case for the awarding of tenure (APT Manual 5.7.5.4).
- b) On or before February 1, all academic appointees who wish to be considered for appointment *With Tenure* shall submit their application form and relevant materials to the Chair, Academic Appointment Review Committee. In order that informed student opinion be taken into account by Academic Appointment Review Committees, candidates for tenure in the Faculty of Humanities must submit a teaching dossier including “Faculty-approved narrative student opinion surveys representative of the courses and levels of courses taught ... as well as all of the information derived from the USRI [Universal Student Rating Instrument]” (Faculty of Humanities “Policy on Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching” – 2007, C.1).
- c) The Dean will also invite candidates to submit to the Chair, should they choose to do so, copies of any items relevant to their professional competence as specified in their letters of appointment. Up to three such items may be sent to referees. See also APT Manual 5.7.5.3.
- d) In addition, the Dean will invite candidates to submit to the Chair ancillary material relevant to their terms of appointment (e.g. evidence of participation in teaching development, comments from chairs of committees) that will enable the Academic Appointment Review Committee to better understand and evaluate candidates’ work in the areas of scholarly teaching and service.
- e) Candidates should consult APT 5.6.11 to 5.6.21, with particular attention to dates and deadlines. The deadline for the submission of complete applications is February 1 (APT 5.6.12). However, the AARC may decide to consider any new relevant information submitted no later than one working day before the Academic Appointment Review Committee meets (APT 5.6.17).
- f) The Head will solicit advice from other academic staff at the University of Calgary in accordance with established departmental procedures (APT 5.6.18; see Appendix 2 for department specific procedures), and will provide a copy of his/her assessment and recommendation and discuss it with the candidate as described in APT 5.6.19.
- g) The Chair must notify the candidate if tenure will probably be denied. In such a case, the candidate has one week to respond in writing to the Chair. The applicant shall be invited to appear and address the Committee at the outset of the next meeting. For further information, see APT Manual 5.7.5.5 to 5.7.5.7.

Two of these will be from within the Faculty of Humanities and two from outside the Faculty of Humanities (see APT Manual 5.6.16). The Dean will write to the first referee on each list and hold the others in reserve.

- ii) In addition, the Dean will write to two other referees, one chosen from within the Faculty by the Head, and one chosen from outside the Faculty by the Dean.
 - iii) If necessary, the Dean will contact alternates from the list supplied by the candidate, or from a list compiled by the Head at the Dean's request.
- c) The Dean will make available to each referee:
- i) the candidate's curriculum vitae;
 - ii) copies of material described in D.1(c) above; and a teaching dossier to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness, including USRI ratings and student opinion surveys from a range of courses of various kinds and levels;
 - iii) the University's requirements for Instructor or for Senior Instructor, as appropriate (APT 3.9 or 3.10), and the criteria for appointment *With Tenure* in the instructor ranks (APT 5.7.5.3);
 - iv) the present document (the Faculty of Humanities' "Criteria, Policies, and Procedures for Tenure, Assessment, and Promotions").
- d) All letters from referees are confidential to the Dean and the Academic Appointment Review Committee. However, candidates should take special note of APT 5.7.5.5, which explains procedures when an unfavourable ruling is probable.

E. Guidelines for Heads in Soliciting Advice

The Head will solicit advice from other academic staff at the University of Calgary in accordance with established departmental procedures (APT 5.6.18). Department procedures are outlined in Appendix 2.

F. Guidelines for Academic Appointment Review Committee

F.1 Composition of the Academic Appointment Review Committee

The APT Manual (5.7.4) sets out the composition of an Academic Appointment Review Committee (AARC), which is advisory to the Dean.

- i) the Dean or delegate (Chair)
- ii) four tenured faculty members, one of whom must be from outside the Faculty of Humanities. The Striking Committee will annually name representatives from three departments in the Faculty and the external representative.
- iii) up to two tenured academic members appointed by the Dean from two of the remaining three Departments
- iv) for each applicant, the Head of the relevant department (see APT 5.7.5.6 for the Head's role in case of appeals to the AARC) (non-voting)
- v) a member appointed by the Faculty Association (non-voting)
- vi) one participating student member, who will be the Students' Academic Commissioner for Humanities or, if necessary, the Students' Union Vice-President (Academic) (non-voting)

A rotational system will ensure that normally a given Department is unrepresented only once in a period of six years. The structuring of the Committee has equity, especially gender equity, as a goal. The Committee may not meet unless both genders are represented (APT section 5.7.4.2b).

The Dean will inform candidates of the membership of the Faculty's Academic Appointment Review Committee. Candidates have the right to recommend possible changes (see APT Manual 5.7.4.6).

F.2 Committee Procedures (see APT Manual 5.7.4.2 to 5.7.6.4)

The Dean will make candidates' CVs at the time of appointment and relevant portions of candidates' letters of appointment available to the Academic Appointment Review Committee.

Academic Appointment Review Committees in the Faculty of Humanities will recognize and respect diverse career patterns and the implications of such patterns for tenure consideration.

IV. MERIT ASSESSMENT AND PROMOTIONS (see APT section 6)

A. General Statement on Assessment and Merit Increments

1. Merit increment recommendations within the faculty are constrained by the pool allotted to the Faculty by the Chair of GPC (see GPC Manual 6.2). The Dean is responsible for ensuring that the faculty's allocation is respected (see GPC Manual 2.3.3b and 6.2.2).
2. FPC assesses individual academic staff members. Faculty members are responsible for regularly submitting a report on their activities "in a form prescribed by the President" (APT Manual 6.1.9), and for providing the Department Head with information about their performance during the reporting period. For academic staff holding appointments *With Tenure*, regular assessment is defined as a formal assessment on a biennial basis (APT 6.1.4). An Academic Performance Report (previously known as the Academic Annual Report) will be due the year of the formal assessment. All Initial Term, Contingent Term or Limited Term academic staff will be required to submit a Report each year (APT 6.1.5). Formal assessment will occur on a biennial basis (APT 6.1.5). The Faculty's date for submission to the Head of these reports is June 30.
3. FPC expects faculty members to indicate the extent of their collaboration, if any, with co-authors, co-editors, co-teachers, etc. Based on the information provided, the Department Head provides FPC with an assessment of the academic staff member's performance in the reporting period.
4. FPC requires faculty members to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in accordance with the Faculty's "Policy for Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching" (see section V, A below).
5. In preparing an assessment, the Department Head will first consider the individual performance of each faculty member. Comparative assessment of faculty members is also necessary. In recommending merit increments, the Head must respect the pool allotted to the department by the Dean.
6. Faculty members on research and scholarship leave will be assessed on the basis of the activities set out in the approved leave application, recognizing that scholarly projects may be subject to reasonable alterations from the activities originally proposed. Therefore, a copy of the Research & Scholarship (R&S) leave report (due to the President no later than 3 months after the completion of a R&S leave – see CA 16.21b) must be submitted with the academic performance report when a R&S leave has been completed during the reporting period. In the case that a R&S leave is completed on June 30 of the year the academic performance report is due, members will have until September 1 to submit this report to their Head. Heads, in completing their assessment of the reporting period where a R&S leave has been completed, will take

B. Unsatisfactory Performance

Failure to achieve positive expectations concerning teaching, scholarship, and service, at a level appropriate to a faculty member's rank and position within rank, constitutes unsatisfactory performance. However, in cases of unsatisfactory performance in one area, Heads and FPC consider the extent to which strong performance in another area may compensate.

C. Relative Weighting of Activities for Merit Recommendations

C.1 Criteria and Expectations

- a) While criteria and expectations differ for faculty in the professorial ranks and for faculty in the instructor ranks (see APT Manual 3.6 to 3.10), FPC takes teaching effectiveness and meritorious service into account in every case and at all ranks.
- b) In accordance with APT Manual 3.1.1, FPC expects all academic appointees in the professorial ranks to engage in Teaching, Research, and Service.
- c) In accordance with APT Manual 3.9.3 (Instructor) and 3.10.4 (Senior Instructor), FPC will assess Instructors on the basis of the agreed duties in their letters of appointment.
- d) In accordance with APT Manual 6.4.10c and 6.4.10d, FPC raises its expectations of performance as a faculty member progresses through a rank, including the rank of Professor. FPC assesses a Professor more rigorously than an Associate Professor, an Associate Professor more rigorously than an Assistant Professor, a Senior Instructor more rigorously than an Instructor. Similarly, FPC increases its expectations the higher a faculty member is within a rank.
- e) FPC will recognize and respect diverse career patterns, such as those associated with caring responsibilities, part-time appointments, and leaves of absence, and the implications of such patterns for assessment purposes (APT Manual 3.5.4.e).
- f) FPC will evaluate periods that incorporate leaves, as defined by the *Collective Agreement* article 18, in accordance with the GPC Manual 7, "Leaves of Absence."
- g) FPC values collegueship, to the extent described in APT Manual 3.5.1: "colleagueship should be considered to the degree that it can be shown to have affected the teaching, research, or service of the individual, colleagues, or the unit."
- h) FPC recognizes the evolving use of information technology and evaluates contributions in this domain as follows:
 - i. Teaching: FPC will consider integrating information technology into Humanities programs as an integral part of an individual's profile. In accordance with APT Manual 3.2.6, FPC considers creating and maintaining web sites, developing, testing and applying CAL techniques and software in the context of innovative teaching.
 - ii. Research: FPC recognizes the scholarship expressed in the creation of web sites, electronic documents, software, databases, authoring systems, and the like. In evaluating such items, FPC relies particularly on peer and user assessment processes. In accordance with APT Manual 3.3.5, FPC also recognizes publication in electronic journals, the entry of information into databases, program libraries, and the like, provided that these outlets for scholarly communication are subject to an appropriate refereeing process.
- i) Assessment of performance accords with the interpretation of increments in GPC Manual 6.5.1.

C.2 Teaching

- a) Teaching effectiveness in the Faculty of Humanities is assessed according to the provisions of the “Policy on Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching” (see section V, A below) and its ancillary guidelines for the teaching dossier described in Humanities Teaching Notes 4 (revised 2007 and available on the web at <http://ucalgary.ca/humanities/node/97>). Faculty members in both professorial and instructor ranks must provide their Department Head with substantive evidence on which a teaching assessment may be based.
- b) Department Heads will assess teaching on evidence of quality as well as quantity, taking into account APT Manual 3.2.2 and 3.2.4: “evaluation should consider all ways a teacher addresses the responsibility and interacts with students [and] . . . should consider the extent of innovation, preparation, reflection of current knowledge, level of interest, direction, and encouragement demonstrated. . . .”; “*part* of such evaluation of teaching may be based upon the general reputation enjoyed by the teacher among informed peers and students. Such reputation shall be evidenced only by signed documentation or formal evaluation processes” (emphasis added).
- c) Department Heads must include in evaluations of teaching effectiveness an appraisal of graduate teaching and supervision, when appropriate. See APT Manual 3.2.1, 3.7.2 and 3.8.2.
- d) Faculty members must submit to their Head by the designated date of June 30 of every second reporting period an up-to-date set of materials for comprehensive review of their teaching. (see Humanities Teaching Notes 4, revised 2007) Note that tenured faculty are required to submit this teaching dossier along with the regular Academic Performance Report at every other biennial assessment (i.e. every fourth year). Untenured continuing faculty are required to submit this teaching dossier along with the regular Academic Performance Report at every biennial assessment (i.e. every second year). Student opinion surveys, including but not limited to USRI ratings, constitute an integral part of the dossier for this review; regulations are articulated in the “Policy on Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching.”
- e) Good teaching is recognized in merit increment recommendations.
- f) Unsatisfactory teaching in a given reporting period is reflected in merit increment recommendations and also results in the expectation that in the following year(s) the Department Head will receive complete sets of the approved student opinion survey as evidence of attempts to improve teaching effectiveness. Evidence of unsatisfactory teaching includes results from student opinion surveys, serious complaints to the Department Head or Dean (particularly in significant numbers), persistent or recurring problems, and neglect of the university’s regulations regarding course outlines, examinations, grades, etc. A rating of “unsatisfactory” on the USRI is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for an FPC evaluation of “unsatisfactory teaching performance.”
- g) FPC views negatively the absence, in accordance with the schedule outlined in C.2d) above, of substantive evidence of teaching effectiveness.

C.3 Scholarship and Research

- a) FPC recognizes the integration of scholarship and teaching in its assessment of faculty members in all appointment categories.
- b) Faculty members are required to supply to their Head copies of all items being claimed for purposes of the evaluation, including texts of oral presentations.
- c) FPC does not merely count numbers of publications; it emphasizes the quality of scholarship and publication.

- d) FPC considers with special care work that has not been subjected to accepted editorial selection procedures for academic publication. In the absence of evidence of refereed publication and accepted editorial selection procedures, FPC expects alternative evidence by which to assess the value of published items.
- e) Because of the number of disciplines and fields of research within the Faculty, FPC relies primarily, but not exclusively, on Department Heads' assessments of quality. The Department Head is expected to provide FPC with information about the standing of journals, University presses, and commercial publishing houses. FPC will consider such evidence of reception as reviews, awards, and other honours as pertinent factors in assessing the quality of scholarship.
- f) FPC credits completed books, articles, reviews, and creative works, whether published in the reporting period or completed and formally accepted for publication by the publisher or journal. All such items related to publication to be credited in a reporting period must be listed on the form provided by the Faculty for this purpose, including full bibliographical information and page numbers (or manuscript page totals for items in press or to appear).
- g) FPC recognizes the importance of oral publication—papers, talks, addresses, outside seminars, etc.—as a form of dissemination of scholarly work, and of public readings and performances as a form of dissemination of creative work. FPC realizes that oral publication and performances of creative work may be preliminary or ancillary to formal publication, which may be credited separately. FPC seeks to understand the context of oral presentations and performances, so that it can assess the character and importance of the setting, the breadth of the audience, and the impact on the discipline.
- h) Although it is not expected that the Department Head read closely every credited publication, FPC expects Department Heads to have an accurate understanding of credited items. The Department Head will bring to FPC copies of all items to be credited.
- i) Faculty members in the professorial ranks are expected to be both actively and productively engaged in scholarship in their disciplines and/or fields of research. Publication of the results of scholarship is expected. FPC and Department Heads view with increasing concern prolonged unproductive periods, particularly when there is no evidence of work in progress. Lack of productivity affects recommended merit increments.
- j) FPC will consider productive participation in a Research Group as part of an individual's profile.

C.4 Service

- a) Faculty members are expected to do their share of service, internally within the department, faculty, and university, and externally, where appropriate, in the community and for learned societies and other organizations related to their discipline.

- e) Because the university, as a collegial system, depends on the participation and contribution of members of its faculty, FPC will view negatively persistent failure to serve on committees or to attend their meetings, or to accept other assignments contributing to the governance of the department, faculty and university.

B. Promotions in the Professorial Stream

D.1 Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

- a) In making a recommendation regarding promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, FPC will consider a candidate's entire academic career (see APT Manual 6.3.7). This differs from the process for merit increment recommendations, where the focus is primarily on performance during the reporting period.
- b) The APT Manual 3.7.1 states that "Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires evidence of teaching effectiveness, recognized research attainment or equivalent professional attainment and a satisfactory record of service." FPC pays particular attention to the first two criteria, including graduate teaching and supervision where appropriate (APT Manual 3.7.2)

- b) In the Faculty of Humanities FPC is constituted as follows:
- i) the Dean (Chair, voting only to break a tie)
 - ii) All Department Heads in the Faculty (voting)
 - English
 - French, Italian and Spanish
 - Germanic, Slavic & East Asian Studies
 - Greek and Roman Studies
 - Philosophy
 - Religious Studies
 - iii) the Associate Dean acting as Head for Humanities appointees (voting)
 - iv) one member appointed by the Faculty Association (TUCFA) (non-voting)
 - v) one or more members of the Continuing, Contingent Term, or Limited Term academic staff designated by the Dean (non-voting observers)
 - vi) one student member, appointed by the Students' Union or, failing that, the Graduate Students' Association (voting)
 - vii) at least one and no more than two academic staff members elected by Continuing, Limited Term and Contingent Term academic staff members of the Faculty (voting)
- c) Except where the nature of the membership of the Faculty Promotions Committee is *ex-officio*, alternate members will also be appointed, consistent with the above process.
- d) The Committee includes at least two voting members of each gender. When this is not achieved by the configuration described above, the Dean asks the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), in consultation with the Faculty Association, to appoint one or two additional voting members, from among the Associate Deans if this will meet the gender requirement, or otherwise from among the other members of the Faculty.

F.2 Meetings of FPC

t

- d) When an appellant is unable to appear before FPC or declines the invitation to appear before FPC, the Head shall not be present during any discussion of the appeal. In such a situation, if FPC requires clarification, factual information shall be solicited from both the appellant and the Head simultaneously in written form or by teleconference.

V. OTHER FACULTY POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

A. Policy on Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching

This policy is based on the work of two committees: the first chaired by Professor Brenda Baker with a report accepted by Faculty Full Council in October 1990, the second chaired by Professor Hermina Joldersma with a report accepted by Faculty Full Council in December 1996. Copies of both reports are available in departmental and decanal offices.

Both reports contained recommendations which were approved, some of them in amended form, by Faculty Full

member in developing satisfactory resolutions. Such assistance may include referring the faculty member to appropriate institutional units intended to facilitate good teaching. Final responsibility for good teaching, however, rests with the faculty member.

- b) The teaching of Instructors and Senior Instructors shall be evaluated according to the Faculty's *Policy*, with the exception that these colleagues are encouraged to consult with their Heads concerning the submission of material in the years between the teaching dossier.
- c) Sessional Instructors shall be evaluated as consistently as possible with this *Policy*, and in accordance with the provisions of the Collective Agreement (article 23.7). Guidelines on the assessment of Sessional Instructors in the Faculty of Humanities are included in section V, B.
- d) Heads should be permitted some flexibility in the administration of the dossier system, taking into account unusual career paths and a balance in the number of dossiers to be evaluated in any given year. Postponements under the system shall be solely at the discretion of the Head and with the agreement of the individual faculty member.

A.3 The Gathering and Submission of Information for the Evaluation of Teaching

While accepting the principle that student opinion of teachi

New Appointees who have not submitted a dossier under the review system because they have not yet taught at the University for two years should submit for the annual evaluation the standard student opinion surveys, administered according to this

B. Guidelines on the Assessment of Term Certain (Sessional) Instructors

(approved by Full Council – April 26, 2007)

As outlined in the Collective Agreement, article 23.7 (Assessment of Performance):

23.7.1 The performance of a Sessional Instructor shall be assessed in the first instance with a student ratings form authorized for general use within the Faculty or Department. The results of these ratings, along with any peer evaluations and other materials pertinent to the Sessional Instructor's performance of teaching or other duties, including materials submitted by the Sessional Instructor, shall be provided to the Sessional Instructor and Department Head or equivalent and retained in the Department, following as closely as possible the practice for Continuing academic staff in the unit.

23.7.2 After a Sessional Instructor has completed a three-year term, or has taught the equivalent of eight (8) half-courses, whichever comes first, the Department Head or equivalent shall review the file within one month and provide an appraisal of the Sessional Instructor that considers the cumulative record of Student Ratings and any other pertinent information concerning teaching effectiveness or other assigned duties. The Sessional Instructor may present comments with respect to the Head's appraisal into the file. S.0004 T21-I3(the 1(ca)5.4(Seng effJ-24.916.6(sal o4(c))

C. Policy on Recognition of Graduate Student Supervision (in relation to graduate students who are teaching as sessionals under CA article 23.2(I))

(approved by Full Council – May 1, 2008)

According to the Letter of Understanding pertaining to the Recognition of Graduate Student Supervision, the supervision of graduate students who are teaching as Sessionals under article 23.2(I) will be recognized as workload for the academics involved in supervision.

The letter of understanding stipulates a default system for awarding teaching release to academic staff members who are involved in this supervision. It also allows Faculties to establish their own guidelines for the award of such teaching release.

In the Faculty of Humanities, each graduate student who has been appointed to teach 1 HCE under article 23.2(I) will be assigned an academic supervisor (not necessarily the same as the graduate student's supervisor). This academic supervisor will receive recognition / credit for this workload at the Faculty Promotions Committee deliberations, similar to that recognition / credit received by supervisors of graduate students.

D. Policy on Teaching Release for Independent Study Courses

(approved by Full Council – April 26, 2007)

E. Outside Professional Activity

(Currently under review)

APPENDIX 1:

Academic Staff Recruitment Guidelines (December 2004)

Table of Contents

Academic Staff Recruitment & Selection at a Glance

Letter to Academic Recruiters

1. Requesting Approval for Recruitment
2. Advertising a Continuing Academic Position
3. Academic Selection Committee
4. Short-Listing Candidates
Candidate Information Package
5. Site Visits and Interviews
6. Selection Committee Recommendation to Dean
7. Negotiating Terms and Conditions of Offer
8. Recommendation for Academic Appointment
9. Board Appointment Letter & Information Package
10. Recruiting & Selecting Foreign Workers
Foreign Worker Application (application for a Labour Market Opinion)
Foreign Academic Recruitment Summary
Foreign Worker Application (application to extend a Labour Market Opinion)
Immigration Information Package
11. Welcoming, Orientation, & Support
12. References

The full document is available on the web at:

http://www.ucalgary.ca/hr/administrators/recruitment/academic_staff_recruitment_guidelines

APPENDIX 2: Department procedures for soliciting advice from other academic staff at the UofC

2.1 Department of English

The APT manual section on tenure consideration procedures (5.6.18) states that "The Head shall solicit advice from other academic staff at the University of Calgary. Each Department or equivalent shall have established procedures for the Head to solicit advice before completing a recommendation concerning tenure under section 5.6.19, and these procedures shall be included with the Faculty guidelines ... "

In the Department of English, the following procedures will be followed:

1. The advice of all and only tenured academic staff within the Department will be sought.
2. In addition, when tenured academic staff members outside the Department have direct knowledge of the applicant's academic work, the advice of such persons will be sought. The applicant may suggest who outside the Department should be consulted, but the Head may consult with others as well. The Head will provide the applicant with a list of all those outside the Department whose advice was sought.
3. The Head will make the applicant's curriculum vitae and relevant research / publication, teaching, and other materials available for two weeks for inspection by those whose advice is sought. Letters from referees will not be made available nor will their content be disclosed.
4. The Head will solicit signed written comments from those whose advice is sought.
5. The signed written comments will be maintained in a confidential file in the Faculty of Humanities office. The Head will make a fair summary of advice received and include it in his/her assessment prepared under APT 5.6.19.

(penp941,6(e)57 filant td – Sept

2.2 Department of French, Italian and Spanish

On the designated date when academic appointees who wish to be considered for tenure submit their application to the Dean as Chair of the AARC, they will forward a copy of their application to the Head of the Department, along with the documents necessary to support the application, including a current curriculum vitae and a comprehensive teaching dossier (as specified in the Faculty's guidelines).

Submission of relevant documents to the Head of Department to solicit advice from other academic staff at the University of Calgary shall proceed as follows:

- (i) Applicants in the professorial stream shall submit copies of not more than five relevant publications. The distribution of confidential material should be discussed with the Head. In addition to the ranked list of four external referees provided to the Dean's office, applicants in the professorial stream may supply to the Head the name and department of up to four tenured academic staff members in other departments at the University of Calgary who have direct knowledge of the applicant's academic work and whose opinion they wish to be considered.
- (ii) Applicants in the instructor stream shall include in their teaching dossier a statement on special pedagogical duties, such as course development and coordination. The distribution of confidential material should be discussed with the Head. In addition to the ranked list of four internal referees provided to the Dean's office, applicants in the instructor stream may supply to the Head the name and department of up to four tenured academic staff members at the University of Calgary or in other universities who have direct knowledge of the applicant's academic work and whose opinion they wish to be considered.

Having oyoemic tos8(he25 TwiHi)6w{(itie)5.7(s w TcI9mclou)5.3(u)5pJ2 w TcI9mclou(2635 TD0 Tc0 Tw()Tj-3.52(emic ded to a)

2.3 Department of Germanic, Slavic and East Asian Studies

1. All departmental applicants for tenure will provide the Head with the necessary documents to solicit advice from other academic staff at the University of Calgary (APT 5.6.18) by the designated date.

Specifically, applicants must submit documents as follows:

- a) Applicants in the professorial stream will submit a curriculum vitae and copies of no more than five relevant publications, as well as sample elements from the teaching dossier (excluding any confidential materials, but including a statement of pedagogical aims).
- b) Applicants in the instructor stream will submit a curriculum vitae and a comprehensive teaching dossier (excluding any confidential materials).

All applicants will supply the Head with the name and department of any relevant academic staff in other departments at the University of Calgary with direct knowledge of the applicants' academic work whose opinions they would like to have considered.

2. Having obtained a curriculum vitae and the relevant materials specified in 1. above from all departmental applicants for tenure, the Head will inform all Board Appointees (Continuing, Limited Term and Contingent Term) in the department of the availability of these documents and solicit a written response from them by a date no less than two weeks thereafter.
3. The Head will contact relevant academic staff from outside GSEA, as identified by the applicants, informing them of the availability of the documents and soliciting a written response from them by a date no less than two weeks thereafter.
4. Under FOIP, all written responses are confidential. They will be kept in the office of the Dean, along with a confidential list, prepared by the Head, of all comments received.
5. The Head will provide the applicants with a list of all those whose opinions have been sought in the tenure process, including any persons beyond those identified in 2. and 3. above. The Head shall prepare a fair

2.4 Department of Greek and Roman Studies

1. Make available the candidate's dossier to all GRST tenurable and tenured faculty for a two-week period.
2. Dossier material to be made available to faculty within the Dean's Office up until one week prior to the due date for the delivery of the Head's letter of recommendation to the candidate.
3. Head to encourage tenured and tenurable faculty to respond in writing to this material and to the tenure application generally.
4. The APT phrase 'to solicit advice' should not be interpreted to mean that the departmental Head in any way compels faculty response, either in writing or verbally by interviewing informally faculty; silence is a faculty member's right.

(revised August 2008, pending department approval)

2.5 Department of Philosophy

The APT manual section on tenure consideration procedures (5.6.18) states "The Head shall solicit advice from other academic staff at the University of Calgary. Each Department or equivalent shall have established procedures for the Head to solicit advice before completing a recommendation concerning tenure under section 5.6.19, and these procedures shall be included with the Faculty guidelines ... "

In the Department of Philosophy, the following procedures shall be followed:

1. Each tenure application shall be discussed in a meeting attended only by the tenured academic staff of the Department.
2. The Head shall also solicit signed written comments from the tenured academic staff of the Department.
3. In addition, when tenured academic staff members outside the Department have direct knowledge of the applicant's academic work, the advice of such persons may be sought. The applicant may suggest who outside the Department should be consulted, but the Head may consult with others as well. The Head shall provide the applicant with a list of all those outside the Department whose advice was sought.
4. The Head shall make the applicant's curriculum vitae and relevant research / publication, teaching, and other materials available for two weeks for inspection by those whose advice is sought. Letters from referees shall not be made available nor shall their content be disclosed.
5. The Head shall maintain a confidential record of the signed written comments received, and a fair summary of

2.6 Department of Religious Studies

NOTE: References preceded by an A are to paragraphs in the APT Manual (October 2008 revision); references