



UNIVERSITY OF
REGINA

Faculty of Science

CRITERIA FOR GRANTING SABBATICALS, PROMOTIONS, CONTINUING APPOINTMENTS, CAREER GROWTH INCREMENTS, AND MERIT AWARDS TO FACULTY MEMBERS

(Revised September 2003)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES**
- 2. ACADEMIC PROFILES**
 - 2.1 INSTRUCTOR*
 - 2.2 LECTURER*
 - 2.3 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR*
 - 2.4 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR*
 - 2.5 PROFESSOR*
- 3. REVIEW COMMITTEE**
 - 3.1 COMPOSITION AND ELECTORAL PROCESS*
 - 3.2 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES*
- 4. PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES**
 - 4.1 EVALUATION*
 - 4.2 SCHOLARSHIP*
 - 4.3 TEACHING*
 - 4.4 ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES*
 - 4.5 PUBLIC SERVICE*
- 5. CONTINUING APPOINTMENTS**
- 6. PROMOTIONS**
 - 6.1 GUIDELINES ACCORDING TO RANK*
 - 6.2 PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION*
- 7. SABBATICALS**
- 8. INCREMENTS**
 - 8.1 CAREER GROWTH INCREMENTS*
 - 8.2 MERIT INCREMENTS*

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Academic staff members in the Faculty of Science are expected to be practicing scholars. To advance through the ranks they must be active in the assigned duties of teaching and research. They are also expected to contribute to the administration of the Department, Faculty, University and relevant professional organizations. Standards of performance should be applied in a manner that recognizes differences in the ranks, subdisciplines, patterns of activity at various times in one's career and the annual workload and assignments. Quantitative and qualitative expectations in teaching, research and administrative service should be formulated in a way that is clearly understood and readily applied. Furthermore, the language of evaluation should be unambiguous and consistent with the provisions of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement.

2. ACADEMIC PROFILES

2.1 INSTRUCTOR

A position at the rank of Instructor is an appointment without term and requires a minimum of a B.Sc. An individual at this rank is not expected to do research. The focus of the Instructor rank is one of teaching and related duties. Individuals at this rank are expected to demonstrate proficiency in teaching at the undergraduate level and to perform both administrative duties and public service. The various levels of the Instructor rank (i.e. I, II and III) are determined in accordance with Article 13.2 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement.

Administrative duties should be kept as participatory, but are expected. We are looking for collegial and community involvement.

2.2 LECTURER

A position at the rank of Lecturer is a tenurable appointment and requires a minimum of a M.Sc. The focus of the Lecturer rank is one of teaching and related duties. Individuals at this rank are expected to demonstrate proficiency in teaching at the undergraduate level and to perform both administrative duties and public service. An individual at this rank is not expected to have an independent research program. However, the individual will be encouraged to develop an independent research program.

Administrative duties should be kept as participatory, but are expected. We are looking for collegial and community involvement.

2.3 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

The Assistant Professor rank is a tenurable appointment requiring a minimum of a Ph.D. (or equivalent) and is the starting point of a career. An individual at this rank is expected to fulfill the promise of research independence and teaching ability at all levels that led to the appointment of the individual in the first instance. We look for evidence that incumbents have developed separate research identities from their previous supervisory influence and are developing a clearly identifiable, self-supporting research program. This does not mean that we expect closure on previous collaborative work; after all, science works through such cooperative ventures.

We expect Assistant Professors to publish work from their theses and postdoctoral research (if applicable), and accounting for time delays in publication rates, we expect to see, in the first few years, refereed articles appearing on the record. Within a few years, we should also see evidence of articles appearing from work initiated at this University; that is, evidence of career independence.

Administrative contributions are expected at the Department level but should be kept as participatory. We are looking for evidence of collegial involvement.

2.4 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Promotion to this rank is based on the fulfillment of the promise of progress at appointment. The attainment of this rank indicates that the faculty member has demonstrated merit in scholarship, has a successful teaching record at all levels assigned, and is continuing to produce published works and to maintain a viable research program. Associate Professors are expected to be attracting graduate students into their programs and, within a few years at this rank, to be invited to present their work at national and even international meetings and symposia. Active involvement in the administrative infrastructure of the department and also participation in administrative service to the Faculty and the University should be evident.

2.5 PROFESSOR

The rank of Professor should be that of an academic who has a cumulative record of superior performance in scholarly activities, research, teaching and service to both the University and national organizations. Considerable evidence of leadership, and national and international recognition should be on record, demonstrating strong peer respect in the subdiscipline. Professors should be recognized as authorities in their areas of expertise and therefore, be active as reviewers and external referees for Ph.D. theses and granting agencies. Publication history and grant support should be well established, and research programs self-supporting. Professors should willingly give of their time, within reason, to be involved in senior academic administrative bodies on campus and act as responsible spokespersons for the University and their subdisciplines.

In a truly collegial environment, senior academic staff members should be a resource to those of junior rank, providing encouragement, mentoring and support to those moving through the ranks, especially in grantsmanship, teaching proficiency and publishing articles in refereed journals.

3. REVIEW COMMITTEE

3.1 COMPOSITION AND ELECTORAL PROCESS

1. Participation in the electoral process for the Faculty Review Committee of the Faculty of Science:
 - (a) The following academic staff members of the Faculty of Science shall have voting rights:

- (i) Members holding "Full-Time Appointments" in the "Faculty Ranks" and "Teaching Ranks" -- Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructor I, Instructor II, and Instructor III.
 - (ii) Members with permanent "Part-Time Appointments" in the "Faculty Ranks" and "Teaching Ranks" -- Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructor I, Instructor II, and Instructor III.
 - (iii) Members who are not members of the Faculty Association bargaining unit (i.e. "out of scope") but who had an "Annual Performance Review" conducted by the Faculty of Science in the previous academic year.
 - (iv) Members with "Full-Time Term Appointments" in the "Faculty Ranks" and "Teaching Ranks" -- Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructor I, Instructor II, and Instructor III.
- (b) The following academic staff members of the Faculty of Science shall be eligible to be nominated:
- (i) Members holding "Full-Time Appointments" in the "Faculty Ranks" and "Teaching Ranks" -- Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructor I, Instructor II, and Instructor III, excluding department heads and members who are not part of the Faculty Association bargaining unit.
- (c) The following issues shall also be considered:
- (i) When the performance of Instructors is being reviewed, Instructor representation on the Faculty Review Committee will be instituted wherever feasible in accordance with Article 17.12 of the U.R.F.A Collective Agreement.
 - (ii) Wherever feasible, it is recommended that only members with continuing appointments be nominated.
2. **Membership:** shall include one representative from each Department in the Faculty. In accordance with Article 17.16 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement the Dean may be present as an observer when the Faculty Review Committee meets.
3. **Procedure:** up to three nominations from each Department shall be submitted to the Dean, via the Department Head, prior to September 10 of the calendar year in which that Department's representative completes the term of office. The Dean will then arrange for the academic staff members of the Faculty of Science (excluding Laboratory Instructors) to elect by mail ballot, prior to October 1, one representative and one proxy for each Department. Nominations shall be allocated numerical votes and ballots shall be marked with a 2, a 1, and a 0.

The nominee with the greatest number of votes will be the elected representative; the nominee with the second largest number of votes will be elected as the proxy.

4. **The proxy** will replace the representative if the latter becomes ineligible or physically unable to serve during the Faculty Review process. Once involved in the work of the Faculty Review Committee the proxy will complete the review process that year.
5. **Term of Office:** Two years for both representative and proxy. A person who has served two consecutive years on the Faculty Review Committee is not eligible for immediate reelection.
6. **Chair:** One of the representatives shall be elected by the Faculty Review Committee members to serve as chair. The chair shall have voice and vote.
7. The Faculty delegates to the Faculty Review Committee the power to act in situations not covered by the above electoral guidelines.

3.2 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Preamble

The requirement that a Faculty use “written established criteria and procedures” is given in Article 17.13 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement. The procedure is described in general terms in Articles 17.14 through 17.22. The purpose of this document is to give a written description, at an appropriate level of detail, of the procedures used in the Faculty of Science.

Article 17.9 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement specifies which academic staff members are to be reviewed by a Review Committee. Academic staff members at the rank of Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructor I, Instructor II, or Instructor III who are being reviewed shall be reviewed by the Faculty Review Committee. The procedures are described by means of an introductory explanation followed by the relevant articles of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement and specific details relevant to the Faculty of Science.

Review Procedure

Performance review, as described in Article 17 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement, is the major duty of the Faculty Review Committee. One additional duty not mentioned in the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement is the review of applications for sabbatical.

Review of Applications for Sabbatical

The Faculty Review Committee meets once in October or November to consider applications for sabbatical. The Faculty Review Committee’s recommendations are submitted to the Dean in writing. In accordance with Article 17.16 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement the Dean may be present as an observer when the Faculty Review Committee meets.

Performance Review

Since the review process is specified in some detail in the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement, the most relevant passages are quoted verbatim *in italics* below, and procedures specific to the Faculty of Science are given in ordinary (Roman) type.

In the Faculty of Science, in addition to the Annual Information Form specified by Article 17.6 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement, a Statistical Summary form shall be completed annually by each Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructor I, Instructor II, or Instructor III. For these academic staff members, each time the Annual Information Form is referred to in the following procedures, it is assumed that the Statistical Summary is also included.

In accordance with Article 17.13 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... The application of these factors within each Faculty or equivalent unit shall be in accordance with written established criteria and procedures. When establishing the criteria and procedures, the Dean or equivalent shall consult with the academic staff members of the Faculty or equivalent unit, in committee. These criteria shall be reviewed from time to time by the Dean or equivalent and the academic staff members of the Faculty or equivalent unit, in committee. Such a review is to be initiated either at the request of the Dean or equivalent or after a request by the academic staff members of the Faculty or equivalent unit, as ascertained by a motion to that effect passed at a meeting of the academic staff members of the Faculty or equivalent unit to which they are assigned as specified in Article 13.3. These criteria shall be distributed to the members to whom they pertain and to the Faculty Association.

The adoption of Criteria for Performance Review by Faculties and equivalent units shall be approved by a majority vote of the members to be governed by such criteria. In the event that agreement cannot be reached between the Dean and the members, the Criteria for Performance Review in such Faculties or equivalent units shall be specified in writing by the Vice-President (Academic) only after a meeting with the faculty or equivalent unit in committee as per Article 5.7.

For any Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructor I, Instructor II, or Instructor III in the Faculty of Science, the “written established criteria” or “Criteria for Performance Review” mentioned in Article 17.13 of the U.R.F.A Collective Agreement are given in the current version of the document entitled “Criteria for Granting Sabbaticals, Promotions, Continuing Appointments, Career Growth Increments, and Merit Awards to Faculty Members and Instructors,” which is available from the Faculty of Science or at www.uregina.ca/science. For the Faculty of Science, the “written established ... procedures” for performance review mentioned in Article 17.13 of the U.R.F.A Collective Agreement are the procedures described in this document.

In accordance with Article 17.14 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... While it is recognized that there may be considerable variation among the criteria of Faculties and

equivalent units, every effort will be made to ensure that such variations are not extreme or unfair.

In accordance with Article 17.15 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... The initial review shall be made by the department head or other appropriate person in accordance with procedures established by the department or other appropriate unit, and entered on the form over the signature of the recommending officer.

When the department head or other appropriate person has made a recommendation, it will be communicated in writing to the academic staff member as soon as possible (preferably two weeks) before the next level of review, which would normally be the review committee.

The recommendation will be discussed by the recommending officer with the academic staff member. The academic staff member is entitled to a copy of the recommendation made on her/his behalf on request.

The member shall sign the form indicating the member has read the document. Clarifying information may be added by the academic staff member as soon as possible (and within one week of reading the document or having received the communicated information from the form). This additional information shall be attached to the form prior to its review by the Review Committee.

In the Faculty of Science, the “department head or other appropriate person” or “recommending officer” referred to Article 17.15 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement shall be the Department Head. The procedure relating to the initial evaluation is given in Article 17.15 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement. In the Faculty of Science, the following details are relevant to this procedure. Upon submission of the Annual Information Form by an academic staff member with a probationary appointment, the Department Head may choose to hold an informal meeting with the academic staff member during which the Department Head may make suggestions about revisions to the documentation that the latter has provided but it is the responsibility of the academic staff member to determine and provide all necessary information required for the review process. As well, communication of the recommendation from the Department Head to the academic staff member shall include a paper copy of the Performance Review Form at the request of the academic staff member.

In accordance with Article 17.11 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement, the Department Head does not have access to the Letters of Reference collected for reviews with regard to Tenure and Promotion.

In accordance with Article 17.16 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... The next step in the review process is an independent review by a committee elected by members of the Faculty or equivalent unit, or is selected by another procedure fully acceptable to the members of the Faculty or equivalent unit and the Dean or equivalent. No out of scope faculty member may be elected to the committee. The Dean may be present as an observer when the review committee meets.

The Review Committee shall review the statements included in and attached to the Annual Information Form and the Performance Review Form in the light of established criteria of the Faculty or equivalent unit, and make written recommendations on the form. Keeping in mind the substance of Article 17.1, if there are verbal submissions to the committee made in the performance review process, the committee should decide if they are fair and appropriate commentary based upon appropriate evaluation of the evidence. If they are not, they should be excluded from consideration. If they are deemed to be fair and appropriate commentary, they should be put in writing and communicated to the member being reviewed.

The review committee shall schedule a meeting with the Dean to provide the committee's recommendations to the dean.

The Faculty Review Committee shall be elected according to the Faculty of Science Faculty Review Committee Electoral Procedures, described in Article 3.1 of "Criteria for Granting Sabbaticals, Promotions, Continuing Appointments, Career Growth Increments, and Merit Awards to Faculty Members and Instructors" available from the Faculty of Science or at www.uregina.ca/science.

In the Faculty of Science, the Annual Information Forms and Performance Review Forms shall be copied to produce one binder of information for each member of the Faculty Review Committee. One copy of each letter applying for review, tenure, or promotion, as well as any Letters of Reference relevant to applications for tenure or promotion shall be made available to the Faculty Review Committee. Any Teaching Dossiers submitted by academic staff members shall also be provided to the Faculty Review Committee. The Faculty Review Committee shall treat all information provided as confidential. All documentation made available to the Faculty Review Committee as a whole shall be stored in the Faculty Review Room (LB 229) during the period of deliberations, which typically occurs from January to March.

The Faculty Review Committee shall conduct its review in an orderly fashion paying attention to relevant deadlines, such as decisions for members with probationary appointments. The Faculty Review Committee is granted considerable flexibility concerning the order in which the work is done.

In the Faculty of Science, the Dean may attend meetings of the Faculty Review Committee as an observer. The Faculty Review Committee may meet in camera. If a member of a Faculty Review Committee is in a conflict of interest with any academic staff member being reviewed, the member shall be required to leave the room during any deliberations with respect to this review, and shall not be informed of the recommendations made with respect to this review except by means of the regular procedures.

In the Faculty of Science, the Faculty Review Committee may invite a department head to one or more Faculty Review Committee meetings to discuss the comments and recommendations of the Department Head. A written transcript of questions and answers relevant to the academic staff member under review shall be kept and provided to the Dean.

The Faculty Review Committee shall schedule a meeting with the Dean to provide the Committee's recommendations to the Dean in writing. The Faculty Review Committee shall record whether or not a decision was unanimous or an even split, all other outcomes will be reported as "in favour of" or "opposed to."

In accordance with Article 17.17 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... *The academic staff member has the right to see the form after all statements have been made on it prior to those of the Dean or equivalent.*

To that end, when all written statements have been included on or appended to the performance review form, the Dean or equivalent will invite, in writing, every academic staff member who is being reviewed to make an appointment for the purpose of perusing and discussing the information on the form, and the forthcoming career decision or recommendation of the Dean or equivalent. Unless prevented from doing so by unusual circumstances, all academic staff members who desire an appointment and who are not on leave must respond within the following seven days. The Dean or equivalent will schedule such appointments as quickly as possible. All appointments are to take place as soon as possible but in no case later than June 30th, except for those members who are on leave. Academic staff members who are on leave shall make arrangements with the appropriate Dean or equivalent for an appointment to be scheduled on a date which is mutually satisfactory.

At the meeting, the member will be given an opportunity to interpret, explain, or add to the information contained in the written statements.

The Dean or equivalent will allow a period of seven calendar days after the initial meeting in case the member wishes a further consultation.

If the academic staff member feels that there is reason to do so, that member may attach a special submission to the Performance Review Form prior to the final decision or recommendation of the Dean or equivalent. It is the member's obligation to attach such a submission within seven days after the initial interview.

In accordance with Article 17.18 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... *On the matter of promotion to the academic rank of Professor, a Campus Promotion Committee shall review the member's file and all material related to the promotion decision. This committee will be chaired by a Vice-President other than the Vice-President (Academic) and will be comprised of one elected representative (normally at the rank of Professor and who is not an active member of a peer review committee) from each Faculty. This committee is advisory to the Dean of the member's Faculty. However, in the case of a new appointment to the University to the rank of Professor, this committee will make recommendations directly to the President. Half of the members will be elected annually. Four additional members will be appointed to provide sociodemographic balance on the Campus Promotions Committee. These committee members will be appointed by the Vice-President (Research and International) following consultation and agreement with the Faculty Association.*

In accordance with Article 17.19 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... *Only after all the steps outlined above have been completed will the Dean or equivalent make a decision or recommendation concerning the academic staff member's career progress. The Dean may consult with any of the parties involved in the review process prior to making a decision or recommendation.*

The decision or recommendation of the Dean or equivalent shall be entered on the Performance Review Form and signed.

In accordance with Article 17.20 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... *A Dean or equivalent may develop, administer, and use appropriate student course/instructor evaluation forms, following consultation in committee with the appropriate unit.*

Such evaluation forms shall be designed, in part, for the purpose of obtaining fair and reasonable assessments of the quality of teaching.

When the results are used in any performance review this shall be done in a fair and responsible manner.

A faculty member who does not wish to use the form which is in current use may make a written proposal to the Dean or equivalent suggesting an alternate method of student course/instructor evaluation.

Article 17.20 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement allows the use of “appropriate student course/instructor evaluation forms.” In the Faculty of Science, unless a written proposal for an alternate method of student course/instructor evaluation has been agreed to by the Dean, the evaluation of teaching and the forms used are described in the Faculty of Science “Guide for Academic Staff Members” (Part III, and the Appendices). The “Guide for Academic Staff Members” is available from the Faculty of Science or at www.uregina.ca/science. For every course section, a statistical summary of the responses to the Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire called the Faculty of Science Course Evaluation Report shall be prepared. A copy of this report shall be provided to the Department Head, the Faculty Review Committee, and the Dean for any academic staff member being reviewed.

In accordance with Article 17.21 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... *The career progress arising from the performance review process shall be communicated to the academic staff member in writing in a timely manner, normally within three weeks of the dean's decision, and shall take effect on the July 1st following the end of the review period.*

In accordance with Article 17.22 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement... *Every member who has been reviewed and whose performance has been deemed to be below standard for the rank and level of appointment shall be so informed in writing by the Dean or equivalent together with specific recommendations for the necessary improvements, while maintaining other requirements, in order for performance to be considered at an acceptable level.*

Furthermore, upon written request, the Dean or equivalent will provide to an academic staff member written reasons for the decision or recommendation made in respect of that member, and such reasons will refer clearly to the established criteria.

4. PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES

4.1 EVALUATION

The following guidelines assume good judgment and good faith at all levels of the review process. The required performance of duties of Instructors and Faculty are described in Article 16 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement. Article 17 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement states that these duties will be evaluated according to the agreed procedures. In accordance with Article 17.9 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement every academic staff member shall normally complete an Annual Information Form and submit the completed form to the Department Head. **The Department Head will complete the Performance Review Form annually for all academic staff members.** Article 17.6.2 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement states that the Performance Review Form must be signed by the academic staff member to indicate that the member has read the form.

Article 17.3.2 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement describes the academic staff members who will be reviewed annually. Article 17.3.3 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement exempts academic staff members with continuing appointments or instructors with at least five years teaching experience and requires that the review process occur every second year with no recommendation made in the off year on the Performance Review Form. The review process will be done in accordance with Article 17.6 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement and the Faculty of Science procedures for performance review.

Academic staff member evaluation involves an assessment of the individual's performance of their assigned duties in teaching, scholarship and administrative service (including Public Service). Every academic staff member of the Faculty of Science is expected to act in a collegial and professional manner as a matter of course. Decisions leading to promotion or salary increase will be based on the quality of individual contributions in the broad areas of assigned duties in Scholarship, Teaching, Administrative and Public Service, with scholarship and teaching being preeminent. Expectations for performance will increase with rank. **Staff whose assigned duties and workloads are not consistent with the criteria document should have such assignments agreed to in writing with the Department Head and approved by the Dean.**

4.2 SCHOLARSHIP

Whether in an applied field or an area of basic research, scholarship in the Faculty of Science involves contribution of new knowledge (i.e. research) and scholarly dissemination of knowledge (eg., refereed articles, books, reviews) in the respective disciplines. Since scholarship is a basic function of a university and interdependent with teaching at the university level, it follows that all faculty members are expected to be engaged in such activity. It is expected that individual scholarly activity or contributions to collaborative endeavours (i.e. research and publication) be consistent with the normal range of subdisciplines represented by the individual's home department.

Research activity and productivity are relatively easy to document; their evaluation is more difficult. The publication of research results in books and papers, or presentations at conferences are easily documented. Evidence of prestige among colleagues in the international scientific community is also a useful yardstick of research ability. Invitations to present papers, chair conference sessions, participate in symposia, or referee papers and research grant applications, provide supporting evidence of scholarly recognition.

A simple counting of publications without assessment of their quality is not sufficient, and indeed may be misleading. Consequently, care must be exercised in evaluating publications. In most cases, publication is the final stage of a research project and provides the permanent record of that particular scholarly achievement. Peer evaluation of such work is critical and faculty must publish in peer-evaluated media acceptable to their subdiscipline. Prolonged absence (3 years or more) of peer-evaluated publications will be interpreted to indicate research inactivity and assigned duties will be adjusted to reflect the absence of research activity.

Early in one's career the supervision of graduate students can be both a benefit and a hindrance. Excellent students are an asset and are to be recruited. Such students can provide momentum and a team environment leading to the development of a strong collegial support group. Not all subdisciplines have the same pool size to recruit from and so expectations in this area will vary accordingly. New faculty members should be made fully aware of the costs of research and student-support, and understand their obligations toward their graduate students.

4.3 TEACHING

Teaching at the university level includes the selection, preparation and presentation of lecture and laboratory materials. In the sciences teaching may also include the design and overall supervision of laboratories associated with courses. **The academic staff member that is assigned the course is responsible for setting all assignments, laboratories and examinations associated with the course and the associated laboratory.** Our primary responsibility is to develop and maintain high standards for teaching. Quality teaching is expected and demonstration of teaching proficiency is a

prerequisite for a continuing appointment and promotion at all ranks. Academic staff members are referred to the Faculty of Science “Guide for Academic Staff Members ” for additional information. The guide is available from the Faculty of Science or at www.uregina.ca/science.

New appointees are commonly recruited from a predominantly research environment and their teaching experience is limited. Letters of reference usually give assurances that the individual should be able to teach effectively (eg., gave clear seminars and presentations at meetings). Teaching a first year class is a very different matter, and teaching performance should be monitored with care and attention early in the career. Consideration should be given to mentoring and peer evaluation, during the probationary period.

Good teaching is required in the Faculty of Science and it follows that there must be a consistent method of evaluating teaching on a regular basis. In the Faculty of Science courses are assessed initially by students to determine the level of student satisfaction. Despite the acknowledged importance of teaching, its evaluation is difficult. Teaching that is clearly “below acceptable standards” is readily detected in student assessments and the reliability of serious complaints can be verified. Similarly, outstanding and inspiring teachers are easily recognized. However, student evaluations and feedback should not be the sole method of teaching evaluation. Department Heads or their designate, should review teaching on a regular basis using a variety of methods including classroom visits, examination of classroom materials (eg., course outlines, handouts, assignments, exams) and discussions with the individual academic staff member. All academic staff members involved in teaching must keep a teaching dossier containing detailed syllabi of all courses taught including lists of textbooks and references, examples of assignments and copies of examinations.

If student evaluations consistently suggest that students are not satisfied with an individual’s instruction then additional information will be obtained. The academic staff member will be invited to meet with the Department Head to discuss the results of student assessment and determine if there is a genuine problem. If a problem is detected, ways to resolve the problem will be discussed. This may require classroom visits by the Department Head or appropriate peers. Part of the solution may involve mentoring, particularly in the case of junior academic staff members. A written report will be submitted by the Department Head and placed in the academic staff member’s personal file outlining the steps taken to rectify the problem and how successful they were. If the problem cannot be resolved satisfactorily in the department, the Department Head will notify the Assistant Dean (Undergraduate). At this point the academic staff member will be invited to meet with the Assistant Dean (Undergraduate) to discuss the problem and possible solutions. This may require a visit to the classroom by the Assistant Dean (Undergraduate) and if appropriate the Department Head (or designate). A written assessment of the teaching with recommendations for improvement will be sent to the academic staff member and copied to the Department Head for the academic staff member’s personal file. The academic staff member’s teaching in subsequent courses will be monitored for signs of improvement. The

academic staff member will be required to write a self-evaluation outlining the steps taken to resolve the teaching problem and how successful these measures have been and submit this to the Department Head with a copy to the Assistant Dean (Undergraduate).

We are looking for evidence that the individual has an in-depth knowledge of the course subject, is up to date, follows the course outline, is not blindly wedded to the textbook and is presenting the material at an appropriate level. A clear, organized lecturing style is important. The delivery should be open, friendly and enthusiastic. The ability to stimulate students to think independently is important. Clear diction, writing and pace are important because students lose interest or cannot follow the material if too many assumptions are made, or if the academic staff member speaks too quickly, too slowly, in a monotone voice or is inaudible. Effective teaching at the university level encompasses:

- a. The ability to present the subject matter clearly, logically and at an appropriate level for the class.
- b. Availability to students at posted times outside regular lecture periods.
- c. Enthusiasm for the subject and the ability to communicate this enthusiasm to the students.
- d. The development and fostering of independent critical thinking skills in students.
- e. The ability to gain students' respect, to treat students fairly and equitably, and to accommodate special needs or problems wherever reasonably possible.

Every effort should be made by academic staff members to introduce students at all levels to current research. In keeping with our roles as active practitioners of our disciplines we should also instill in our students an understanding and appreciation of the direct linkage that exists between research and instruction.

Although the assignment of teaching duties is a matter between academic staff members and the Department Head, academics normally should participate in instruction at all levels, at least during their early career and especially during the probationary period.

4.4 ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

The University of Regina uses a form of consultative governance and it is incumbent upon each academic staff member to accept a fair share of responsibility regarding administration and committee work. Such work should not be a major consideration when making recommendations for promotion, but should be recognized in the overall evaluation and assignment of duties.

Administrative contributions should not simply be measured in terms of the number of committees involved. An over-commitment to administrative tasks should not be allowed to detract from an individual's assigned responsibilities in research and teaching. In particular, the institution should respect that young academic staff members are honing their research and teaching skills, and ensure that they are not given heavy administrative loads. Every attempt should be made to judge the quality of work done when evaluating administrative contributions.

4.5 PUBLIC SERVICE

It is important that academic staff members earn the respect of the communities we serve. Individual public activities contribute to the public image of the Faculty and the University. Each person does this in a particular fashion. Such activities may, in certain instances, be very effective and demanding of much individual effort. At all times, academic staff members should remember that they represent their Department, Faculty and University, and should act in a professional manner. When clearly representing personal views, either orally or in writing, academic staff members should acknowledge this as not necessarily representing the view of the University.

These contributions may provide partial support for recommendation of a merit award, but are less useful in supporting an academic promotion.

5. CONTINUING APPOINTMENTS

Tenure and appointments continuing indefinitely are described under Article 14.2.3 (Faculty) and Article 14.2.4 (Instructors) of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement respectively.

Continuing appointments will be granted only to those who, on the basis of demonstrated performance, are expected to proceed through the academic ranks. This implies that during the probationary period, the individual has performed well in all of the assigned areas previously described. In particular, teaching proficiency must have been demonstrated and a viable ongoing independent research program must be in evidence if part of the assigned duties. The awarding of a continuing appointment is the most important career decision made concerning an academic staff member because it leads to a career appointment.

Continuing appointments for faculty members will be referred to as Appointments with Tenure. Faculty members may apply for a continuing appointment or be nominated by their Department Head, or the Dean. Faculty may apply for tenure at any time but in accordance with Article 14.2.2 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement no probationary appointment may normally continue for more than five years. When the faculty member is to be considered for tenure, the written application must be made to the Department Head with a copy to the Dean **on or before November 30th** to be consistent with Article 17.10 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement.

In accordance with Article 17.11 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement the candidate shall supply the names of three referees to the Dean **on or before November 30th**. Academic members being considered for a continuing appointment shall supply a copy of their current curriculum vitae, and four copies of three articles that best exemplify their work to date. Faculty members being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor concurrently should use the same referees for both career considerations.

In accordance with Article 17.11 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement the Dean will send a written request for a letter of reference to each referee, and may obtain further letters as needed. Heads of Department must provide an overview of the faculty member's teaching and may include curriculum materials, information on new courses introduced, laboratory development and other innovations, and a synopsis of teaching evaluations at all levels taught to date. A current teaching dossier is required of each faculty member being considered for tenure.

In accordance with Article 18.6 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement an Appointment with Tenure is granted where there is evidence of consistent acceptable performance through the probationary period including professional growth and development that is demonstrated by contributions to the discipline and the University. There is the promise that future contributions will enhance the academic reputation of the University. Tenure will not be granted in the event that any special conditions attached at the time of appointment have not been fulfilled.

Continuing appointments for Instructors will be referred to as Appointments Continuing Indefinitely. In accordance with Article 14.2.4 an appointment may continue indefinitely after successful completion of three years of employment. Instructors being considered for an appointment continuing indefinitely shall supply a copy of their current curriculum vitae and teaching dossier. An indefinite appointment is granted where there is evidence of consistent acceptable performance and there is the promise that future contributions will enhance the academic reputation of the University. An appointment continuing indefinitely will not be granted in the event that any special conditions attached at the time of appointment have not been fulfilled.

6. PROMOTIONS

6.1 GUIDELINES ACCORDING TO RANK

In accordance with Article 17.10 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement an academic staff member who is requesting promotion shall make a written application to the member's Department Head, with a copy to the Dean, **on or before November 30th**. In all cases considered for promotion, a clear written statement of the basis for the promotion request and supporting documentation must be provided to the Faculty Review Committee. In accordance with Article 17.11 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement the

faculty member shall supply the required list of referees as well as copies of their curriculum vitae and publications to the Dean **on or before November 30th**.

Academic staff members wishing to be considered for promotion to Instructor II or Instructor III shall provide four copies of the member's current curriculum vitae, a teaching dossier and two letters of reference.

Academic staff members wishing to be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor shall provide four copies of the member's current curriculum vitae, plus four copies of one published peer-evaluated article that in the opinion of the staff member best exemplifies their work, a teaching dossier and three letters of reference.

Academic staff members wishing to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor shall provide a list of three external referees accompanied by a short biography of each. Attached to the application will be four copies of the member's current curriculum vitae, plus four copies of three published peer-evaluated articles that in the opinion of the academic staff member best exemplifies their work, and a teaching dossier. For promotion to Associate Professor, letters will be solicited from these referees.

For promotion to Professor, the academic staff member shall provide a list of six external referees accompanied by a short biography of each. A total of six letters of reference will be solicited, three from the list provided by the member and an additional three solicited by the Dean after discussion with the Department Head. Attached to the applications will be seven copies of the member's current curriculum vitae, plus seven copies of five published peer-evaluated articles that in the opinion of the academic staff member best exemplifies their work.

All referees contacted will be provided with a copy of the faculty member's most recent curriculum vitae and copies of the articles supplied. The referees will be asked to comment on the faculty member's scholarly work and to offer an opinion regarding the career decision under consideration. Normally, the names of external referees should not be previous supervisors, collaborators, departmental colleagues (past or present) or co-authors with the candidate in the previous six years.

A synopsis of the academic staff member's teaching (courses taught and a statistical summary) over the career up to a five year period must be provided by the Department Head as part of the promotion case to be evaluated by the Faculty Review Committee. The basis for this synopsis is a teaching dossier provided to the Department Head by the academic staff member.

6.2 PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

Instructor I to Instructor II

Promotion at this level will be based on successful completion of a M.Sc. and a demonstrated record of relevant teaching proficiency. An Instructor I with a B.Sc.

(Hons.) may be promoted to an Instructor II with an established record of relevant teaching proficiency and four years of relevant teaching experience. The Instructor should have demonstrated the ability to modify existing courses as required, be ready to participate in course development and have acquired experience in administration and public service.

Instructor II to Instructor III

Promotion at this level will be based on the successful completion of a Ph.D. and a demonstrated record of relevant teaching proficiency. An Instructor II with a M.Sc. may be promoted to an Instructor III with an established record of relevant teaching proficiency and five years of relevant teaching experience. The candidate must have demonstrated an ability to contribute to all aspects of course development and have acquired proficiency in administration and public service.

Lecturer to Assistant Professor

To be considered for promotion from Lecturer to Assistant Professor a Ph.D. degree is required. In addition, teaching proficiency must have been demonstrated and research must have been initiated to an extent that indicates the ability of the candidate to carry on an independent research program.

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion at this level will be based on a demonstrated record of relevant teaching proficiency at all levels and an ongoing record of independent scholarship demonstrated by peer-evaluated publications. Administrative duties must have been accepted as required within the Department.

Associate Professor to Professor

The rank of Professor should be open to those who, having fulfilled all the previous requirements, have established national or international reputations in scholarship. It is understood that an established record of teaching proficiency is also required. Commitment to the institution and participation in its governance are also required. Administrative duties must have been accepted as required within the Department, Faculty and University.

7. SABBATICALS

The Faculty of Science endorses a sabbatical as a means of encouraging professional development and productive scholarship of mutual benefit to the academic staff member and the Faculty. The terms of sabbatical are described in Article 16.5 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement. Instructors are eligible for sabbatical under the terms set out in Article 16.5 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement.

A sabbatical is not automatic. The justification for a sabbatical is determined primarily on the basis of a written proposal outlining the nature of the program to be undertaken, and the benefits to the individual and the University that may reasonably be expected. The Faculty Review Committee examines proposals and advises the Dean about the academic merits of the sabbatical proposal. In accordance with Article 16.5.1 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement the Dean may reject proposals because of lack of merit or may defer a sabbatical because of staffing problems.

The following criteria will form the basis of assessment of the sabbatical proposed:

- (a) completion of the Application for Sabbatical form (available from the Departmental Secretary, the Dean's office or at www.uregina.ca/science) and a written sabbatical proposal;
- (b) a performance record demonstrating an active research program for the faculty ranks and a teaching development program for the instructor ranks as shown in an accompanying up-to-date curriculum vitae;
- (c) a sabbatical plan giving a clear and specific indication of the activities to be carried out (eg., research/project(s), establishment of research linkages, research articles, books or book chapters, conferences, sites to be visited) including:
 - i) a statement (developed in consultation with the Department Head) of the relevance of the proposed activities to the academic staff member's professional field and assigned duties;
 - ii) a statement of the anticipated short and long term benefits for the University, Faculty, and academic staff member, including the expected outcome of the proposed sabbatical (to be considered in the review of the final report).

Each case is considered individually, but in general, approval is limited to those applicants who present a well thought-out plan of research/teaching development, study, travel, or other activity clearly related to the academic staff member's professional field and assigned duties at the University of Regina.

- (d) a clear statement of the requirement of a sabbatical in accomplishing professional development and the merits associated with the proposed location(s), (accompanied by letter(s) of invitation from other institutions) must be included. In keeping with the philosophy and past practices of the Faculty of Science the academic staff member will be encouraged to pursue the majority of the activities associated with the sabbatical at another institution.
- (e) an analysis by the Department Head of the potential impact of the sabbatical on the operations of the Department (number in the unit to be on sabbatical at that time [if known]; alternative arrangement for the delivery of courses normally given by the academic staff member);

- (f) a statement concerning the arrangements that will be made for the continuation of ongoing work (eg., supervision of graduate students, committee work).

Academic staff members who have been granted a sabbatical shall:

- (a) submit a Sabbatical Report form and a written report summarizing the activities and accomplishments within three months of completion of the sabbatical. **The academic staff member is responsible for distributing the completed copies of the Sabbatical Report form and the written report to the Department Head, the Dean of Science, the Office of Research Services, and Human Resources.** Subsequent applications for sabbatical may, in part, be evaluated on the basis of the achievements of previous sabbaticals. Therefore, any concrete indications of the value of the sabbatical period (books or articles published, renewed requests for services) should be submitted as and when they become available for inclusion or notation in the academic staff member's general information file in the University Archives.
- (b) present the results of their sabbatical at a Departmental seminar within six months of return.

8. INCREMENTS

8.1 CAREER GROWTH INCREMENTS

A Career Growth Increment will be awarded annually in recognition of demonstrated contributions to the Faculty's objectives of excellence in research and teaching. The contributions expected will vary with the individual's rank and position. Academic staff members will be expected to provide reasonable and appropriate documentation to demonstrate their contributions.

All academic staff members will be evaluated on their assigned duties and activities. Career growth increments are granted annually on the basis of evidence that the academic staff member performs assigned duties satisfactorily. Performance is evaluated by the Faculty Review Committee, which then forwards its recommendation to the Dean in writing. Refer to Article 17.6 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement for requisite documentation. The Faculty Review Committee should be notified in writing of any assigned duties or workloads that have been agreed to that are not consistent with the criteria document and that must be taken into account during the evaluation process of individual academic staff members.

8.2 MERIT INCREMENTS

Merit increments may be granted to those who, considering their present rank and position, have clearly made outstanding contributions in an area of their assigned duties

since their last merit increment or promotion, while maintaining a consistently good performance in all areas assigned. Outstanding performance in important administrative responsibilities and/or activities related to the academic staff member's discipline may be recognized for a merit award provided long term, strong contributions have been in evidence in the assigned duties since the last merit award or promotion was granted.

Merit increments shall be made on the basis of Article 18.3 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement. Academic staff members may apply for merit or be nominated by their Department Head, the Faculty Review Committee or the Dean. In all cases of merit application by the academic staff member a clear statement of the basis for the merit request and the appropriate supporting documentation must be provided to the Faculty Review Committee. In accordance with Article 17.10 of the U.R.F.A. Collective Agreement an academic staff member who is requesting a merit increment shall make a written application to the member's Department Head, with a copy to the Dean, **on or before November 30th**.

Revised November 1983
Revised November 1987
Revised December 1989
Revised May 1993
Revised November 1997
Revised October 1999
Revised May 2001
Revised September 2003