



## DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

### **Information and Criteria for Tenure, Promotion and Time and Performance Step Increases**

Approved by Departmental Ballot  
January 23, 2001

(Revision of policy on signed student comments  
and to include Category 1; September, 2002)

(Revision of criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor  
approved by Departmental ballot 11 August 2008)

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The following is in addition to the relevant material in the Faculty Policy Manual and the Special Plan Agreement.

The three traditional areas of faculty activity: *teaching*, *scholarship* and *service*, are considered for tenure and promotion, as well as for time and performance step increases (TAPSI) with regard to salary. Individual faculty responsibilities will involve combinations of these activities decided upon in consultation with the Chair, consistent with ensuring that the Department as a whole discharges its responsibilities to the University, the Academic Community and society at large.

**Part II describes the information for Tenure and Promotion and**

**Part III describes the criteria for Tenure and Promotion.**

**Part IV describes the current criteria for Time and Performance Step Increases (TAPSI).**

## **II. RELEVANT INFORMATION for Tenure *and* Promotion**

### **Introduction**

This section defines the nature of the information that is deemed relevant in a consideration for tenure or promotion in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. The criteria employed to evaluate this information are stated in Part III of this document, CRITERIA for Tenure and Promotion.

The relevant information is grouped under three headings, indicating the sources from which the information is expected to be provided to the Tenure and Promotion Committee: the faculty member, the Chair of the Department, and other sources. Under each of these three headings, the information is subgrouped in accordance with the three defined areas of faculty responsibilities: Scholarship, Teaching, and Service, although some information may be relevant to more than one area.

### **II.A INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE FACULTY MEMBER**

The individual faculty member is the most important source of information to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The principal document for submission of relevant information is the College of Physical and Engineering Science Information Record for Faculty Evaluation. Each faculty member must provide an updated CPES Information Record, prior to the deliberations of the Committee. A faculty member who fails to submit information will normally not be considered for a time and performance step increase, promotion or tenure. The faculty member may append to the CPES Information Record any additional information that he or she desires to bring to the attention of the Committee.

In the area of scholarship, the faculty member should include copies of selected papers, letters, chapters in books, acknowledgements etc. In the area of teaching, the faculty member must include a teaching dossier as part of the current CPES Information Record.

#### **(i) Scholarship**

Scholarship includes basic and applied research and research in teaching methods. Information provided by the faculty member regarding scholarship may include the following:

1. Refereed publications in professional journals, with complete title, co-authors, volume, date and page numbers; or date of acceptance.
2. Refereed publications in conference proceedings, symposium contributions, etc.; with volume and page numbers or date of acceptance.

3. Books or chapters in books. (Items of a pedagogical nature may be included under Teaching at the option of the faculty member).
4. Letters to editors, submitted papers, unrefereed papers and reviews, work in progress.
5. Nationally assessed research grants received.
6. Contract research grants and reports resulting from such research.
7. Other grants such as equipment grants, grants from local agencies, charitable societies, etc.
8. Applications for grants or contracts.
9. Awards and honours received for scholarship.
10. Consulting activities of a scholarly nature.
11. Organizing scholarly conferences, workshops, etc.
12. Editorship of journals, proceedings, etc.
13. External refereeing: for journals, grant agencies, theses.
14. Invited talks at conferences or other universities, etc.
15. Contributed papers, participation in workshops, seminars. (If appropriate, these may be included under teaching at the option of the faculty member.)
16. Serving as advisor, advisory committee member or examining committee member for a graduate student. (May be included under Teaching at the option of the faculty member.)
17. Other information the individual considers evidence for scholarship.

**(ii) Teaching**

The faculty member will provide much of the following information in the appropriate spaces in his/her CPES Information Record for Faculty Evaluation, which includes a faculty member's Teaching Dossier.

1. Courses taught, including contact hours, numbers of students, laboratory hours, teaching assistants, and whether a coordinator for a multi-section course.

2. Serving as advisor, advisory committee member or examining committee member for a graduate student. (May be included under Scholarship at the option of the faculty member.)
3. Responsibility for distance, extension, and continuing education courses.
4. Curriculum innovation or substantial changes to a course.
5. Development of teaching materials, computer aided instruction, textbooks, laboratory manuals, study guides, etc. (May be included under Scholarship at the option of the faculty member.)
6. Involvement with student projects, for example in the Mathematics and Statistics Clinic or the Ashton Statistical Laboratory.
7. Awards and honours received for teaching.
8. Research into teaching methodology and any publications resulting from such research (may be considered as Scholarship, at the option of the faculty member).
9. Mentoring a colleague or sessional in the teaching of a course.
10. Other information the individual considers evidence of performance.

**(iii) Service**

1. Member of Departmental, College, and University committees, and the nature of contributions made to such committees.
2. Undergraduate counsellor, graduate officer, co-op officer.
3. Contributions to professional or scholarly societies, international programs, Faculty Association and The Fields Institute.
4. Activities which represent the Department or University to the community at large; talks to general audiences.
5. Recognition for professional service (on or off campus).
6. Liaison activities, high school talks, judge at science fairs, Mathematics and Statistics Club, College Royal.
7. Distance, extension, and continuing education.

8. Putnam Competition coordinator, coaching students for academic competitions or presentations. (May be included under Teaching at the option of the faculty member.)
9. Other information the individual considers evidence of service. This may, for example, include letters documenting service activities.

## **II.B INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT**

According to Section E of the Faculty Policy Manual, the Chair has certain responsibilities to acquire and report to the Tenure and Promotion Committee the nature and quality of a faculty member's activities.

### **(i) Scholarship**

In accordance with Section E of the Faculty Policy Manual when external assessment of the faculty member's scholarship is to be obtained, the Department Chair and the faculty member will consult concerning a list of assessors. If agreement is not reached, the Committee will choose the list of assessors. The normal number of external assessments to be obtained is three. The Chair will write a standard covering letter to each external assessor; providing information about the faculty member's scholarship and the pertinent University policies. Letters more than two and one-half years old shall not be retained in the file except with the permission of the faculty member.

### **(ii) Teaching**

1. A complete teaching schedule for the Department, supplemented by the registrar's summary of course offerings, enrolments and grades (as available).
2. The numerical results of student assessments of teaching effectiveness compiled by the Department. These assessments are obtained in a uniform manner as described in the attached Appendix 2: "Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics".
3. Course materials, such as course outlines, tests and examinations, on file in the Department.
4. Unsigned comments from students, faculty members or the Chair may not be considered by Promotion and Tenure Committees. Signed comments may be entered into consideration if the faculty member involved has had the opportunity to see and comment in writing on the comment, and if her/his written comments are also forwarded to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**(iii) Service**

The Chair will give the Committee a list of all committee assignments in the Department, and will provide an assessment of the quality of the faculty member's contribution to Departmental committees and administration. The Chair will provide any written communications received indicating a faculty member's service contributions outside of the department.

**III. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

Every faculty member in the Department holding a probationary appointment or eligible for promotion is considered for tenure and promotion annually. The criteria described herein are based on relevant information in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. This information is described in this document, Part II: INFORMATION for Tenure and Promotion.

In regards to determining a decision for Tenure or Promotion for a particular faculty member, each member of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will rank the faculty member under discussion in each of the areas of: scholarship, teaching and service. The following categories, outstanding, very good, good, weak and unsatisfactory will be used in the ranking process.

**III. A/B TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

The maximum term of a probationary appointment is described in the Collective Agreement. Promotion of a faculty member to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor necessarily implies that tenure will be granted.

Subject to an individual's distribution of effort, the Committee must be satisfied that the faculty member:

1. Will make a positive contribution to the department in each of the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service.
2. Is a conscientious teacher capable of teaching at all levels including introductory and advanced undergraduate or graduate courses.
3. Has made a solid contribution to scholarship beyond the terminal degree. The primary criteria are its quality and independence.
4. Will make a positive contribution to the department's graduate program.

**CRITERIA**

At least good performance in all three areas with outstanding or very good performance in teaching or scholarship.

### **III.C PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

This rank implies a high degree of maturity and experience in scholarship and teaching and a very substantial contribution to the life of the Department and the University. The primary criterion for promotion to Professor is the faculty member's stature as a scholar. The faculty member will be consulted concerning names of referees from whom letters of evaluation will be sought in accordance with faculty policy. The mechanism for this is described in Part II.B (i) of this document.

In assessing the faculty member's contributions, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will consider the same three areas as described under Tenure, in A of this section. However, higher levels of achievement are necessary to warrant promotion to Professor reflecting the stature of this rank. Inherent in promotion to Professor is a demonstrated maturity in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service.

#### **CRITERIA**

Either (1) sustained performance that is outstanding, or very good, in the area of scholarship, as evidenced by external referees, together with sustained performance that is outstanding, or very good in the area of teaching with good performance in service or (2) sustained performance that is at least very good in either scholarship (as evidenced by external referees) or teaching, and at least good performance in each of the other two areas.

Faculty members fulfilling the second criterion can expect promotion to Professor only after lengthy service. This statement is included as a guideline and should not be construed as requiring a minimum length of service before promotion will be considered.

### **IV. CRITERIA FOR TIME AND PERFORMANCE STEP INCREASES**

Time and performance step salary increases (TAPSI) are recommended by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee for each faculty member, based on a performance evaluation normally conducted biennially, with exceptions as described in Section G Part 3 of the Faculty Policy Handbook. The Departmental recommendation will fall into one of the following 5 categories, as defined by Faculty Policies:

**Category 4:** A faculty member who receives an evaluation of 4 will receive one grid step, effective at each of the next two salary adjustment dates and will be considered for 1 or 2 additional steps.

**Category 3:** A faculty member who receives an evaluation of 3 will receive one grid step,

effective at each of the next two salary adjustment dates and will be considered for 1 additional step effective at the first or the second of these dates depending on the rank order in this category

**Category 2:** A faculty member who receives an evaluation of 2 will receive one grid step, effective at each of the next two salary adjustment dates.

**Category 1:** A faculty member who receives an evaluation of 1 is recommended for one grid step, effective either on the next July 1st adjustment date or on the subsequent July 1st adjustment date, as determined at the discretion of the Department Committee.

**Category 0:** A faculty member who receives an evaluation of 0 is recommended for zero steps on each of the next two salary adjustment dates (July 1st). For the purposes of feedback and performance improvement only, there will be a performance review in the subsequent year.

The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee arrives at its recommendation through a process of judgment combined with numerical ratings, as described in the following paragraphs.

For the numerical ratings, the Committee evaluates the quality of contributions in each of three areas: scholarship, teaching and service. Normally, this evaluation is based on the faculty member's performance over the previous five years, with emphasis on the past two years, using the *same information* defined in Part II of this document. Each Committee member individually assigns to each faculty member, in each area, an integer from 0 to 10, where 5 represents an average contribution and 10 indicates a truly outstanding performance. Then, in Committee, the members discuss each faculty member's performance in turn and explain the basis for their choice of rankings on the 0 to 10 scale. Committee members are free to change their ratings at this point, but it is not necessary for members to agree on the ratings. At the end of the discussions, each Committee member submits his set of rating numbers to the Chair. Committee members do not rate themselves; but at the end of the discussions the Committee members absent themselves in turn while the remaining members discuss their performance as above.

The Chair of the Department calculates a weighted average of these ratings in the three areas for each faculty member. The weight factors are in proportion to the distribution of effort units which has been arrived at in consultation between the faculty member and the Chair, in accordance with the attached **Appendix 1: Distribution of Faculty Effort**. The Chair will communicate these weights to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The weights are determined as follows. Given a faculty member's requested Distribution of Effort, then  $\{T,R,O\}$  are the teaching, research/scholarship, and service/other components of the requested Distribution of Effort, as described in points 1 and 3 of the attached Appendix 1, and  $T_1$  represents the actual Teaching Effort units, as defined in point 2. The Chair computes the following set of weight factors, for each faculty member. This set of weights is then used to compute a weighted average rating for each faculty member.



Teaching:  $W_T = T_1 / (T_1 + R + O)$

Scholarship:  $W_R = R / (T_1 + R + O)$

Service:  $W_O = O / (T_1 + R + O)$

The result of this calculation is a single number for each faculty member, in the interval [0,10], which is rounded to two digits and presented to the Committee by the Chair as an initial ranking of performance. The Committee is not bound by this numerical ranking, but rather uses it as a starting point for recommendations of category **4, 3, 2, 1 or 0** evaluations.

The Committee's final recommendations are a collective judgement, based on the following considerations.

The initial ranking based on the numerical calculation described above.

Recognition given to outstanding or singular achievements during the past two year period.

Faculty who have consistently received high departmental evaluations in previous years, but have not recently been awarded a double step, may be recommended more highly. (Previous years' recommendations are made available to the Committee, after the above numerical ranking is complete.)

Faculty who are assigned a low ranking by the numerical procedure are reviewed again by the Committee, to determine whether or not a recommendation for a **0** evaluation is appropriate.

The final evaluation, from the set {0, 1, 2, 3, 4}, is assigned for each faculty member in accord with the following criteria, taken from Faculty Policies:

- 0:** Performance is unsatisfactory relative to the standards of the department and the University, i.e. it falls well short of expectations within the established career path and allocation of duties. The faculty member is not meeting her or his responsibilities. In the standard career path this will mean poor work in teaching and negligible research\* productivity.
- 1:** There is not evidence of sufficient career progress to justify normal advancement along the grid. The performance falls short of "good" but cannot be deemed entirely unsatisfactory. This judgement could reflect teaching of barely acceptable quality (poor classroom performance, teaching materials less than current, persistent student complaints that have been investigated and are deemed justified, ....), or less than satisfactory performance in

assigned service/administrative duties, or negligible output of scholarly work, or all of these; the proportions to which the areas cited would enter the judgement will reflect the faculty member's allocation of effort.

- 2: A good performance by the standards of a major university that is recognized as a leader in the country and maintains high expectations of its faculty. This level of performance will show obvious career progress, thereby meriting award of steps along the career progress grid. It will be more than merely 'satisfactory', otherwise there would not be a reason in terms of career development for the award. There will be no significant problems or unsatisfactory aspects in any of the areas of teaching, research\* or service/administration and at minimum satisfactory in the other area of responsibility; the allocation of responsibilities among these three areas will be used in reaching a balanced judgement.
3. An excellent performance relative to the high expectations of a major university recognized as leader in the country. Performance will be markedly superior in at least one of the areas of teaching, research\* or service/administration and very good in an other. A positive approach to service/administrative assignments, if and as requested by the Chair or Dean is expected, as is effective discharge of these assignments.
- 4: A performance that stands out in cross-university terms relative to the excellent performance noted by a rating of '3'. Such a performance would be one that excels across the entire distribution of effort. Normally it would involve superb performance in two of the areas of teaching, research\* or service/administration, but circumstances could arise when activity or external recognition in any one of these areas justified, on its own, a rating of '4'. A positive approach to administrative assignments, if and as requested by the Chair or Dean is expected, as is effective discharge of these assignments.

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

The Departmental Committee will allocate its quota of two-step awards for the two subsequent years according to the above evaluations, and will submit to the College Committee a list in order of priority, with supporting documentation, of faculty members which it has recommended for two-step awards for each year. These awards will be decided by the College Committee, according to Faculty Policies. This list and documentation will also be available to the subsequent year's Departmental Committee.

At the conclusion of deliberations and according to Section G, Part 3, 3.04(iii) of Faculty Policy a letter signed by each committee member will be sent to all faculty members informing him/her of the recommendations of the Committee. Each faculty member will be invited to a meeting with the Chair, to discuss strengths and weaknesses identified by the Committee and the faculty member's contributions to the department and career path.

**Appendix 1:  
Distribution of Faculty Effort  
in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics**

1. Each faculty member's effort over a F,W,S, sequence will normally be distributed among the three areas according to the following:

Teaching (T):	50 ± 20 units
Research/Scholarship (R):	50 ± 20 units
Other (O):	25 ± 10 units

The sum  $T + R + O = 125$  units.

2. Actual teaching effort  $T_1$  is computed as the sum of the following units achieved.

<b>Duty</b>	<b>Units</b>
(i) Teaching one section of an assigned class (one appearing on the teaching schedule), with at least 1 registered student (as of the last add date).	10
Additive Factors to the above:	
1. If the number of registered students, n, is greater than 50.	$1 + \text{Int} \left[ \frac{n - 51}{20} \right]$
2. Teaching a course which is new to the instructor (a course is new to the instructor if he or she has not presented it in the past).	5
(ii) Teaching a seminar course or department-approved reading course for graduate students.	4
(iii) Coordinator of Multi-section course	
Total number of students ≤ 500	2
Total number of students > 500	3
Plus (per instructor)	1
(iv) Teaching a laboratory section associated with a course.	3
(v) Advisor or Co-advisor of Thesis or Project, to completion:	
	M.Sc. 4
	Ph.D. 8
(At option of faculty member these units may be added to the Scholarship portion.)	

3. Near the end of the Fall semester, each faculty member will be requested to choose his/her preferred effort distribution for the coming F, W, S, sequence, as above. The Chair will take these requests into account when assigning duties.
4. Before September 15<sup>th</sup> each year, the chair will send a letter to each faculty member stating the faculty member's distribution of effort for the previous F,W,S, sequence, calculated by the set of weights described in Part IV of this document. These revisions will take into account actual course enrolments (as of the university "reporting date"), as well as any requests regarding the placement of relevant items in Part II.A in alternative categories. The final Distribution of Effort agreed upon between the faculty member and the Chair should be signed by both parties.
5. The average of the individual weights for the two years under consideration will be averaged by the Chair, to obtain a single set of three weights for the final calculation described in Part IV of this document.

**Appendix 2:  
Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness  
in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics**

The teaching of all undergraduate and graduate courses assigned by the Chair to each faculty member will be evaluated. The standard departmental evaluation form (copy attached) will be used and administered by the chair of his designate. Normally, the evaluations are held during the last three weeks of each semester. The Chair or his designate will seek the assistance of sessional instructors and graduate students to administer the evaluations. Only the Chair or his/her designate will compile the numerical results for each course, and produce an average of all students' responses to each question and an overall average. One copy of this summary will be given to the appropriate faculty member and one copy will be made available to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Written student comments on evaluation forms which include the handwritten signature of the author, with the author's legibly printed name indicated, may be provided to the Chair and subsequently to the Department Committee as part of the Tenure, Promotion and Time and Performance Step Increase evaluation process. All information gathered, including student identities, will be made available to the Chair, the Department Committee and the faculty member. An opportunity will be provided to the faculty member to append written comments before the material is taken into consideration by the Department Committee.

All evaluation forms with written, but unsigned, comments by students, as well as all computer cards filled out by students on a particular course, will be returned to the appropriate faculty member at the end of the examination schedule of each semester. Unsigned written comments on the evaluation forms may not be read by persons other than the faculty member.

**DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS  
TEACHING EVALUATION FORM**

NOTE: Numerical results calculated from this evaluation are used by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee in making faculty salary and promotion decisions. These results along with those evaluation forms having unsigned written comments are passed directly to the faculty member after final grades have been submitted following the final examination period.

Comments which you wish to have directed to the Chair must include your handwritten signature, with your legibly printed name indicated. These comments are made available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee only after the faculty member has had the opportunity to read and respond to the contents. Your identity will be made available to the Chair, the Department committee and the faculty member.

---

Please respond to the following seven items using the scale A to E as shown below. Any omissions in your responses to items 1 to 7 will be interpreted as “no opinion”.

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>
	<b>Above</b>		<b>Below</b>	
<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>

---

1. The clarity of the instructor’s lecturing voice is \_\_\_\_\_ .
2. The instructor’s ability to interpret and answer questions is \_\_\_\_\_ .
3. The instructor’s ability to explain the course material is \_\_\_\_\_ .
4. The instructor’s organization of course material in each lecture is \_\_\_\_\_ .
5. The instructor’s ability to present the course material in a manner which stimulates interest and enthusiasm in the subject is \_\_\_\_\_ .
6. If applicable in your case, the instructor’s willingness to help when approached outside of lectures is \_\_\_\_\_ .
7. How would you rate your instructor in terms of overall effectiveness as a teacher?

**Additional comments on the above or in connection with the instruction in the course.**

---

---

---

---

---