

Department of Social Science Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
For Teaching Stream Appointments
(DRAFT Discussed at Council March 2017, Sept 2018, Nov 1, 2018.
Approved by Council Dec 5, 2018)

Table of Contents

1 Preamble

2 Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

2.1 Pre-candidacy

2.2 The File Preparation Committee

2.2.1 Composition of the File Preparation Committee

2.2.1.1 For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream

2.2.1.2 For Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

2.2.2 Role of the File Preparation Committee

2.2.3 Responsibilities of the Candidate

2.2.4 Timeline for the Work of the File Preparation Committee

2.2.4.1 For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream

2.2.4.2 For Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

2.2.5 Preparing Teaching Documentation

2.2.6 Preparing Service Documentation

2.2.7 Compilation of the Candidate's File

2.3 The Adjudicating Committee

2.3.1 Composition of the Adjudicating Committee

2.3.2 Conflict of Interest

2.3.3 Adjudication

2.3.3.1 Adjudication for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream

2.3.3.2 Adjudication for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

3 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream

3.1 Criteria for Teaching

3.1.1 University Criteria

3.1.2 Departmental Criteria

3.1.2.1 Criteria for Excellence

3.1.2.2 Criteria for High Competence

3.1.2.3 Criteria for Competence

3.1.2.4 Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated

3.3 File-Based Criteria

3.1.3.1 Contents of Teaching

3.1.3.2 Effectiveness of Communication

3.1.3.3 Participation and Performance in Specific Situations

3.2 Criteria for Service

3.2.1 University Criteria

3.2.2 Departmental Criteria

3.2.2.1 Criteria for Excellence

3.2.2.2 Criteria for High Competence

3.2.2.3 Criteria for Competence

5.2.4 Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated
3.2.3 File-Based Criteria

4 Criteria for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

4.1 University Criteria

4.2 Departmental

Criteria Attachments

ATTACHMENT A

Letter to be sent to collegial referees concerning observation and evaluation of teaching

ATTACHMENT B

Letter to be sent to internal/external referees concerning evaluation of teaching

ATTACHMENT C

Letter concerning teaching sent to undergraduate and graduate students

ATTACHMENT D

Letter to be sent to reviewers concerning service of Candidate

This document, along with Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures (November 23, 2003) and all relevant template letters, shall be made available to all candidates and all members of the File Preparation Committees and the Adjudicating Committee.

1. Preamble

As an academic community, the Department is a unique blending of diverse approaches to a common purpose. Teaching in both general education and a variety of specialized and interdisciplinary fields and committed to an equally diverse array of scholarly and service activities, we are indeed a heterogeneous group. At the same time, we pursue a shared mission. As noted in the Department's submission for its most recent program review (1999-2000), "the Department of Social Science is one of two departments in the Faculty of Arts specifically mandated to carry out York University's long-standing commitment to interdisciplinary education." Moreover, its members "bring to their teaching, scholarship and community service a determination to apply critical interdisciplinary perspectives to the study of social experience." Among themselves, "members of the Department nurture an open, supportive intellectual culture that integrates and enhances the critical insights of many disciplinary practices." Criteria for the tenure and promotion of Departmental faculty accordingly face a double challenge. On the one hand they should cohere around the distinctive intellectual values associated with the Department's interdisciplinary mandate. On the other hand they must be flexible enough to capture the widely varying contributions made by a very diverse faculty.

The Department considers Professors in the Teaching Stream to be full and equal members of the Departmental community who are valued for their leadership in developing pedagogical excellence. The procedures and levels of consideration given to tenure and promotion cases in the Teaching Stream shall duplicate exactly those used in the Professorial Stream, including the concepts of Pre-Candidacy and Candidacy.

2. Procedures

Within the Department of Social Science the files of candidates will pass through the T&P process via two committees: the Adjudication Committee and the File Preparation Committee. In addition, candidates are also encouraged to seek the advice of the Chair of the Department.

In keeping with the Senate document: "No person shall serve simultaneously on [Department, Faculty or Senate] tenure and promotion committees (including the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals committee) at different levels".

2.1 Pre-Candidacy

Upon appointment to Pre-candidacy all pre-candidates and candidates for

tenure and promotion shall be provided with the document “Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures” (approved by Senate, September 2002) and the document “Tenure and Promotions—Alternate Stream Document” (approved by Senate 15 December 1977; Amended 27 November 2003 and 24 May 2007) and be advised, in writing, to familiarize themselves with their contents. Furthermore, upon entering candidacy, each candidate shall again be advised of his/her rights and responsibilities under the current Senate document.

Early in pre-candidacy new faculty members will be appointed a mentor, whose role will be to advise the faculty member and to provide guidance for the duration of the pre-candidacy period. Mentoring should include informing the faculty member of the various services available for help in the tenure and promotion process (e.g., the York University Faculty Association (YUFA), the Teaching Commons, etcetera). The Chair of the Adjudicating Committee shall keep in touch with both the pre-candidate and the mentor.

2.2 The File Preparation Committee

2.2.1 Composition of the File Preparation Committee

2.2.1.1 For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream - The file for each candidate will be prepared by a File Preparation Committee (FPC) composed of a minimum of three (3) probationary or tenured members of the Department in accord with Senate Rules and Guidelines. Normally, two members of the FPC are named by the Adjudicating Committee (AC) and are drawn from the probationary and tenured members of the AC. The third member of the FPC is named by the Candidate and will normally be from the Candidate's home unit.

2.2.1.2 For Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream - For each candidate who agrees to stand for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream the Adjudicating Committee shall, with the assistance of the Department's Chair, appoint a File Preparation Committee consisting of three tenured faculty, including at least one holding the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream or Full Professor; one of these members shall be chosen by the candidate. The File Preparation Committee shall follow the same procedures and solicit the same kinds of evidence required of files for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream.

2.2.2 Role of the File Preparation Committee

The FPC is responsible for assembling a complete file, which fairly and accurately reflects the candidate's academic career. Its task is to compile evidence, but not to render judgment (see Senate Tenure and Promotions Documents, April 2004). The FPC provides no commentary other than factual information necessary to provide a context for the evidence in the file. These and other important steps are set out clearly in the Senate Tenure and Promotions Documents, and hence are not repeated here.

2.2.3 Responsibilities of the Candidate

Curriculum Vitae - It is the candidate's responsibility to prepare a curriculum vitae in standard format that identifies all of his/her teaching, pedagogical, service and scholarly contributions, clearly indicating their nature, dates, and status (e.g. activities in progress). It is also the candidate's responsibility to supply the File Preparation Committee with copies of all teaching and scholarly materials to be assessed. In the case of collaborative teaching activities or co-authored or co-edited scholarly works, it is the responsibility of the File Preparation Committee to solicit letters from collaborators, co-authors or co-editors, documenting the candidate's contribution to the work.

Candidate's Statement – Candidates are required to provide a statement on teaching, equivalent to the Candidate's Research Statement composed by candidates in the professorial stream. This statement, which the candidate is encouraged to compose in consultation with the File Preparation Committee, sets out the candidate's teaching philosophy and pedagogy in the context of the candidate's training and the interdisciplinary nature of the department. The statement, which does not normally exceed 2000 words, may contain a description of the candidate's teaching activities, contributions to curriculum or program development, and teaching innovations, as applicable.

2.2.4 Timeline for the Work of the File Preparation Committee

2.2.4.1 For tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream - File preparation shall normally begin in February or March of the academic year preceding adjudication. Files for tenure and promotion shall be submitted to the Adjudicating Committee by September 30th so that the Adjudicating Committee can forward the file to the LA&PS Review Committee by November 1st.

2.2.4.2 For Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream - In contrast to the fixed timetable governing procedures for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream, those leading to promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream are discretionary: they begin only when the candidate is judged to be ready. While the Senate document entitles candidates to initiate the process independently, the following procedures reflect the assumption that such a judgment is more likely to be well-founded when carried out on a comparative basis by an impartial group of colleagues. They also reflect the belief that departments have an obligation to invite appropriately qualified members to become candidates for promotion at the earliest opportunity.

The Adjudicating Committee shall by January 15th of each year solicit curricula vitae from all Department members currently at the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream. Those wishing to supplement the curriculum vitae with a brief statement about their qualifications are free to do so. The Committee shall

conduct a review of all documents received on or before March 15th in light of Senate and Departmental criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream. By April 15th candidates who wish to stand for promoting will proceed with the expectation that their file will be reviewed by the Adjudicating Committee in the Fall of that year.

2.2.5 Preparing Teaching Documentation

Over a two (2) year period, a minimum of five (5) and maximum of six (6) letters of evaluation may be submitted in the file. At least three (3) of the letters of evaluation, one of which may be from a referee selected by the Candidate, will be collegial reviews of the Candidate's teaching based on at least two (2) and possibly more classroom visits to different courses conducted by each reviewer. Two (2) letters of evaluation by internal/external referees, one of whom may be selected by the Candidate, will include a classroom visit and a comprehensive desk-based review assessing the Candidate's Statement, syllabi, course assignments, relevant publications if any, and other documentary materials on teaching such as contributions to teaching innovations, curriculum and program development, and activities in support of the development of teaching. The internal/external reviewers will be at arm's length. All requests for assessment of teaching shall include the relevant criteria statements of the Senate document and the Department's Guidelines. As well, all referees are provided with relevant teaching materials (e.g., course outlines, assignments, etc.) before they observe the candidate in a classroom situation. A copy of the letters sent to prospective referees is included in Attachments A and B.

Letters of evaluation are also obtained from students who have completed either undergraduate courses with the Candidate, normally within the last three (3) to four (4) years. A longer sample period may be required if the Candidate has been on leave in the period designated for the sampling. Random sampling of student names from the courses taught by the Candidate is undertaken in order to identify and contact approximately fifty to seventy-five (50-75) students. Normally at least fifteen to twenty (15-20) letters should be received and included in the Candidate's file.

In addition, graduate students who have acted as Teaching Assistants are asked to provide a letter. Normally, letters from five (5) to eight (8) Teaching Assistant students will be included in the Candidate's file. Where a Candidate has taught few or no courses with Teaching Assistants, the number of these letters may be reasonably lower or, in the latter case, absent.

It is recognized that it may be difficult to obtain letters from undergraduate students; such letters, however, are important to a file in the Teaching Stream and the FPC is expected to make more than one round of solicitation if necessary.

The Candidate may add names to the lists generated by the FPC; the Candidate's suggested names may comprise up to one-third of the students contacted by the FPC.

Statistical summaries of the quantifiable material (student evaluations) are

prepared by the Dean's Office and may be included in the file, at the discretion of the FPC. Signed comments from students obtained as part of the teaching evaluations may be included.

Copies of the letters sent to students are included in Attachment C.

2.2.6 Preparing Service Documentation

The FPC will obtain letters of evaluation from at least three (3) referees who are familiar with the Candidate's service to the University. Once the FPC determines the list of potential referees, the Candidate may add up to one-third more names (up to one-quarter of the total names on the list.) The number of letters obtained by the FPC will depend on the diversity of the Candidate's service activities both within the Department and within the University. Reviewers will receive relevant materials (as determined by the candidate) to assist in their evaluations. Normally the letters will reflect the activities of the Candidates within the last five years.

All follow-up letters to those who have agreed to provide assessments of the candidate's service shall include a statement that it would be helpful to the Committee if the terms "excellence", "high competence", "competence", or "competence not demonstrated" were referred to in their responses.

2.2.7 Compilation of the Candidate's File

In addition to compiling documents pertaining to teaching and service as outlined above, the FPC will prepare a brief document that summarizes the collection and preparation of the information in the file and provides contextual information that the Committee deems relevant to a comprehensive evaluation of the file. The summary statement might include:

Teaching

- number of letters sent out and number of responses obtained
- how the list was selected
- whether the classes that were assessed (by visits or by questionnaire) were compulsory
- whether the classes assessed could be regarded as particularly tough or controversial
- any special circumstances such as teaching buyouts that might affect the teaching section of the file

Service

- number of letters sent out and number of responses obtained
- how the list was selected
- any special circumstances such as fellowships or sabbaticals that might

affect the service section of the file

The summary will not include any gist from letters. Refer to the Senate Tenure and Promotions Documents (2004), page 18. Any commentary provided by the FPC shall be exclusively factual in nature without judgment of any kind.

The FPC is encouraged to consult with the Candidate in his/her preparation of the summary statements and in the preparation of the Candidate's response to material contained in the file (e.g., letters from referees) should the option to do so be pursued.

The Candidate has the right to review all of the material collected for his/her file, except original copies of letters of reference or comments from students (i.e., letters or comments that have not had identifying material removed from them) (Senate Policy F.2.3 p13, F.3.1.6 p19-20). Normally, the Candidate will review the completed file with the members of the FPC prior to the review of the file by the Adjudicating Committee.

2.3 The Adjudicating Committee

2.3.1 Composition of the Adjudicating Committee

There will be 6-8 members of the committee from the tenure-stream faculty with the Chair of the Department as a member ex officio. The Executive Committee of the Department of Social Science shall appoint the Chair of the Adjudicating Committee. In years with three or fewer files to prepare and adjudicate, the number of members from each File Preparation Committee shall be two (2); in years when the number is greater than three, the number of members from each File Preparation Committee shall be one (1). In the case of a cross-appointed candidate, there will be consultation with the second department about representation on the Adjudicating Committee.

By September 15th the Adjudicating Committee shall solicit student representatives by appropriate means (one undergraduate, one graduate), including a call for candidates on the Social Science Listserv. It should be ascertained that there are no conflicts or relations affecting impartiality between the student and the candidate under consideration for tenure and promotion. The importance of confidentiality should be emphasized as well. When there are more than two student volunteers, the Adjudicating Committee shall select two representatives on the basis of a short written submission concerning their qualifications for and interest in membership.

The Adjudicating Committee shall select by vote the members of each File Preparation Committee, with the exception of the member(s) named by the candidate.

The Adjudicating Committee Report shall be particularly attentive to producing an adequate statement of the committee's rationale for its decision in each of the two areas (teaching and service). However, in the case of promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream the committee may decide not to base its report on

these two individual sets of criteria but a more holistic view of the candidate's file.

2.3.2 Conflict of Interest Guidelines

It is incumbent on any member of the File Preparation Committee and/or the Adjudicating Committee who believes that there may be a conflict of interest to declare it at the beginning of any process. A "test" for deciding if there is a conflict is to ask: "Would a reasonable person observing the situation from the outside, who is apprised of the details, think that your judgment would be filtered through the relationship in question?". Once a committee member declares a potential conflict of interest and has declared his/her own position on the conflict, a decision shall be rendered by the Adjudicating Committee as to the existence of a conflict of interest as well as to the resolution. If the member is sitting on the Adjudicating Committee, he/she shall excuse himself/herself from the ensuing discussion and the rest of the Committee shall make the decision. Once the question of conflict of interest is resolved, the Adjudicating Committee shall provide the Executive Committee with "...a rationale and/or explanation of how the committee resolved that there was no conflict or what steps they took to address and ensure that the potential conflict of interest was mitigated" (quoted from Handbook for Academic Administrators, Academic Appointment Process). The Executive Committee shall review the resolution of the conflict of interest for approval.

2.3.3 Adjudication

2.3.3.1 Adjudication for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream - According to the Collective Agreement Tenure & Promotion document (Teaching Stream, p29, emphasis added),

The University's need for specialized teaching skills in certain areas is the *raison d'être* of the Teaching Stream, and thus the consequent emphasis on teaching therein is reflected in the criteria for evaluating members of the stream. Indeed, this need is the basis for requiring that nothing less than **excellence (superiority) in teaching** and **competence in service** to the University be the required standard for the granting of tenure to an individual in the stream.

2.3.3.2 Adjudication for Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream - Unlike the guidelines for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream, the Adjudication Committee is not required to make individual decisions in each of the two areas of Teaching and Service, but may make an overall decision on the candidate's file.

3.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream

According to the Senate document (B.1.2.):

An Associate Professor, Teaching Stream is a superior teacher who has also demonstrated a competent level of service to the University that one would expect from a colleague in whose hands the care of the University has been placed by the granting of tenure.

It is because of this trust and because of its desire to give instruction of the highest quality that the University establishes a minimal threshold over which individuals in the Teaching Stream must pass to become part of that trust. In recognition of attainment of a level of distinction as a superior teacher whom it wishes to retain, the University grants a promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream with tenure. It is expected that the Associate Professor, Teaching Stream will maintain, enhance and perhaps broaden his/her capabilities as a teacher over time. As a tenured member of the faculty of York University, an Associate Professor, Teaching Stream is governed by the general rules of the University relating to tenured faculty.

3.1 Criteria for Teaching

To the extent that there are uniform criteria applicable to all Department faculty, they spring from two sources: A) the University's general criteria for teaching as set out in the Senate document; and B) a more specific set of intellectual values rooted in the Department's mandate and central to its academic identity.

3.1.1 University Criteria

According to the Senate document on the Teaching Stream (most recently approved May 2007, Section B.2.2. Evaluation of Teaching):

Since teaching is the prime responsibility of members of the Teaching Stream, it is essential that teaching performance be evaluated both in terms of content and presentation. Because the relative emphasis of some of the essential elements of teaching will vary from unit to unit in the University, the responsibility for defining the criteria and the methods for evaluating the criteria are left to the various sub-units. The lists of criteria and methods must be submitted to the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions for approval prior to implementation.

The evaluation of teaching is a difficult, complex process that must involve both colleagues and students. Because colleagues have expertise, previous experience and an overview of the curriculum of the unit, their evaluations will be given the most weight in addressing the question of the teaching proficiency of the candidate. Student evaluations by class

questionnaires can be very helpful in assessing the candidate's ability to communicate the content of the course. The opinions of former students who have had time to assess the value of the course are also valuable in assessing the quality of the teaching.

3.1.2 Department Criteria

The Department regards teaching as a cornerstone of its mandate. There are two key features of this mandate. On the one hand, teaching in this unit encompasses many different approaches to knowledge offered under the twin rubrics of general education and the interdisciplinary programs. On the other hand, all [graduate and undergraduate] Department course offerings share an emphasis on apprehending social experience from critical interdisciplinary perspectives. Accordingly, the teaching contributions of candidates should be assessed for their effectiveness in meeting this latter goal, while bearing in mind that there are many ways of being both "critical" and "interdisciplinary." In keeping with this emphasis, collegial assessors should mainly be selected with the candidate's interdisciplinary expertise in mind and requested to respond, insofar as the assessor's expertise permits, to the question of the candidate's interdisciplinarity in their written assessments of the candidate's undergraduate teaching.

"Elements of Teaching" in the Department: Teaching in the Department involves delivering courses with socially relevant content and integrated curriculum that cultivate critical and interdisciplinary thinking. The relevance of content is assessed by the ability of the course to bring the life experiences of students to bear on the topic of instruction and discussion as well as to mobilize the topic to enable students to critically reflect upon their life experiences. The integration of content is assessed by the ability of the course director to provide an overall direction, sense, and organization of the course, integrating lectures, tutorials (if any), assignments and exams all together in a cohesive whole. Teaching in the Department involves challenging students with new ideas and perspectives to enable them to develop critical judgement. Teaching in the Department also involves adopting a caring and engaging approach toward students that is attuned to their needs and capacities while simultaneously challenging them by encouraging innovation and inventiveness. All together, these may be called "elements of teaching" in the Department.

"Formats of Teaching" in the Department: Teaching in the Department involves different formats ranging from lecture classes to seminars, reading courses, and tutorials. Some elements of teaching are easier to practice and more appropriate than others in some formats. The Department expects course directors to adopt appropriate elements of teaching for appropriate formats.

The Adjudication Committee will take into account a specific combination of elements and formats of teaching in which the candidate is involved. The Committee will look for the clarity of course outlines, quality of assignments,

appropriateness of readings, communication skills with students, organizational capacities, ability to generate an atmosphere conducive to productive debate, ability to develop critical skills, effective integration of new technologies, contribution to curricular development and availability to students.

3.1.2.1 Criteria for Excellence: To be ranked as excellent, there should be demonstrated support amongst collegial assessments, student letters, and numerical course evaluations, showing that the candidate performs above the statistical means in the Department and that the candidate excels in at least several elements and/or formats of teaching. The collegial letters should explicitly address the elements of **relevance, integration, organization, care and engagement**, contextualizing these as regards the format of teaching assessed. Being involved in teaching-related administrative positions or being a recipient of teaching awards are also important indicators demonstrating excellence.

3.1.2.2 Criteria for High Competence: High competence in teaching is demonstrated by a combination of assessments that indicate that the candidate has performed around the averages in the Department in both qualitative and quantitative terms. The candidate must demonstrate strength in at least some elements and formats of teaching.

3.1.2.3 Criteria for Competence: Competence in teaching is demonstrated by a combination of assessments that indicate that the candidate has performed at the Department averages in some elements and formats of teaching. The candidate must also demonstrate strength in at least one of the elements and formats of teaching.

3.1.2.4 Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated: The ranking of unproven competence will be given in cases where the candidate fails to demonstrate competence in any of the elements and formats of teaching in the Department or a serious failing in one or more.

3.1.3 File-based Criteria

Given that strength in teaching can take many forms, the assessment of that strength should be open to a wide range of evidence. For the guidance of the File Preparation and Adjudication Committees, some forms of evidence potentially relevant to a teaching file are listed below, grouped according to the three areas enumerated in the Senate Document. Candidates who supply an appropriate rationale may include other forms of evidence as well.

3.1.3.1 Contents of Teaching

1. Course creation: interdisciplinarity, innovation, creativity, quality of course-related materials;

2. Textbooks and other published teaching materials prepared by the candidate;
3. Knowledge of subject matter as demonstrated in syllabi and lectures and seminars;
4. Evolution, renewal, of course content over time.
5. Other teaching and teaching-related work in or beyond the classroom: Foundations course work on critical skills; the Teaching Commons; etc.
6. Scholarship on pedagogy demonstrating evidence of research, analysis, reflection, and synthesis;
7. Teaching awards and nominations for teaching awards.
8. Research presentations and publications in areas in which the Candidate teaches, demonstrating up to date engagement with the teaching field.

3.1.3.2 Effectiveness of Communication

1. Clarity of expression, appropriateness of level of 'pitch', ability to stimulate discussion, learning, critical thinking, general engagement;
2. Response to challenges of English-language learners;
3. Recognition of student diversity, including ethnicity, gender, race, age, and intellectual range.
4. Classroom management: Maintenance of an atmosphere conducive to learning; respect for students; pedagogical alertness to differences in background and level of ability; success in getting students to understand and care about the issues.

3.1.3.3 Participation and Performance in Specific Situations

1. Ability in a variety of teaching formats: large and small lectures, tutorials, one-to-one office hours, reading and guided research courses (including availability outside of the classroom), and fieldwork;
2. In keeping with the Senate criteria (quoted on page three above), letters to colleagues, teaching assistants and students soliciting assessment should include a request that they address the question of superiority in any one of these areas.
3. Other teaching and teaching-related work in or beyond the classroom: supervising and mentoring tutorial leaders in lecture courses; Foundations course work on critical skills; Centre for Academic Writing; etc.;
4. Classroom management: Maintenance of an atmosphere conducive to learning; respect for students; pedagogical alertness to differences in background and level of ability; success in getting

students to understand and care about the issues.

3.2. Service to the University

3.2.1 University Criteria

According to the Senate Document, "Tenure and Promotions Criteria and Procedures" (approved March 21, 2002), assessments of service to the University should reflect the following considerations:

Service to the University will take many forms. Service to the University is performed by faculty members through participation in the decision-making councils of the University, and through sharing in the necessary administrative work of Departments, Faculties, the University or the Faculty Associations not otherwise counted under professional contribution and standing. Reviewers, will attempt to discriminate among the kinds of administrative work in which a faculty member has participated. Contributions through committees and administrative offices should be assessed as an area for the display of knowledge and good judgement in the creation of new courses, programmes, Faculties, and Colleges.

The work of some committees is routine; obligations to serve on them from time to time are implicit in being a member of Faculty and deserve no special weight. Committees relevant to the making of academic policy, or major duties assumed at the request of the University or assumed on behalf of the Association which have led to its improvement, are clearly more important and will be given proper consideration.

3.2.2 Departmental Criteria

Of the two areas, teaching and service, for which the Adjudicating Committee is charged with developing procedures and criteria of assessment, service would probably seem to be the one least open to claims of Departmental specificity. Nevertheless, the Department houses interdisciplinary programs whose co-ordination requires ongoing and demanding attention of Departmental Committees above and beyond the administrative requirements for managing each programme. Altogether, the Department faculty are often required to make considerable commitment to not only their programmes for which they are hired but also running Departmental Committees that hold it all together. Accordingly, in evaluating the extent and quality of the candidate's Service, the following criteria will be used:

1. Regular participation on committees among the following areas: the Department, Colleges, Faculty, Senate, the University, and the Faculty Association;

2. Chairing any such committees;
3. Administrative work within the Department such as serving as Chair of the Department; Undergraduate Coordinator, Curriculum Coordinator or Coordinator of any of its Programs;
4. Administrative work outside the Department such as serving as Head or Academic Advisor of a College;

3.3.2.1 Criteria for Excellence: A ranking of excellence demonstrates active, continuing and sustained contribution to the Department or university at large in significant capacities. The ranking of excellence requires not only serving in these various capacities outlined above but also demonstrating fairness, effectiveness, judgement, collegiality, respectfulness and other attributes of strong collegial spirit and conduct as assessed by collegial reviews.

3.3.2.2 Criteria for High Competence: A ranking of high competence would normally require also reasonable and consistent involvement in service. But such participation must demonstrate the promise of strong collegial spirit and conduct as assessed by collegial reviews.

3.3.2.3 Criteria for Competence: A ranking of competence would normally require a reasonable involvement in service in any combination of capacities outlined above.

3.3.2.4 Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated: A candidate who does not meet the minimum quantitative or qualitative requirements for competence would receive a rank of unproven competence.

3.3.3 File-based Criteria

Evaluation of these contributions will be based on the following sources: the applicant's curriculum vitae; letters of assessments of the applicant's work from Chairs and colleagues of committees, etc., on which the applicant served.

4. Criteria For Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

4.1 University Criteria

In addition to its criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, Teaching Stream, the Senate document provides a general orientation to criteria for promotion to "Professor, Teaching Stream" ("Preamble"; "B"). According to the Senate document (B.1.3.):

The rank of Professor, Teaching Stream denotes an individual who exhibits leadership and makes a substantial contribution as a teacher and colleague.

Promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream is not coincident with a minimum period of time at the Associate level, nor is it a routine progression. The promotion is granted in recognition of distinguished accomplishments in teaching and service.

4.2 Department Criteria

The Adjudicating Committee shall base its recommendation regarding a candidate's promotion on this overall standard as well as on the more specific criteria found in the Senate document and these Departmental Guidelines. Here again the guiding assumption is that candidates have different strengths and there are many paths to eminence. Bearing this proviso in mind, an abstracted (i.e., "ideal typical") pattern might appear as some variation of the following:

- Evidence of commitment and achievement in teaching
- A record of "service" teaching, particularly to first and second year students
- Documented curricular innovation and course development
- Contribution to pedagogical scholarship or innovation demonstrated through relevant publications
- Positive relations with and mentoring of teaching assistants
- Contributions to pedagogy beyond York, e.g., leadership in professional organizations, editing journals, etc.
- Consistent contribution to governance at Departmental, college, YUFA, faculty and/or Senate levels
- Evidence of impact within these levels of York governance
Leadership in some of these service areas in some circumstances, evidencing commitment and accomplishment

While not all candidates are likely to match this ideal profile, the expectation is that those who merit promotion will balance shortcomings in some areas with strengths in others in such a way as to make the candidate one of those "from whom the University receives its energy and strength."