

Department of Social Science Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
(Initial version approved Jan. 16, 2003; additions approved March 4, 2004; Revised April
25, 2005; Revisions Approved June 20, 2005)

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*
 - 2.2.1.2 *For Promotion to Full Professor*
 - 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*
 - 2.2.4.2 *For Promotion to Full Professor*
 - 2.2.5 Preparing Teaching Documentation
 - 2.2.6 Preparing Documentation for Professional Contribution
 - 2.2.7 Preparing Service Documentation
 - 2.2.8 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*
 - 2.3.3.2 *Adjudication for Promotion to Full Professor*

3 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

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 Professional Contribution and Standing

- 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*
 - 3.2.2.4 *Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated*
- 3.2.3 File-Based Criteria

3.3 Criteria for Service

- 3.3.1 University Criteria
- 3.3.2 Departmental Criteria
 - 3.3.2.1 *Criteria for Excellence*

- 3.3.2.2 *Criteria for High Competence*
- 3.3.2.3 *Criteria for Competence*
- 5.2.4 *Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated*
- 3.3.3 File-Based Criteria

4 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

4.1 University Criteria

4.2 Departmental Criteria

Attachments

ATTACHMENT A

Initial letter concerning Professional Contribution and Standing to be sent to potential referees

ATTACHMENT B

Letter concerning Professional Contribution and Standing to be sent to confirmed referees

ATTACHMENT C

*Professional Contribution and Standing
Senate Guidelines, Description of Criteria for Tenure and Promotion:*

ATTACHMENT D

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

ATTACHMENT E

Letter concerning teaching sent to undergraduate and graduate students

ATTACHMENT F

Letter to be sent to students receiving thesis or teaching supervision

ATTACHMENT G

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." The research they undertake tends to be "methodologically and theoretically creative, wide-ranging and often related to communities outside the university." 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.

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 be advised, in writing, to familiarize themselves with its 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 Centre for the Support of Teaching, *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 - 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 Full Professor - For each candidate who agrees to stand for promotion to Full Professor 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 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.

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 his/her scholarly contributions and clearly indicates both their nature (article, book chapter, conference proceedings, etc.) and their publication date or status (under contract, in preparation, forthcoming, in press). It is also the candidate's responsibility to supply the File Preparation Committee with copies of all contributions to be assessed. In the case of co-authored or co-edited works, it is the responsibility of the File Preparation Committee to solicit letters from the co-author/editor, documenting the candidate's contribution to the work.

Candidate's Statement - Given the diversity of research profiles within the Department, the candidate's statement plays a pivotal role in the assessment of his/her research contribution. It sets out the unifying aims, concerns, questions and methods that have guided the candidate's research, placing these within a larger frame of scholarly inquiry as well as in the more immediate context of the candidate's academic training and

career. In doing so it provides the File Preparation Committee with the contextual information needed in identifying assessors appropriate to the candidate's work. It also enables the assessors themselves to form a clear picture of the relationship between specific contributions and the candidate's overall program of work.

Preparation of the Statement, while optional, is the candidate's responsibility, although he/she is encouraged to do so in consultation with the File Preparation Committee. The Statement, which does not normally exceed 2000 words, should address at least the following themes: the candidate's (inter)disciplinary training and intellectual formation; the aims and goals of the candidate's scholarly activity (core themes and lines of continuity); location of candidate's research within/across recognized scholarly disciplines; life events which may have altered or delayed candidate's scholarly activity; work in progress and future plans; academic background(s) or specialization(s) needed for competent assessment of the candidate's work.

Teaching Dossier - While not required, candidates are encouraged to prepare a teaching dossier for the use of referees.

2.2.4 Timeline for the Work of the File Preparation Committee

2.2.4.1 For tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor - 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 Faculty of Arts Review Committee by **November 1st**.

2.2.4.2 For Promotion to Full Professor - In contrast to the fixed timetable governing procedures for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, those leading to promotion to Full Professor 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. 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. 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

Normally three (3) collegial referees, including one selected by the Candidate, are asked to observe one of the Candidate's classes and to prepare a letter of evaluation. The collegial referees may include individuals who are asked to observe and evaluate the

Candidate's teaching but might also include individuals who have a working knowledge of the Candidate's contributions to technical innovations, curriculum and program development, and activities in support of the development of teaching. All requests for collegial assessment of teaching shall include the relevant criteria statements of the Senate document and the Department's Guidelines. As well, teaching referees are also provided with relevant teaching materials (e.g., course outlines, assignments, etc.) before they observe the candidate in a classroom situation. A copy of the letter sent to prospective referees is included in Attachment D.

Letters of evaluation are also obtained from students who have completed either undergraduate or graduate 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 (50) students. Normally at least 10 letters are received and included in the Candidate's file.

In addition, graduate students who have been supervised in thesis work with the Candidate or have acted as Teaching Assistants are asked to provide a letter. Normally, letters from five (5) to eight (8) supervision or Teaching Assistant students will be included in the Candidate's file. As the Department does not have its own graduate programs, letters from Teaching Assistants are likely to be more common.

The time period for which letters are obtained will depend in part on the number of students the candidate has supervised. It is recognized that it may be difficult to obtain letters from undergraduate students. Finally, the response rates for graduate and undergraduate students might not be the same.

The Candidate may wish to add names to the lists generated by the FPC; the Candidate may name up to one-third of the students contacted by the FPC.

Records of course evaluations are maintained in the Office of the Chair. The FPC will prepare statistical summaries of the quantifiable material in order to facilitate the review by the Adjudicating Committee; both the original records and the summary are included in the Candidate's file. Signed comments from students obtained as part of the teaching evaluations may be included.

Copies of the letters sent to students and to supervision students are included in Attachments E and F, respectively.

All candidates are to be encouraged in writing "...to prepare a teaching dossier for the use of referees, encompassing course materials, statement of teaching philosophy, reflections on pedagogical strategies, and other relevant information" (See the Senate document, III, 2, iii).

2.2.6 Preparing Documentation for Professional Contribution and Standing

Normally the File Preparation Committee will draw on the candidate's statement for preliminary guidance in locating appropriate assessors. Through discussion with scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research, it will identify assessors with the academic standing and specialized knowledge(s) needed for a well-rounded evaluation of the candidate's scholarly activity. The Senate document calls for a minimum of three such letters. Where the candidate's work lies within a well-defined field and the letters themselves are in general agreement, three letters will normally suffice. Where more than

one specialization is involved or where serious differences arise among the assessors, more letters may be needed. In keeping with the Senate document's injunction that the File Preparation Committee "endeavour... to limit the number of references sought," the number of letters assessing the scholarship of Department candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will normally not exceed five (5).

As prescribed in the Senate document, materials sent to assessors will include the candidate's curriculum vitae, statement, publications, and a copy of the Senate criteria for tenure and promotion at York. In addition the letter accompanying this material will include the following paragraph:

"Evaluation of scholarly contributions by Departmental faculty should be guided by the "Senate Criteria for Tenure and Promotion at York" (attached). In addition, they should also give some weight to the core intellectual values associated with the Department's interdisciplinary mission. In practice this means that assessment of the sheer volume or disciplinary rigour of a candidate's work should be balanced by attention to its methodological and theoretical creativity, its success in bridging disciplines, discourses or fields of inquiry, and its relevance to communities outside the university." All referees requested to provide their professional assessment of the candidate's scholarship are explicitly asked to include, where expertise permits, an assessment of the interdisciplinary quality of their work.

All follow-up letters to those who have agreed to provide assessments of the candidate's scholarship shall include a statement that it would be helpful to the Committee if the terms "excellence", "high competence" or "competence" were referred to in their responses.

With regard to cases of promotion to Full Professor, the one difference is that instead of asking assessors in each area of achievement to evaluate the candidate on a scale ranging from "Competence" to "Excellence," the Committee may perhaps seek evaluations of the candidate's entitlement to promotion in light of Senate and Departmental criteria for advancement to the rank of Professor.

2.2.7 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. The FPC may determine that letters will be obtained from referees outside of the University. 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" or "competence" were referred to in their responses.

2.2.8 Compilation of the Candidate's File

In addition to compiling documents appertaining to teaching, service and research 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:

Research

- autobiographical information for each of the referees.
- names of referees contacted and which ones responded
- a description of how the referee list was drawn up
- a note of which referees were suggested by the candidate
- pertinent information concerning unusual disciplinary norms
- any unusual, relevant aspects of the Candidate's career path such as maternity/paternity leave or illness

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 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 may 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). 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 less 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 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 three areas (teaching, scholarship and service). However, in the case of promotion to full professor the committee may decide not to base its report on these three individual sets of criteria but a more holistic view of the candidates 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 - According to the Senate guidelines, a favourable recommendation for either Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor requires “either demonstrated superiority (excellence) in a minimum of one of the three categories outlined above [Scholarship, Teaching and Service], with at least competence demonstrated in teaching and in professional contributions and standing [Scholarship], or at least high competence in all three categories.” (Senate Tenure and Promotion Documents, 2004, page 9).

Pattern	Scholarship	Teaching	Service
A	Excellence	Competence	Competence not demonstrated
B	Competence	Excellence	Competence not demonstrated
C	Competence	Competence	Excellence
D	High competence	High competence	High competence

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

3.1 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

According to the Senate document:

An Associate Professor is a matured scholar whose achievements at York and/or elsewhere has earned his or her colleagues’ respect as an individual of superior qualities and achievements. A normal expectation of promotion to Associate Professor would be between three to six years of service in the rank of Assistant Professor (“B”).

Under the rubric of “The Relation of Promotion to Tenure” it states the following:

The decision to grant tenure is one of the most important relationships between the faculty member and the University since it confers upon the scholar a continuing career appointment. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that a candidate who has been judged worthy of tenure is normally worthy of being promoted to the rank of Associate Professor (“B”).

The Adjudicating Committee shall normally assess the candidate who is considered to have earned tenure by the standards of the Department Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion to have also earned promotion to Associate Professor. Under exceptional circumstances, tenure may be granted while promotion is delayed. Exceptional circumstances, in keeping with the Senate document, shall fall, for example, under the rubric of the following:

- (i) medical circumstances — where certain extended and severe medical problems have delayed a candidate from realizing his/her promise;

(ii) major change in field of academic concentration;

(iii) documented high promise of *excellence* or high competence in the three criteria categories to be realized in the immediate future (i.e., no longer than two years);

(iv) exceptional conditions where extraordinary service was rendered by a candidate (“B”).

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, “Tenure and Promotions Criteria and Procedures” (approved March 21, 2002), assessments of teaching should reflect the following considerations:

Members of faculty perform many functions, but all are teachers. At the level of the university, teaching is itself an expression of scholarship. In an age of intense specialization generating an information explosion, the scholar who can take information and synthesize it into coherent structures of knowledge is performing an essential and sophisticated task. To be able to create an intelligible and intelligent university course is a very significant accomplishment. The facile distinction between teachers and researchers comes from another era when a graduate education conferred upon the teacher a long-lasting competence in a single field.

To assess the quality of a candidate’s teaching, there are certain standards which can and should be applied within the University. The content of the teaching must be evaluated — whether it is conventional and routine, or whether scholarship is revealed through research, analysis, reflection, synthesis, and the expression of original work. The effectiveness of communication must also be considered, since communication is the essence of good teaching. The performance of the candidate must be assessed in terms of specific situations — i.e., with undergraduate or with graduate students, in groups and tutorials, in the laboratory or in the field, in small or large lectures. A candidate may be more effective in one situation than in others. While no one situation should be given a premium value to the detriment of others, a candidate should be superior in at least one area of teaching.

The judgement of colleagues must be brought to bear on the assessment of teaching performance; reliance on mere hearsay should be avoided. The direct expression of students’ evaluation of teachers should be solicited.

3.1.2 Department Criteria

With due attention to a balanced assessment of teaching, professional contribution and service, and recognizing with the Senate document that “[t]eaching is itself an expression of scholarship,” 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 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 and graduate 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. While the Department does not yet have a graduate programme, Department faculty are involved in teaching graduate courses and supervision of graduate students in other units. *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 has to be a consensus amongst collegial assessments, student letters, and numerical course evaluations 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 syllabus and lectures (and seminars?);
4. Scholarship as demonstrated by evidence of research, analysis, reflection, and synthesis;
5. Evolution, renewal, of course content over time.
6. Other teaching and teaching-related work in or beyond the classroom: Graduate teaching and supervision (recognizing that, with the limited access to graduate programmes in the Department, opportunity for this responsibility is variable across fields and within programmes);

supervising and mentoring tutorial leaders in lecture courses; Foundations course work on critical skills; Centre for Academic Writing; etc.

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 problems of second-language instruction;
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: Graduate teaching and supervision (recognizing that, with the limited access to graduate programmes in the Department, opportunity for this responsibility is variable across fields and within programmes); 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. Criteria for Professional Contribution and Standing

In meeting its interdisciplinary mandate the Department has recruited faculty from a wide array of academic backgrounds. Moreover, its hiring practices have favoured applicants who show strength in more than one field and concerns that span conventional disciplinary boundaries. The result has been an astonishing diversity of intellectual profiles. While some of these fit readily into the contours of emerging interdisciplinary fields (such as Communication Studies or Law and Society), others are not so easily categorized. The challenge, then, is to frame criteria for Professional Contribution and Standing that are somehow uniform and yet responsive to the many different logics, standards and disciplinary practices appropriate to a very diverse collection of research careers.

3.2.1 University Criteria

According to the Senate Document, “Tenure and Promotions Criteria and Procedures” (approved March 21, 2002), assessments of Professional Contribution and Standing should reflect the following considerations:

In most cases distinction within a profession arises from the communication of knowledge or skills through public service, scholarly publication, or the production of works of art. Although publication and performance are not in themselves a guarantee of excellence, one recognises that these kinds of professional activity are addressed to communities larger than York University, and that, therefore, they must be judged in this larger professional context. In certain cases a distinguished public expression constitutes *prima facie* evidence that the quality of the work has been assessed and found to be of a high standard; in other cases it may be necessary to solicit assessments from specialists in the same field.

When the candidate has written or produced a work as part of a team or group in a research project, as often happens in the sciences, the nature of his or her contribution must be assessed.

Intellectual achievement may also be manifested by studies or activities that have been commissioned by governments or by private institutions. Contributions of this kind are significant, but they can be uneven and should always be evaluated by a recognized authority in the same field.

Generally, the quality of a candidate’s scholarship will be evaluated in the light of judgements by reputable scholars; in cases where there may be Department within a discipline, the Department should describe the nature of the conflict among schools of thought and present the Committee with a wider range of professional opinion. Where the candidate is relatively junior, judgment should point not only to immediate achievement, but to the promise or lack of promise for further development.

The work performed by members of faculty for public and private institutions is indeed an integral part of the relationship between the University and the community. Communication with the general public in a variety of forms and media will be a continuing necessity for the modern university, and outstanding contributions of faculty in this area must be recognized. Service in an advisory capacity to various public agencies, presentation of lectures and talks to other than professional audiences, performances with radio and television networks — all such activity should be documented as evidence of any special capacity to enhance the intellectual relationship between the University and the community.

These activities must not be separated from the other criteria; they will be weighed in relation to the central core of responsibility which belongs to every

member of faculty not only to transmit but to extend the boundaries of perception, understanding, and knowledge.

3.2.2 Departmental Criteria

Assessment of Departmental faculty should also give some weight to the core intellectual values associated with the Department's interdisciplinary mission. In practice this means that attention to methodological and theoretical creativity, success in bridging disciplines, discourses or fields of inquiry, and relevance to communities outside the university should balance assessment of the sheer volume or disciplinary rigour of a candidate's work.

The most highly valued intellectual practices in the Department include conducting and disseminating (by publishing and speaking) research that is **interdisciplinary** (not only crossing over disciplines but also genres such as art and science and sectors such as governmental and non-governmental), **collaborative** (involving partners from within and without academia) and **engaging** (addressing multitude of publics). Traditional values such as innovation and originality are assessed in conjunction with these specific practices. The contribution of faculty to their fields is assessed with respect to their advancement of these values with their research and its dissemination. The Department faculty are expected to promote and facilitate the formation of intellectual communities (e.g., through editing journals, creating and/or moderating online discussions, and organizing conferences) and cultivating new intellectual frontiers (e.g., editing significant anthologies or organizing conferences). Collegial assessors are expected to comment on these core and traditional practices of scholarship both in terms of quality and quantity of publications, speeches and other instruments of dissemination.

While the following criteria specifically focus on expectations of the Department under normal circumstances as regards peer-reviewed publications, the Adjudication Committee considers a combination of qualitative and quantitative contributions of the candidate as well as a combination of other forms of contribution that crosses over genres and sectors. The Committee will consider, for example, development of exceptional web portals, arts installations, addressing various publics and scholarly involvement with major policy issues also as contributions to scholarship. The Department assumes that the assessment of excellence, high competence, and competence not demonstrated is a qualitative analytic process, even when the source of information may be quantitative.

3.2.2.1 Criteria for Excellence: A ranking of excellence demonstrates active, continuing and sustained contribution to scholarly research and dissemination of its results during the probationary period. While the Department recognizes that there are various ways of contributing to interdisciplinary research as mentioned above, it expects that the candidate has published peer-reviewed articles, chapters and/or book(s) in well respected scholarly presses and journals within his or her field. As judged by the reviewers, an excellent candidate will have established a coherent body of work recognized within candidate's field(s) as having made an original contribution through a consistent output of regular-length refereed journal articles, book chapters and/or book(s) during probation.

3.2.2.2 Criteria for High Competence: A ranking of high competence would normally require a reasonable output of regular-length refereed journal articles or book chapters during probation that may have not yet cohered into a recognizable contribution but show growing evidence of originality and creativity.

3.2.2.3 Criteria for Competence: A ranking of competence would normally require a reasonable output of regular-length refereed journal articles or book chapters during probation that may not have cohered into a recognizable body of work.

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

3.2.3 File-Based Criteria

While the above sets of criteria apply equally to all Departmental faculty, individual candidates should also be assessed by methods and standards appropriate to their specific research profiles. Normally the “Professional Contribution” section of a candidate’s file contains three kinds of evidence: a detailed list of the candidate’s scholarly contributions included in his/her *curriculum vitae*; a personal statement by the candidate (should he/she choose to provide one); and a set of letters by arms-length assessors in the candidate’s field. A fair evaluation of the candidate’s specific research profile requires a thoughtful integration of these elements as the file is prepared.

The Adjudicating Committee will assess the candidate’s file in keeping with three sets of criteria, in order of priority: those in the Senate document, those cited in the paragraphs above, and those appropriate to the scholarly and other communities addressed by the candidate’s research.

3.3. Service to the University and Community

3.3.1 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.

In exceptional cases the University must recognise its responsibility for the fact that the growth of a candidate's scholarly and academic development may have lagged because of the large demands which important administrative work has made upon his/her time. In such circumstances the Senate Committee will require full information from persons familiar with the extent and nature of the candidate's participation in a major service activity.

3.3.2 Departmental Criteria

Of the three areas, teaching, professional contribution 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 12 interdisciplinary programs whose co-ordination requires ongoing and demanding attention of Departmental Committees above and beyond the administrative requirements for managing each programme. All together, 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. Moreover, while the Senate Document "Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures" speaks of Service as "Service to the University", the Department's submission for program review in 1999-2000 refers less restrictively to "community service". ("The many instructors who have been gathered together in this unit bring to their teaching, scholarship, and community service a determination to apply critical interdisciplinary perspectives to the study of social experience".) This may be taken to indicate the Department's special understanding of its intellectual and societal vocation. Indeed for many members of the Department the very nature of their teaching and scholarship may well be deemed to be inseparable from commitment to a variety of services rendered not just to the university but to the larger community and public of which the university is a part. Assessment of Departmental faculty in this area should thus reflect this enlarged view of service. Moreover, because the Department as a whole has few graduate program, many members teach and perform service by contributing to the administrative and committee work of various departmental graduate programs. Recognizing the variable and limited access to graduate responsibilities within the Department, attention should be paid and recognition given to such extra-Departmental contributions. The rubric, Service to the University and Community, honours this enlarged view of service. 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, Departments, Colleges, Graduate Programs, Faculty, Senate, the University and 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 Master or Academic Advisor of a College;
5. Service in an administrative or advisory capacity to various community organizations and public agencies outside the university including local, national and international organizations;
6. Addresses, lectures etc., of a public service nature.

3.3.2.1 Criteria for Excellence: A ranking of excellence demonstrates active, continuing and sustained contribution to the Department, university at large and various local, national and international communities 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; letters of assessment by officers and members of community organizations and public agencies on which the applicant served.

4. Criteria For Promotion to Full Professor

4.1 University Criteria

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

A Professor is an eminent member of the University whose achievements at York and/or in his/her profession have marked him or her as one of the scholars from whom the University receives its energy and strength. Clearly

this level of achievement cannot be identified with serving several years as an Associate Professor; nevertheless, the rank should not be considered a form of apotheosis. The rank of Professor should be within the expectancy of all Associate Professors (“B”).

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
- Significant commitment and accomplishment in graduate supervision (recognizing that Department members do not all have equal access to graduate teaching opportunities)
- Documented curricular innovation and course development
- Positive relations with and mentoring of teaching assistants
- Two books or book equivalents (again bearing in mind that “...assessment of the sheer volume or disciplinary rigour of a candidate’s work should be balanced by attention to its methodological and theoretical creativity, its success in bridging disciplines, discourses or fields of inquiry, and its relevance to communities outside the university”)
- Demonstrable influence on the interdisciplinary fields in which the candidate participates
- Contributions to the fields beyond York, *e.g.*, leadership in professional organizations, editing journals, etc.
- Consistent contribution to governance at Departmental, graduate, 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
- Evidence of service at the national level (*e.g.*, sitting on SSHRC committees)
- Evidence of service in international academic, governmental and non-governmental organizations.

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.”