

Department of Social Science Tenure and Promotion Standards

(Initial version approved Jan. 16, 2003; additions approved March 4, 2004; revised April 25, 2005; revisions Approved June 20, 2005; revised March 2012; substantial revisions, April 2014, approved by Department (February 2015), revisions Approved June 27, 2019).

Table of Contents

1.0 Preamble

2.0 Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

2.1 Pre-Candidacy

2.2 The Adjudicating Committee

2.2.1 Composition of the Adjudicating Committee

2.2.2 Conflict of Interest Guidelines

2.2.3 Adjudication

2.2.3.1 Adjudication for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

2.2.3.2 Adjudication for Promotion to Professor

2.3 The File Preparation Committee

2.3.1 Composition of the File Preparation Committee

2.3.1.1 For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

2.3.1.2 For Promotion to Professor

2.3.2 Role of the File Preparation Committee

2.3.3 Responsibilities of the Candidate

2.3.3.1 Curriculum Vitae

2.3.3.2 Candidate's Statement

2.3.3.3 Teaching Dossier

2.3.3.4 Other Responsibilities

2.3.3.5 E-copies

2.3.4 Timeline for the Work of the File Preparation Committee

2.3.4.1 For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

2.3.4.2 For Promotion to Professor

2.3.5 Preparing Teaching Documentation

2.3.6 Preparing Documentation for Professional Contribution and Standing

2.3.7 Preparing Service Documentation

2.3.8 Compilation of the Candidate's File

3.0 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

3.1 Criteria for Teaching

3.1.1 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

3.2 Criteria for Professional Contribution and Standing

3.2.1 Departmental Criteria

3.2.1.1 Criteria for Excellence

3.2.1.2 Criteria for High Competence

3.2.1.3 Criteria for Competence

3.2.1.4 Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated

3.3 Criteria for Service

3.3.1 Departmental Criteria

- 3.3.2.1 Criteria for Excellence*
- 3.3.2.2 Criteria for High Competence*
- 3.3.2.3 Criteria for Competence*
- 3.3.2.4 Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated*

4.0 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

4.1 Departmental Criteria

This document shall be made available to all candidates, all members of departmental File Preparation Committees and the Adjudicating Committee together with the following documents:

- (i) York University's *Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures Document* (approved by Senate, 21st March 2002, amended 27th November 2003, 24th May 2007, and June 28th, 2007); this document will henceforth be referred to as '*Policy*'.
- (ii) All relevant template letters referred to herein.

1.0 Preamble

The Department of Social Science embodies diverse approaches to academic study. The intellectual and societal vocation which unifies the Department is to cultivate and apply critical interdisciplinary practices of teaching and research to social life. While recognizing that there are many ways of engaging in interdisciplinary studies, at a minimum the term implies the production of knowledge that extends beyond a single disciplinary boundary and that is designed to promote new and different ways of thinking. It may integrate the social sciences to the arts, humanities and sciences, and involve collaboration with government, non-governmental and civil society organizations.

The Department's teaching is undertaken in a variety of specialized and interdisciplinary fields and in "General Education". Our interdisciplinary teaching addresses issues which cannot be dealt with adequately by an individual discipline; it is methodologically diverse and guided by the nature of the subject matter rather than by adherence to a particular disciplinary approach. Research undertaken in the Department is likewise interdisciplinary; it, too, is methodologically and theoretically creative, wide-ranging, often heterodox, and of relevance to a variety of academic audiences and often to audiences outside academia.

Members of Faculty are trained in different fields and disciplines and use a wide range of theoretical and methodological approaches in both individual and collaborative work. Criteria for the tenure and promotion of Faculty members 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, they must be flexible enough to capture the widely varying contributions made by a diverse faculty body.

2.0 Procedures for Tenure and Promotion (henceforth T&P)

Within the Department, candidates' applications for tenure and promotion pass through two committees: the File Preparation Committee and the Adjudication Committee.

2.1 Pre-Candidacy

Upon appointment to Pre-candidacy a faculty member shall be provided with *Policy* as well as this document and be advised, in writing, to familiarize themselves with its contents. Upon entering Candidacy, a faculty member shall again be advised of procedures and their rights and responsibilities under the current University's document by the Chair of the Department.

2.2 The Adjudicating Committee (henceforth AC)

2.2.1 Composition of the AC

In accord with F.3.2.1(d) of *Policy*, “An Adjudicating Committee will consist of a minimum of six and a maximum of eight probationary/tenured faculty and normally two, but not more than three students. A majority of faculty members on the Adjudicating Committee shall have tenure”. The Chair of the Department is an *ex officio, non-voting* member. The Executive Committee of the Department shall appoint the Chair of the AC for a period of two years. In years with three or fewer files to adjudicate (not including files for advancement to candidacy), two members of the AC shall sit on each File Preparation Committee, whereby no member is expected to sit on more than one File Preparation Committee. In years when the number of files is greater than three, one member of the AC will be asked to sit on each File Preparation Committee, whereby, again, no member is expected to sit on more than one File Preparation Committee. Members of the AC who are not members of a File Preparation Committee shall be designated “at large”. In the case of a cross-appointed candidate, there will be consultation with the second department about representation on the AC.

The AC will normally contain two student members, one undergraduate, one graduate. By September 15th, the AC shall solicit two student representatives by appropriate means, including calls on the Department’s graduate program listservs and coordinators or directors of programs. It should be ascertained that there are no relations affecting impartiality between the student and the candidate (students must be at arm’s length from the candidate – they should not be teaching assistants for the candidate, under the candidate’s graduate supervision, nor currently enrolled in a course taught by the candidate). The importance of confidentiality should be emphasized. When there are more than two volunteers, the AC shall select two representatives on the basis of a short-written submission or interview concerning their qualifications for and interest in membership. All members of the AC, with the exception of the Chair of Department, shall vote and quorum will be 50%+2 of the AC’s voting members (whereby, for an odd number of voting members, the “50%” will be rounded up to the next whole integer, so that, for example, if there are seven voting members on the AC, 50% rounded up will yield four, and the “+2” will give a quorum of six voting members). “No person shall serve simultaneously on tenure and promotion committees (including the Senate Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee) at different levels of the University” (Policy F.2.6).

The AC’s report shall normally be written by the member(s) of the FPC sitting on the AC.

2.2.2 Conflict of Interest Guidelines

It is incumbent on any member of the File Preparation Committee and/or the AC 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 their own position on the conflict, a decision shall be rendered by the chairs of the Department and of the AC as to the existence of a conflict of interest as well as to the resolution. If the member is sitting on the AC they shall excuse themselves from the ensuing discussion and the rest of the Committee shall make the

decision. The Chair of the AC shall provide the Department's 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 (from *Handbook for Academic Administrators, Academic Appointment Process*). The Executive Committee shall review the resolution of the conflict of interest for approval.

In cases for which no conflict of interest is declared or for which any such declarations of conflict are resolved in a manner which allows the conflicted party to maintain their membership of the AC, a candidate may issue a challenge to the participation of the member of the AC in accordance with F.2.11 of *Policy*.

2.2.3 Adjudication

2.2.3.1 Adjudication for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

According to the University's document, a favourable recommendation for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor requires either demonstrated superiority (excellence) in a minimum of one of the three categories outlined above, with at least competence demonstrated in teaching and in professional contribution and standing, or at least high competence in all three categories.

The AC's report shall contain a detailed statement of the committee's ranking in each of the three categories, whereby the rationale for these rankings shall be clearly explained and justified by the evidence of the file. The AC can recommend the candidate for tenure and promotion, tenure without promotion, promotion (where already tenured), delay, or rejection. The AC shall make a recommendation of delay in the second year of candidacy only when a file falls significantly short of the required standard. When the AC concludes that the shortfall is not significant and that there is clear evidence that the file will be of satisfactory strength by the following year, it shall weigh that evidence against the disadvantage to the candidate of a delay and determine whether tenure and promotion should be recommended (*Policy*, F.3.2.2.b).

The AC shall normally assess a candidate who is considered to have earned tenure by the standards of the Department to have also earned promotion to Associate Professor. Under exceptional circumstances (outlined in the University's document C.2. p.5) and usually for candidates in the third year of Candidacy, tenure may be granted while promotion is delayed.

"The decision of the Adjudicating Committee must be sent to the candidate by 1 November" (*Policy*, D.2.2). The candidate will have fifteen (15) days from the date of mailing to add material in writing to the file for consideration by the Dean and, in the event of a negative or delay recommendation, to request reconsideration by the AC. Following any reconsideration, the AC will add its recommendation to the file and copy it to the candidate who may add material to the file during the fifteen (15) days following the reconsideration. The file, with the additional materials if such have been added, shall be sent to the Dean.

2.2.3.2 Adjudication for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, the AC is not required to make individual rankings in each of the three areas (teaching, professional contribution and standing and service), but shall make an overall decision on the candidate's file.

2.3 The File Preparation Committee

2.3.1 Composition of the File Preparation Committee (henceforth FPC)

The file for each candidate who applies for tenure and promotion to associate professor will be prepared by a FPC composed of a minimum of three faculty members, at least two of whom hold tenure. Normally, the FPC consists of three members, two of whom are nominated by the AC (in consultation with the Department's Executive Committee and relevant Program Coordinators). The third member of the FPC is named by the candidate. The members of the FPC are normally drawn from the Department of Social Science and, where appropriate, from the program in which the candidate teaches.

PASSAGE DELETED AS PER SENATE RECOMMENDATION

2.3.2 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, not to render judgment. The content of the FPC's report is thus purely factual and provides a *context* for the evidence in the file. These and other steps are set out in *Policy* (F.3.1). The members of the FPC work collaboratively, with each person taking primary responsibility for assembling one aspect of the file (teaching, professional contribution and standing or service). The Administrative Secretary to the Chair will assist the FPC with collating the file materials. The Chair of the FPC is responsible for ensuring the assembly of the file and preparation of the FPC report. They shall also keep the candidate informed about the progress of the file through the departmental stage of the tenure and promotion process.

2.3.3 Responsibilities of the Candidate

2.3.3.1 Curriculum Vitae (henceforth CV)

The candidate shall prepare a CV in a form that identifies all their scholarly contributions and clearly indicates their nature (article, book chapter, conference proceedings, etc.), for jointly authored publications, the proportion of the text for which the candidate was responsible, and their publication date or status (e.g. under contract, in preparation, forthcoming, in press). Candidates should examine *curriculum vitae* formats such as those of LA&PS and OCGS.

See:

<http://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/senate/committees/tandp/toolkit/CVFormatUpdatedSept2009.pdf>

The candidate should give a copy of their CV to the Department's Chair, the Chair of the AC and the members of their FPC. They may seek advice from all the colleagues occupying the aforementioned positions. The candidate is responsible for keeping their CV updated throughout the tenure and promotion process and may submit successive versions during the process.

2.3.3.2 Candidate's Statement

Given the diversity of research profiles within the Department, the candidate's statement plays a pivotal role in the assessment of their research contribution. It sets out the unifying aims, concerns, questions and methodologies that have guided the candidate's research, situating these within a larger frame of scholarly inquiry as well as in the context of the candidate's academic training and career. In doing so it provides the FPC with contextual information needed in identifying appropriate assessors. It also enables the assessors themselves to form a picture of the relationship between specific contributions and the candidate's overall program of work.

A statement is optional, although the candidate is strongly encouraged to write one in consultation with the FPC. The statement does not normally exceed 2000 words and should address 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); the location of candidate's research within/across recognized scholarly fields; circumstances which may have altered or delayed the 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.

2.3.3.3 Teaching Dossier

Candidates are encouraged to write a teaching dossier which includes course materials, statement of teaching philosophy, reflections on pedagogical strategies, etc.

2.3.3.4 Other Responsibilities

The candidate shall provide the AC with the name of one member, normally in the Department of Social Science, to be appointed to their FPC.

The candidate shall provide the FPC with:

- i. The name of one person to observe one of the candidate's classes and prepare a letter of evaluation;
- ii. A list of up to 40 students whom the candidate has previously taught, both graduate and undergraduate (the total number not to exceed one-third of the total list of students to be contacted);
- iii. A list of all graduate students who have been previously supervised by the candidate;
- iv. A list of all teaching assistants with whom the candidate has previously worked;
- v. Copies of all course outlines, assignments, handouts and any other material which the candidate deems relevant regarding their teaching;
- vi. The name of one or more potential referees who can evaluate the service of the candidate (whereby the FPC draws up a list of eligible names to which the candidate may

add up to one-third more names such that the candidate's nomination(s) make(s) up no more than one quarter of the list);

- vii. Materials the candidate deems necessary for service evaluators;
- viii. The names of scholars (outside York) who are at arm's length from the candidate and who could write letters for the professional contribution and standing of the candidate. These names are to be added to those supplied by the FPC and are not to constitute more than 25% of the names of potential referees (cf. *Policy*, F.3.1.3(a)).

2.3.3.5 E-copies

It is the candidate's responsibility to supply the FPC and the Chairs' Administrative Secretary with electronic copies of all materials relating to the tenure and promotion process, including publications for review and reviews of the candidate's publications.

It is also the responsibility of candidates to ensure they read the Department's and University's documents on tenure and promotion. They should also ensure they keep abreast of the process once it is in progress via their FPC and the Chair of the Adjudicating Committee. Finally, candidates should be aware that at any stage in the process they may update material in their file.

The candidate shall be kept informed in writing about the progress of their case at each point where a recommendation is made to the next higher committee and shall be given fifteen (15) days from the date of mailing of the notification to provide additional material before the file is forwarded to the next committee (see *Policy*, F.2.5).

2.3.4 Timeline for the Work of the File Preparation Committee

2.3.4.1 For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate's file may go forward in Candidacy one. However, it is more usual that the candidate's file go forward in Candidacy two. File preparation normally begins in January of the academic year preceding adjudication (i.e. during Candidacy one). Files shall be submitted by the FPC to the AC by early September so that the latter Committee can meet to adjudicate the file, write its report and forward the file to the Dean of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies by November 1st of the year of the candidate's second year of Candidacy. (N.B. Candidacy years run from July 1st to June 30th).

2.3.4.2 For Promotion to Professor

The application for promotion to Professor is discretionary and may be initiated by any associate professor. There are two points during the academic year when applications for Professor are initiated. The Chair of the AC shall, by May 15th or November 15th of each year, solicit *curricula vitae* from those faculty members currently at the rank of Associate Professor who wish to proceed to Professor. A brief statement detailing their qualifications and eligibility for a Professorship may be submitted by the candidate. There are also two submission schedules for applications for promotion to Professor. In a given year, an FPC should prepare the file and report such that they reach the Department's AC by either January 15th or May 15th).

2.3.5 Preparing Teaching Documentation

Three (3) collegial referees, *including one selected by the candidate*, are asked to prepare a letter of evaluation. The collegial referees shall visit at least one class taught by the candidate. All requests for collegial assessment of teaching shall include the relevant criteria statements of the University's document and the Department's standards. Teaching referees are also provided with relevant teaching materials (e.g., course outlines, assignments, and so on) before they observe the candidate in a classroom situation. Samples of the letters to be sent to prospective referees are included in the Appendix (Letters 4 and 5).

Letters of evaluation are also obtained from students who have either completed undergraduate or graduate courses with the candidate, or who are currently being taught by the candidate. Students who have completed a course or courses which the candidate has taught will usually be selected from courses taught within the previous three or four years, though a longer sample period may be required if the candidate has been on leave during the period designated for the sampling or has taught previously at other institutions. In addition to the list of up to 40 students provided by the candidate, a random sampling of 80 students taught by the candidate is undertaken by the Department, so that approximately 120 students are contacted in all. Only signed letters from students may be included in the 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 (excluding any who are currently still working with the candidate). The time period for which letters are obtained will depend in part on the number of students the candidate has supervised. It should be noted that not all undergraduate programs in the Department have an affiliated graduate program.

Quantitative records of course evaluations are maintained by the Chair's Office. The FPC, aided by the Chair's Administrative Secretary, will prepare statistical summaries of the quantifiable material to be included in the FPC's report. Samples of letters to be sent to students, supervisees and teaching assistants are included in the Appendix (Letters 6, 7, 8, 9).

2.3.6 Preparing Documentation for Professional Contribution and Standing

Normally the FPC will draw on the candidate's statement and CV for preliminary guidance in locating appropriate assessors. The FPC will contact five to six scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research and ask them to identify assessors with the academic standing and specialized knowledge(s) needed for a well-rounded evaluation of the candidate's scholarly activity. Once names of such assessors have been obtained the FPC will decide which of these to contact. The FPC will draw up a long list of at least eight names from the nominations. The candidate will be shown the long list of proposed referees prior to letters of solicitation being sent. Although the candidate cannot veto the list, they can comment on the names and the FPC will take into consideration these views when the final short list is compiled. From the short list, a minimum of three letters shall be solicited. For cases in which a candidate's work lies within a well-defined field and the letters are in general agreement, three letters will normally suffice. Where more than one specialization is involved or where significant differences arise among the assessors, more letters may be needed. The number of letters for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will normally not exceed five. Candidates will be apprised of the names of all referees on the long list.

Materials sent to assessors will include the candidate's CV, personal statement, publications, reviews of publications and a copy of the University's criteria for T&P at York. In addition, the letter accompanying this material will include the following paragraph:

Evaluation of scholarly contributions by Department faculty should be guided by the University Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures document at York. 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 rigor 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 are therefore asked to include, where expertise permits, an assessment of the interdisciplinary quality of the candidate's work.

All follow-up letters to those who have agreed to provide assessments of the candidate's scholarship shall ask assessors to use terms such as "excellence", "high competence", "competence" or "competence not demonstrated". See Appendix for samples of letters (Letters 1 and 2) to be sent to referees and of the University's evaluation criteria for professional contribution and standing).

In the case of co-authored or co-edited works, it is the responsibility of the FPC to solicit letters from the co-author/editor, documenting the candidate's contribution to the joint work or work produced as part of a research team. Letter 3 in the Appendix offers a sample.

Regarding promotion to Professor, instead of asking assessors in each area of achievement to evaluate the candidate on a scale ranging from "Competence" to "Excellence," the FPC may seek evaluations of the candidate's entitlement to promotion in light of Senate's and Department's criteria for advancement to the rank of Professor.

2.3.7 Preparing Service Documentation

The FPC will obtain letters of evaluation from at least three referees who are familiar with the candidate's service to the University. The candidate's service record should be documented in the candidate's CV. Once the FPC has determined 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 the University. Reviewers will receive relevant materials (as determined by the candidate) to assist in the evaluations. At least one letter should be from the program in which the candidate is housed. Normally the letters will reflect the activities of the candidate from the commencement of employment at York, although, if applicable, service at previous institutions may also be assessed.

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. (See Appendix for a sample of the letter to be sent to prospective service referees (Letter 10)).

2.3.8 Compilation of the Candidate's File

In addition to compiling documents appertaining to teaching, service and professional contribution and standing, the FPC will prepare a document that summarizes the process for collecting and preparing the information for the file and provides contextual information relevant to the evaluation of the file by the AC. The summary statement should include:

Professional Contribution

- i. a description of how the referee list was drawn up;
- ii. autobiographical information for each of the referees;
- iii. names of referees contacted, and which ones responded;
- iv. a note of which referees were suggested by the candidate;
- v. professional information about any co-authors or collaborators.

Where applicable, the following are also to be included unless they have been addressed in the candidate's personal statement:

- vi. information concerning unusual disciplinary norms;
- vii. any unusual, relevant aspects of the candidate's career path such as maternity/paternity leave or illness.

Teaching

- i. how the list of students was selected;
- ii. number of letters sent out and number of responses obtained; summary of types of letters obtained: undergraduate, graduate, teaching assistants, research assistants, graduate supervisees;
- iii. whether the classes that were assessed were compulsory course or electives, graduate or undergraduate.

Where applicable, details of any special circumstances, such as teaching release that might affect the teaching section of the file, should be included.

Service

- i. how the list was selected;
- ii. number of letters sent out and number of responses obtained.

Where applicable, details of any special circumstances, such as fellowships or sabbaticals that might affect the service section of the file, should be included.

The candidate may review all of the material collected for their 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 before the Adjudicating Committee reviews the file.

3.0 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

According to the University's document:

An Associate Professor is a matured scholar whose achievements at York and/or elsewhere has earned their 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 (*Policy*, C.1.2).

3.1 Criteria for Teaching

Criteria applicable to all faculty members in the Department spring from two sources: a) the University's criteria for teaching as set out in the *Policy* (B.1); and b) a more specific set of intellectual values rooted in the Department's mandate.

3.1.1 Departmental Criteria

Teaching is a cornerstone of the Department's mandate, two key features of which are (i) that teaching encompass different approaches to knowledge as offered under the twin rubrics of general education and the interdisciplinary programs; and (ii) that all courses emphasise the study of their respective subject matters from a critical interdisciplinary perspective.

Candidates' teaching should be assessed for its effectiveness in meeting this latter goal, and collegial assessors are therefore to be selected with a candidate's interdisciplinary expertise in mind; they are asked to comment in their written assessments on the critical interdisciplinarity of the candidate's teaching.

While the Department has a limited number of graduate programs, departmental faculty members are often involved in teaching graduate courses and supervision of graduate students in other units. Such teaching is to be assessed along with that undertaken in the Department. It should, however, be noted that access to graduate teaching is not evenly spread across faculty members, and therefore that it is not unusual if a candidate has had little or no involvement in graduate teaching or supervision.

The main forms of evidence relevant to a teaching file are listed below. Candidates who supply an appropriate rationale may include other forms of evidence.

- i. teaching in different formats; formats include: large and small lectures, program-specific and general education teaching, seminars, tutorials, directed reading courses, on-line courses, work placement courses, practical and other courses with a high experiential education component, fieldwork.
- ii. teaching at different levels of the curriculum, including, where applicable, at the graduate level;
- iii. course evaluation data;
- iv. student letters;
- v. collegial assessment based on classroom visits and examination of course materials. Assessors are expected to attend to: the course outline (structure, clarity, assignments, readings); the candidate's expertise in the area(s) covered by the course; clarity of delivery in the classroom; the candidate's sensitivity to student diversity and to students' different abilities and linguistic competence. The candidate may also be

- assessed according to their ability to: create an atmosphere which conduces to learning effectively; instil in students a sense of the importance of the topics taught; promote critical thinking amongst students; use technological aids effectively.
- vi. letters from teaching assistants;
 - vii. curricular development;
 - viii. research on pedagogy and the development and use of pedagogical innovations;
 - ix. participating in teaching development workshops;
 - x. (co)authorship of textbooks used in teaching;
 - xi. receipt of teaching awards;
 - xii. principal supervision of graduate students;
 - xiii. membership of graduate examination committees;
 - xiv. furthering student engagement in projects beyond the classroom.

Normally the teaching section of a candidate's file contains: a set of letters by assessors of the candidate's teaching and teaching materials; statistical teaching evaluations; letters from teaching assistants, graduate advisees and undergraduate and graduate students whom the candidate has taught. A fair evaluation of the candidate's teaching profile requires a thoughtful integration of these elements as the file is prepared.

3.1.2. Rankings

For each ranking given below, the criteria listed do not constitute a set of necessary conditions, and only an "ideal" candidate will meet all the criteria. Rather, to attain a specific rank, a candidate must meet a balanced combination of the criteria listed under that rank.

3.1.2.1. Criteria for Excellence

To achieve a ranking of excellence in teaching, a candidate should manifest a record of teaching in different formats and an ability successfully to tailor teaching methods to each format. They should have taught at different levels of the curriculum. For those candidates involved in graduate teaching, account is to be taken not only of graduate courses taught but also of the number and quality of supervisions (and whether as principal supervisor or as a member of supervisory committees), whereby candidates are expected to have shown themselves to be highly supportive and effective supervisors (as attested by students' letters, their students attaining "distinction" or being nominated for and receiving prizes for their work). A candidate's active participation in graduate examination committees is also a sign of excellence.

Course evaluations should lie consistently above the departmental mean (being concentrated in the categories of "very good" and "excellent"). The majority of student letters should be very positive and bespeak the candidate's excellence whilst exhibiting few, if any, negative remarks on matters of substance. The majority of collegial assessments should also attest the candidate's excellence, and teaching assistants' letters should reveal the candidate's superior mentoring and management skills with regard to teaching assistants.

The candidate might have undertaken significant curricular development (e.g. the development and/or major revision of two or more courses, a certificate or a program), and they might have conducted research on pedagogy and/or developed innovative pedagogical methods and applied them successfully to their teaching. (Co)authorship of one or more

published textbook(s) which is (are) recognized internally and/or externally in the candidate's field is a sign of excellence, as is the receipt of teaching awards, whereby the nature of the award is to be assessed, and the absence of such awards does not indicate a lack of excellence. Excellence can also be manifested in the active engagement of students in activities beyond the classroom, e.g. incorporating students into research projects, establishing/supporting student clubs/organizations.

3.1.2.2 Criteria for High Competence

To achieve a ranking of high competence in teaching, a candidate will have taught in different formats and successfully tailored teaching methods to each format. They will have taught at different levels of the curriculum. Those with experience in graduate teaching will have shown themselves to be effective supervisors, where applicable, and have been members of graduate examination committees.

Course evaluations are to stand around or above the departmental mean; students' letters should be generally positive, and negative comments few in number and isolated. The majority of collegial assessments should indicate the high competence of the candidate, and teaching assistants' letters should bespeak the efficacy of the candidate's mentoring and management skills. A highly competent teacher might have engaged in curricular development, e.g. revising or establishing new courses or creating at least one new course, and they might have developed pedagogical innovations and (co)authored a published textbook used in teaching. Receipt of one or more teaching awards can indicate high competence, though the nature of the award is to be assessed, and the absence of such awards is not an indication that the candidate's teaching falls short of high competence. The candidate should also engage students in activities beyond the classroom, e.g. visits to archives, fieldtrips, supporting student clubs/organizations.

3.1.2.3 Criteria for Competence

To achieve the ranking of competence, a candidate will have taught in more than one format and at different levels of the curriculum. If the candidate has experience in graduate teaching, this will consist of courses taught, supervision and membership of examination committees. Course evaluations should be around or, if below, close to the departmental mean (evaluations being concentrated in the categories of "good" and "adequate"). Students' letters may either manifest a range of assessment (though not, in their majority, negative) or consistently attest the candidate's competence. The majority of collegial assessments will attest at least the candidate's competence, and there should be evidence of the candidate's managing and mentoring teaching assistants, as expressed in teaching assistants' letters. Some curricular development might be part of the competent teacher's portfolio, e.g. the creation of a new course or significant modification of an existing course, though they are unlikely to have conceived of significant pedagogical innovation. Evidence of engaging students in activities beyond the classroom will be taken into account.

3.1.2.4 Competence Not Demonstrated

A candidate who has not met the above will be deemed not to have demonstrated competence.

3.2 Criteria for Professional Contribution and Standing

In meeting its interdisciplinary mandate the Department has recruited faculty members from a wide array of academic backgrounds. The criteria for professional contribution and standing reflect this diversity.

3.2.1 Departmental Criteria

Candidates' professional contribution and standing is to be judged with respect to their advancement of critical interdisciplinarity in their research, its dissemination and impact. Note is to be taken of the various audiences – within and without academia – to which candidates' scholarship is addressed. Assessment of departmental faculty should give significant weight to these intellectual values. Hence, success in bridging disciplines, discourses or fields of inquiry, methodological and theoretical creativity, originality, critical practices of scholarship and knowledge production relevant to publics both inside and, where applicable, outside the University should balance the assessment of the sheer volume of a candidate's work.

Venues for dissemination (e.g., publication by scholarly presses, refereed articles in scholarly journals – both of which may be ranked – textbooks, papers published in conference proceedings) may be given different weights by different programs. In addition to the criterion of interdisciplinarity, assessors are asked to comment on a candidate's scholarship both in terms of quality and quantity of publications and other instruments of dissemination. While these guidelines focus mainly on publications, other forms of professional contribution will also be given due weight on a case-by-case basis. We further recognize that research of the highest caliber is often carried out with relatively small research budgets. Hence, whilst the ability to procure large research grants is admirable, it is not the major criterion upon which quality is based. The Department assumes that the assessment of excellence, high competence, and competence not demonstrated is a qualitative process, even when the source of information may be quantitative.

The main forms of evidence relevant to professional contribution and standing are listed below. Candidates who supply an appropriate rationale may include other forms of evidence.

- i. quality, quantity and scholarly significance of publications, including books, edited volumes, articles in journals (refereed and non-refereed), book chapters, articles in conference proceedings, published or unpublished research reports, articles in news magazines or newspapers, film, performance, curation;
- ii. reception and notoriety of work, as indicated by citation counts, reviews or discussions of one's work;
- iii. the development of web portals, arts installations and other modes of dissemination;
- iv. conference presentations, including presentations of papers (refereed, non-refereed and invited), keynote speeches, membership of discussion panels;
- v. organization of conferences and conference panels;
- vi. organization of or participation in colloquia, on-going seminars; workshops, study/reading groups;
- vii. internally and externally funded research projects;
- viii. membership on administrative boards of professional associations;
- ix. editor, associate editor, editorial board member of journals;
- x. membership on adjudicating committees of funding agencies;

- xi. referee for scholarly journals and academic publishing houses;
- xii. external evaluation of departments or programs;
- xiii. serving as external examiner on Ph.D. examination committees;
- xiv. awards for research or other scholarly accomplishments.

The professional contribution section of a candidate's file normally contains four kinds of evidence: (i) a list of the candidate's scholarly contributions included in their CV; (ii) a personal statement by the candidate (should they choose to provide one); (iii) a set of letters by arms-length assessors in the candidate's field; and (iv) letters from the candidate's collaborators/co-authors regarding the nature and extent of the candidate's contribution to joint work. A fair evaluation of the candidate's specific research profile requires a thoughtful integration of these elements as the file is prepared.

3.2.2. Rankings

For each ranking given below, the criteria listed do not constitute a set of necessary conditions, and only an "ideal" candidate will meet all the criteria. Rather, to attain a specific rank, a candidate must meet a balanced combination of the criteria listed under that rank.

3.2.2.1 Criteria for Excellence

To be attested with excellence, a candidate is expected to have published peer-reviewed articles or book chapters and/or book(s) with well-respected scholarly presses and journals within their field. Excellence will often but does not have to involve a voluminous output (e.g. an average of more than two refereed articles or book chapters per year of probation, whereby a book is to be treated as equivalent to five journal articles). Excellence implies the production of an original, high quality and coherent body of published work within a flexible range of quantity. Excellence is also manifest in other forms as indicated by the criteria listed above. It is expected that external reviewers' assessments will mention the exceptional quality of the research. Reviewers may reveal this by using terms such as "very substantial", "extremely important", "outstanding" or synonyms thereof when describing the quality of the work and its impact on the field

3.2.2.2 Criteria for High Competence

To be attested with high competence, a candidate is expected to have published peer-reviewed articles or book chapters and/or a book with well-respected scholarly presses and journals within their field during probation. A minimum average of one refereed article or book chapter per year or its equivalent should have been published during probation, whereby a book is to be treated as equivalent to five journal articles. Though the candidate might not yet be regarded as a leader in their field(s), they will have developed a solid reputation. High competence is also manifest in other forms as indicated by the criteria listed above. External reviewers are expected to use adjectives such as "very good", "important", "substantial", "significant" or synonyms thereof to describe the candidate's work.

3.2.2.3 Criteria for Competence

Competence involves an active involvement in scholarly/creative research and an ability to articulate a clear and coherent research program. The assessment will depend on overall quality of work, within a flexible range of quantity of output, although a minimum of one refereed article or book chapter for every two years of probation is expected, whereby a book

is to be treated as equivalent to five journal articles. There should be evidence of an ongoing research program that must include work in progress and/or work under review as evidence of a likelihood of future publications. Competence is also manifest in other forms as indicated by the criteria listed above. A rating of “competence” will normally require that assessors describe the candidate’s publications as “solid” “competent”, “good”, “promising”, etc.

3.2.2.4 Criteria for Competence Not Demonstrated

A candidate who has not met the above will be deemed **not** to have demonstrated competence.

3.3 Criteria for Service

3.3.1 Departmental Criteria

The Department’s criteria for evaluating service spring from: a) the University’s general criteria for service as set out in the University’s document, and b) a set of “citizenship values” rooted in the Department’s mandate and central to its identity. The Department currently houses twelve undergraduate and three graduate interdisciplinary programs whose co-ordination requires special efforts and attentions above and beyond the administrative requirements for running each program. Thus, faculty members engage in service over and above what they contribute to their home programs. Faculty members also provide services for graduate programs outside the Department.

When judging a candidate’s service, information about the following, although not exhaustive, will be considered. Candidates who supply an appropriate rationale may include other forms of evidence:

- i. attendance of and participation in departmental council meetings and retreats;
- ii. service on departmental committees and/or the Department’s Executive, whereby weight is to be attached to the nature and arduousness of the work involved and to the position of the candidate on the committee (e.g. chair or “ordinary” member);
- iii. *ad hoc* committee work, e.g. membership of hiring committees, chair’s search committee;
- iv. contribution to undergraduate program service;
- v. service on committees in, or directorship of, graduate programs;
- vi. service on committees of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies;
- vii. service on committees of the University Senate;
- viii. service to the York University Faculty Association;
- ix. administrative work in a College, e.g. serving as academic advisor;
- x. service on University-community committees and boards;
- xi. service to students in positions of evaluation of scholarship applicants, essay contests, award nominations.

Evaluation of service contributions will be based on the applicant’s CV, departmental records, letters of assessment from colleagues on committees and any awards bestowed.

3.3.2 Rankings

For each ranking given below, the criteria listed do not constitute a set of necessary conditions, and only an “ideal” candidate will meet all the criteria. Rather, to attain a specific rank, a candidate must meet a balanced combination of the criteria listed under that rank.

3.3.2.1. Criteria for Excellence

A ranking of excellence demonstrates leadership as indicated by service in significant positions, e.g. chairing committees, whereby the workload and responsibilities associated with the committee(s) are to be taken into account. Attendance at and participation in a majority of departmental meetings and retreats are expected. Excellence is demonstrated by a breadth of service to the Department in different roles and on diverse committees and providing service to the University at different levels of governance. Referees’ letters should indicate some praise or special commendation or appreciation for the work.

3.3.2.2. Criteria for High Competence

To attain a ranking of high competence, the candidate’s probationary period will be marked by service on more than one committee per year (at whatever level of the University). High competence usually presupposes membership of at least one committee (usually for a two- or three-year period) considered to be amongst the more burdensome, i.e. those involving work outside of meetings and/or meeting twice a month (e.g. Curriculum, Tenure and Promotions, and Committee positions that involve service to the Department’s Executive). It may, however, consist of a high frequency of participation in *ad hoc* committees or in a time-consuming or important contribution to a particular service activity that is otherwise considered routine committee work. Attendance of and participation in a majority of departmental meetings are expected. Referee’s letters will likely include some commendation.

3.3.2.3. Criteria for Competence

A ranking of Competence indicates that the candidate attends a majority of the Department’s council meetings and retreats. The candidate will also show a commitment to the Department’s governance by serving on at least one committee per year during the probationary period. The candidate is also expected to serve on one or more *ad hoc* committees during probation. Referee’s letters will describe performance of duties as acceptable.

3.3.2.4. Criteria for Competence not Demonstrated

A candidate who has not met the above will be deemed **not** to have demonstrated competence.

4.0 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

4.1 Departmental Criteria

According to *Policy, C.1.3*): “A Professor is an eminent member of the University whose achievements at York and/or in their profession have marked themselves as one of the scholars from whom the University receives its energy and strength”. The AC shall base its recommendation on this overall standard as opposed to evaluating the three fields of

professional contribution and standing, teaching and service separately. The AC's decision is also based on the more specific criteria listed below.

It is assumed that candidates have different strengths and that many paths lead to promotion. Eminence may be achieved each area of the candidate's professional work (research, teaching and service). While not all candidates are likely to match an ideal profile, the expectation is that those who merit promotion will balance shortcomings in some areas with strengths in others. However, eminence in any one area should not come at the expense of contributions to another, and if the AC identifies serious deficits in one or more of the candidate's areas of professional activity, this may lead to a recommendation of "delay".

The file and its associated materials usually refer to the period after tenure and promotion to Associate Professor but may include materials that relate to a career path which goes back before tenure and promotion. An abstracted, "ideal typical", pattern of necessary criteria as well as criteria of leadership and eminence that have been achieved since tenure and promotion might appear as some variation of those listed below.

Teaching

- i. demonstrated exceptional ability as judged by performance in three domains: classroom or teaching in other settings, contribution to teaching pedagogy, student supervision and guidance;
- ii. evidence of clear teaching strategies, goals and achievements over the long term;
- iii. a record of continued "service" teaching, particularly in lower-level courses;
- iv. significant commitment and accomplishment in graduate supervision and/or advising, including a number of principal supervisions (recognizing that faculty members do not have equal access to graduate teaching opportunities);
- v. evidence of active involvement in training outside the classroom (i.e., undergraduate research training, mentoring of students and teaching assistants);
- vi. leadership and innovation in pedagogical practices including curriculum planning and/or course development, and/or new degree or program initiatives;
- vii. research on teaching pedagogy and participation in working committees or conference panels on curricular development held under the auspices of professional associations at a national or international level;
- viii. completion of a textbook that is recognized internally and externally for setting high standards for teaching in a major field;
- ix. teaching awards, internal and external, are normally taken as evidence of eminence, although the nature of the award and the evidence in support of it must be assessed; absence of a teaching award should not be taken as an indication of eminence not achieved;
- x. teaching evaluations from courses at all levels in which scores should be concentrated in the categories of "very good" and "excellent";
- xi. letters of reference from collegial assessors and teaching assistants, the majority of which indicate a rating of very good to excellent (or similar wording);
- xii. letters of reference from students will normally indicate a consistent pattern that the candidate exceeded students' basic expectations.

Professional Contribution and Standing

- i. Evidence of the continued pursuit of a significant scholarly agenda as eminent and worthy of the respect ordinarily accorded a senior scholar;
- ii. Evidence that research is innovative and displays originality and rigour, enabling it to make contributions to knowledge and to have a distinct impact on the candidate's field(s). Of particular significance is the production of seminal work as judged by the wider academic community. Quality of journals, books, monographs and other works (including unpublished reports, etc.), as well as citation counts and manuscript/book awards are the principal methods of identifying seminal work;
- iii. While the quantity of scholarly work may vary, the candidate is expected to have authored at least two books or their equivalent over their career, whereby a book is to be treated as equivalent to five journal articles. Evidence of a strong level of scholarly contribution consists of an average of one or more refereed journal article per year or equivalent in the candidate's (sub)field(s) since their accession to Associate Professor;
- iv. Assessment will depend on overall quality and originality of the work in relation to its methodological and theoretical creativity, its success in bridging disciplines, discourses or fields of inquiry, and its relevance to a variety of publics within and, where applicable, without academia;
- v. Evidence of the promotion and facilitation of intellectual communities and the cultivation new intellectual frontiers. Examples of such contributions include, but are not limited to, editing journals or significant anthologies, creating research networks, invited keynote addresses, creating and/or moderating online discussions, organizing conferences, being principal investigator on large competitively awarded research projects, being an external examiner and giving major presentations at academic conferences;
- vi. Maintaining a high level of involvement in the broader national/international scholarly community through invited membership on provincial, national and international governmental and non-governmental panels or advisory committees (*e.g.*, sitting on SSHRC committees, occupying high offices in academic societies, positions in international bodies);
- vii. Eminence normally requires that the corpus of the candidate's work be rated by referees with terms such as "very substantial", "extremely important", "highly significant" or synonyms thereof when describing the quality of the work and its impact on the candidate's field(s).

Service

There is an expectation that the candidate will have consistently held a variety of service positions, including some deemed to rank amongst the more arduous, which manifest commitment and accomplishment, at program, departmental, graduate, college, YUFA, faculty and/or Senate levels.

- i. Evidence of effective and innovative leadership in a major service capacity that has enhanced the profile and reputation of at least one body, whether it be at program, departmental, graduate, college, YUFA, faculty and/or senate levels. Examples of

- such contributions include leadership in governance, spearheading new policies or administrative procedures such as coordinating a program under development or leading a graduate program through a provincial review, chairing a committee with a particularly important mandate of change and innovation or policy formation, or leading important *ad hoc* initiatives.
- ii. The candidate will have assumed a high level of responsibility in significant positions of service and leadership, such as decanal positions, being Director of an Organized Research Unit, or YUFA, or serving as Chair of the Department, Undergraduate Program Director, or Graduate Program Director;
 - iii. Collegial letters will mention an outstanding level of leadership achievement and the high quality of contribution made by the candidate in all service undertakings.

The sample letters are available on the Department's website and can be accessed through the Chair's Administrative Assistant.