



# *Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Review*

First draft approved by the School on Oct 31, 2017

## 1. Preliminaries

---

The present 2019 Guidelines have been ratified on **MMM DD, YYYY** (the ratification date) and go into effect on Sep 1, 2020 (effect date), in replacement of the 2004 Guidelines (which are presented in the Department of Computing & Information Science document dated Sep 13, 2004 and titled “Information and Criteria for Tenure, Promotion, and Time and Performance Step Increases”).

The School Tenure and Promotion Committee (SoCS T&P Committee) and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee (CEPS T&P Committee) will therefore use the 2004 Guidelines until Aug 31, 2021, and will use the 2019 Guidelines starting Sep 1, 2021. (See, however, the grandfather clause in Appendix.)

The 2019 Guidelines are consistent with the Collective Agreement that expires on Jun 30, 2021 (the expiration date), and in particular with its Article 21 (“Tenure, Promotion, and Review of Faculty Members”). Following the expiration date, the 2019 Guidelines should be revised to reflect any changes in the subsequent Agreement. At the minimum, the expiration date should be corrected.

The 2019 Guidelines are used by both the SoCS and CEPS T&P Committees to review:

- the biennial performance of faculty members (Section 2);
- the annual performance of faculty members (Section 3);
- applications for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor (Section 4);
- applications for promotion to Professor (Section 5).

## 2. Biennial Performance Review

The biennial performance review takes place in even-numbered years for all tenure-track and tenured faculty members. The SoCS T&P Committee assesses the contributions of each faculty member over the past two academic years in each of the three areas of responsibility: TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, SERVICE. The intention is to provide feedback, a performance rating in each area, and an overall performance rating determined on the basis of the performance ratings in the three areas.

The possible contributions of a faculty member in each area of responsibility are grouped into a number of categories, as explained in Section 2.1. The categories in the area of TEACHING are described in Section 2.2, those in the area of SCHOLARSHIP are described in Section 2.3 and those in the area of SERVICE in Section 2.4.

### 2.1. Contribution Categories

The possible contributions of a faculty member in each area are grouped into a number of categories; see Table I. The performance of a faculty member in each category is rated using the scale U, IR, G, VG, O (*Unsatisfactory, Improvement Required/Developmental, Good, Very Good, Outstanding*). The performance rating in each area is derived from the performance ratings in the corresponding categories and uses the same scale; it depends both on the actual contributions of the faculty member over the past two academic years and on the member's distribution of effort (DOE).

SoCS faculty find this categorization useful, as it helps them better understand what is expected from them and how their performance is assessed by the T&P Committees. The SoCS T&P Committee finds this categorization useful as well, as it helps them have a better sense of the

TABLE I — AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND CONTRIBUTION CATEGORIES

TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
<p><i>Regular categories:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching Effectiveness</li> <li>• Production of Teaching Materials</li> <li>• Graduate Student Advising and Examining</li> <li>• Undergraduate Student Advising and Examining</li> </ul> <p><i>Positive categories:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education-Based Scholarship</li> <li>• Teaching Workload</li> <li>• Teaching Recognition</li> <li>• Other Teaching Contributions</li> </ul>	<p><i>Regular categories:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publications</li> <li>• Presentations</li> <li>• Funding</li> </ul> <p><i>Positive categories:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scholarship Recognition</li> <li>• Other Scholarship Contributions</li> </ul>	<p><i>Regular categories:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assigned Internal Service</li> <li>• Non-Assigned Internal Service</li> <li>• External Scholarly Service</li> </ul> <p><i>Positive categories:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Recognition</li> <li>• Other Service Contributions</li> </ul>

overall performance of the faculty member in each area of responsibility. Contrary to the SoCS T&P Committee, the CEPS T&P Committee may choose not to use this categorization, as they are not required to follow the 2019 Guidelines when assessing the contributions of a faculty member in a given area of responsibility. However, a performance rating by the CEPS T&P Committee is valid only if the Committee has followed the 2019 Guidelines to come up with that rating, or if the rating is greater than or equal to the corresponding rating by the SoCS T&P Committee.

A contribution category is either *regular* or *positive*. A regular category cannot be ignored, and each one must receive the rating U, IR, G, VG or O. A positive category is normally either ignored, or rated VG or O, i.e., it normally can only positively affect the performance rating in the corresponding area of responsibility. A positive category may also be rated U or IR, but only in exceptional circumstances.

For example, the performance rating in the area of TEACHING may be negatively affected if the faculty member's teaching effectiveness is low (regular category *Teaching Effectiveness*). However, a faculty member who did not get any teaching award within the past two years (positive category *Teaching Recognition*) should not be penalized for that: after all, we cannot ask even a gifted instructor to get a teaching award every year or every other year. This being said, a faculty member who did get a teaching award should of course be rewarded.

If a contribution is found to reasonably fall into two or more categories, then the faculty member may place it into any of these categories — but in only one of them (i.e., a contribution cannot be counted twice). Likewise, some categories reasonably fall into two areas of responsibility, as shown in Table II; for each one of these categories, the faculty member may request that the alternative area be considered instead of the default area.

## 2.2. TEACHING Categories

*NOTE:* (a) There are usually three teaching assignments per year for a 40% DOE accorded to TEACHING (and these assignments are made by the Dean). The teaching of a course section (whether required/core or elective, classroom-based or E-learning, overload or not) is a typical example of teaching assignment. The development of

TABLE II — CATEGORIES WITH ALTERNATIVE AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

<i>Category</i>	<i>Default Area</i>	<i>Alternative Area</i>
Graduate Student Advising and Examining	TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP
Undergraduate Student Advising and Examining	TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP <sup>1</sup>
<i>(Education-based publications, presentations and funding)</i>	SCHOLARSHIP <sup>2</sup>	TEACHING <sup>3</sup>
External Scholarly Service	SERVICE	SCHOLARSHIP

<sup>1</sup> Only if Graduate Student Advising and Examining is declared as SCHOLARSHIP

<sup>2</sup> See categories Publications, Presentations and Funding

<sup>3</sup> See category Education-Based Scholarship

a course and the coordination of multiple sections of a course are two other examples. (b) The term “teaching overload” refers to an unusual increase in the number of teaching assignments that is not the result of an adjustment in the member’s DOE. A faculty who teaches a course offering on an overload basis is usually compensated with an overload stipend or with a teaching relief in a subsequent semester. For the purposes of performance review, and when the member is not compensated with an overload stipend, the higher number of teaching assignments is then seen as exceeding the departmental norm for the agreed-upon percentage of effort in teaching. (c) The term “teaching relief” refers to an unusual decrease in the number of teaching assignments that is not the result of an adjustment in the member’s DOE (e.g., new faculty members are usually granted one teaching relief in their first year). For the purposes of performance review, a teaching relief is actually seen as a teaching assignment for which all the member’s contributions are given the rating G or the same rating as the contributions for the other teaching assignments (whichever rating is better). (d) Likewise, all TEACHING contributions during a study/research leave or transition leave are normally rated G or better. Lower than G ratings may also be assigned, but only in exceptional circumstances (e.g., consider a faculty member who is the advisor of graduate students but fails to handle their responsibilities towards these students). For all other leaves (e.g., maternity or parental leave), the period when the member was on leave is not part of the review period; any TEACHING contributions during the leave are transferred to the review period.

### **Teaching Effectiveness**

The faculty member’s teaching effectiveness:

O — Is very high.

VG — Is high.

G — Is satisfactory.

IR — Is low.

U — Is very low.

*NOTE:* The assessment of teaching effectiveness (i.e., of the actual teaching as an ongoing process of inquiry, experimentation and reflection) should consider a variety of relevant evidence, including, for example, the outcome of student and peer evaluations, and the careful examination of a comprehensive teaching dossier. The assessment must be placed in the appropriate context and take into account various considerations, including: potential biases in the student evaluations (e.g., race of the instructor, gender, accent, age, “attractiveness”); on-line vs. in-class student evaluations; overall response rates; course characteristics (e.g., elective vs. required, small class vs. large class, hard vs. soft, traditional vs. innovative). While students are typically asked to evaluate courses and instructors through ratings on a scale of 1 to 5, no averages of such ratings should be considered when assessing a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.

### **Production of Teaching Materials**

Overall, the amount, quality and impact of the faculty member’s contribution to the production of teaching materials are:

O — Much higher than normally required by the teaching assignments the member was given.

VG — Higher than normally required by these assignments.

G — As normally required.

IR — Lower than normally required.

U — Much lower than normally required.

*NOTE:* (a) The term “production” encompasses revision. (b) The term “teaching materials” refers to exercises and solutions, lecture and lab notes, guidelines for instructors and TAs, computer-assisted learning materials, etc., as long as they are not publications (see the category *Publications* in the SCHOLARSHIP section).

## **Graduate Student Advising and Examining**

The faculty member has made:

- O — An outstanding contribution to graduate student advising and examining.
- VG — A strong contribution to graduate student advising and examining.
- G — A reasonable contribution to graduate student advising and examining.
- IR — Little contribution to graduate student advising and examining.
- U — No contribution to graduate student advising and examining.

*NOTE: (a) This category may be counted towards SCHOLARSHIP instead. (b) The term “advising” is used when the faculty member is serving on the advisory committee (e.g., advisor, co-advisor, member) of a graduate student (e.g., PhD, MSc, GRA) or has a similar role recognized by the advisor(s). The advisor must specify whether there is a co-advisor; if there is a co-advisor, both the advisor and the co-advisor must clearly indicate their respective roles. Moreover, each PhD or MSc student is expected to complete their program in a timely fashion. (c) The term “examining” is used when the faculty member is not serving on the student’s advisory committee but is serving on—and not chairing—their examining committee (e.g., MSc or PhD seminar or defense examination, PhD qualifying examination), or has a similar role.*

## **Undergraduate Student Advising and Examining**

The faculty member has made:

- O — An outstanding contribution to undergraduate student-advising and examining.
- VG — A strong contribution to undergraduate student advising and examining.
- G — A reasonable contribution to undergraduate student advising and examining.
- IR — Little contribution to undergraduate student advising and examining.
- U — No contribution to undergraduate student advising and examining.

*NOTE: (a) This category may be counted towards SCHOLARSHIP instead, but only if the category *Graduate Student Advising and Examining* is counted towards SCHOLARSHIP. (b) The term “advising” is used when, e.g., the faculty member is the advisor or co-advisor of an undergraduate research assistant. (c) The term “examining” is used when, e.g., the faculty member is the second reader for an undergraduate student taking a senior computer science project course under individual faculty supervision.*

## **Education-Based Scholarship**

The faculty member has made:

- O — An outstanding contribution to education-based scholarship.
- VG — A strong contribution to education-based scholarship.

*NOTE: (a) By default, education-based publications, presentations and funding are counted towards the categories *Publications*, *Presentations* and *Funding* in the SCHOLARSHIP section. However, the faculty member may choose to have them counted towards this category instead. (b) Other evidence of education-based scholarship includes the experimentation of teaching techniques and tools that the faculty member had never used before.*

## **Teaching Workload**

The teaching workload of the faculty member has been:

- O — Much greater than normal.
- VG — Greater than normal.

*NOTE:* (a) The term “teaching workload” refers to the average amount of work the faculty member put into each teaching assignment. (b) The teaching workload of a faculty member may be considered greater than normal if the member has taught, e.g., a course for the first time, and a lot of preparation was required; a course with a large number of students, many lab sections, or many lab hours; a course which requires the instructor to provide a large number of assignments, large assignments, or a very large writing component; a course which requires the instructor to supervise labs themselves, to supervise a large number of TAs, or to manage group work.

## **Teaching Recognition**

The faculty member has received:

O — A major award for their teaching, or positive coverage through a highly regarded media channel, or similar recognition.

VG — An award for their teaching, or positive coverage through a respected media channel, or similar recognition.

## **Other Teaching Contributions**

*NOTE:* (a) This is a positive contribution category, which may only positively affect the performance rating in TEACHING. (b) Examples of other teaching contributions are: teaching a reading course, teaching in a first-year seminar program, attending a teaching workshop or conference, coordinating multiple sections of a course (when this is not a teaching assignment as made by the Dean).

## **2.3. SCHOLARSHIP Categories**

*NOTE:* (a) The assessment of SCHOLARSHIP contributions takes into account the experience level of the faculty member and the normal practices for their particular area of scholarship (e.g., preferred venues for publications, publication rates, funding requirements). In particular, faculty members just beginning an academic career may need time to establish their research programs; they are not expected to contribute to SCHOLARSHIP as much as more senior faculty with the same effort allocation. (b) All SCHOLARSHIP contributions during a study/research leave or transition leave are normally rated G or better. Lower than G ratings may also be assigned, but only in exceptional circumstances (e.g., consider a faculty member who has a confirmed academic integrity offence in a submitted scientific publication during this period). For all other leaves (e.g., maternity or parental leave), the period when the member was on leave is not part of the review period; any SCHOLARSHIP contributions during the leave are transferred to the review period.

## **Publications**

The faculty member:

O — Has an outstanding publication record in highly regarded venues.

VG — Has a strong publication record in respected venues.

G — Has a reasonable publication record in respected venues.

IR — Has a marginal publication record in respected venues.

U — Has had no noteworthy publications.

*NOTE:* (a) Examples of publications are: refereed, unrefereed or submitted journal papers, conference papers, textbooks, book chapters, monographs, research reports; refereed, published or self-published software. (b) The faculty member may choose to have their education-based publications counted towards another contribution category: the category *Education-Based Scholarship* in the TEACHING section.

## **Presentations**

The faculty member, or students they are advising:

O — Have frequently given oral presentations at highly regarded venues.

VG — Have regularly given oral presentations at respected venues.

G — Have given a reasonable number of presentations at respected venues.

IR — Have rarely given presentations at respected venues.

U — Have given no noteworthy presentations.

*NOTE:* (a) The term “presentations” refers to scholarship presentations outside the University. Examples of presentations are: oral or poster paper presentation at a conference; invited talk at another university; plenary or keynote talk at a symposium. (b) If the presentation is given by a student, it must be co-authored by the student and the faculty member; moreover, the faculty member must be the student’s advisor or co-advisor at the time of the presentation, or at the time the work to be presented was submitted. (c) The faculty member may choose to have their education-based presentations counted towards another contribution category: the category *Education-Based Scholarship* in the TEACHING section.

## **Funding**

The faculty member:

O — Is very well supported.

VG — Is well supported.

G — Has reasonable funding, or seeks support.

IR — Has very limited funding and does not seek support.

U — Has no funding and does not seek support.

*NOTE:* (a) Examples of funding are: grants, contracts or funds awarded. (b) The faculty member may choose to have their education-based funding counted towards another contribution category: the category *Education-Based Scholarship* in the TEACHING section.

## **Scholarship Recognition**

The faculty member has received:

O — A major award for their scholarship contributions, or positive coverage through a highly regarded media channel, or other similar recognition.

VG — An award for their scholarship contributions, or positive coverage through a respected media channel, or other similar recognition.

## **Other Scholarship Contributions**

*NOTE:* (a) This is a positive contribution category, which may only positively affect the performance rating in SCHOLARSHIP. (b) Examples of other scholarship contributions are: patents, non-paid consulting, visiting another institution or hosting a visiting professor, simply attending a conference, mentoring a postdoctoral fellow.

## **2.4. SERVICE Categories**

*NOTE:* (a) Faculty members just beginning an academic career are encouraged to establish their research programs and teaching effectiveness before becoming heavily involved with SERVICE; they are not expected



to contribute to SERVICE as much as more senior members with the same effort allocation. (b) All SERVICE contributions during a study/research leave or transition leave are normally rated G or better. Lower than G ratings may also be assigned, but only in exceptional circumstances. For all other leaves (e.g., maternity or parental leave), the period when the member was on leave is not part of the review period; any SERVICE contributions during the leave are transferred to the review period.

### **Assigned Internal Service**

The faculty member has made:

O — An outstanding contribution to assigned internal service.

VG — A strong contribution to assigned internal service.

G — A reasonable contribution.

IR — A marginal contribution.

U — No noticeable contribution.

*NOTE:* The term “assigned internal service” refers to administrative responsibilities within the University (at the Department/School, College or University level) assigned to the faculty member through election or appointment (e.g., by the Director, Dean or Provost).

### **Non-Assigned Internal Service**

The faculty member has made:

O — An outstanding contribution to non-assigned internal service.

VG — A strong contribution to non-assigned internal service.

G — A reasonable contribution.

IR — A marginal contribution.

U — No noticeable contribution.

*NOTE:* Examples of non-assigned internal service activities are: participating in academic discussions or in outreach initiatives (e.g., school visits, open houses, science fairs, newsletter); coaching student competitions; reviewing colleagues’ grant proposals (if not committee service); mentoring a new faculty member, or a faculty member in a new role, or a sessional lecturer.

### **External Scholarly Service**

The faculty member has made:

O — An outstanding contribution to external scholarly service.

VG — A strong contribution to external scholarly service.

G — A reasonable contribution.

IR — A marginal contribution.

U — No noticeable contribution.

*NOTE:* (a) This category may be counted towards SCHOLARSHIP instead. (b) Examples of external scholarly service activities are: chairing a conference session; serving on a conference program committee; reviewing journal papers; being the external examiner for a tenure or promotion application; organizing a national or international conference; being the editor or associate editor of a journal; serving on a governmental grant selection committee; being involved in professional societies or outside organizations.



## **Service Recognition**

The faculty member has received:

O — A major award for their service, or other similar recognition.

VG — An award for their service, or other similar recognition.

## **Other Service Contributions**

*NOTE:* This is a positive contribution category, which may only positively affect the performance rating in SERVICE. Chairing a PhD or MSc defence, when not committee service, is an example of other service contributions.

### 3. Annual Performance Review

---

The annual performance review takes place:

- every year for contractually-limited faculty members; the intention is to provide feedback, a performance rating in each one of the three areas of responsibility, and an overall performance rating; the process is exactly the same as for the biennial performance review, except that the SoCS T&P Committee assesses the contributions of the faculty member over the past academic year (instead of the past two academic years).
- every year for tenure-track faculty members; the intention is to provide feedback only on progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (for tenure-track Assistant Professors) or toward tenure only (for tenure-track Associate Professors or Professors).
- an odd-numbered year for tenure-track and tenured faculty members who received a less than *Good* overall performance rating in the previous biennial performance review; the intention is to provide feedback only toward attaining a *Good* or better overall performance rating in the next biennial performance review.

## 4. Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

---

### 4.1. Occurrence

The term “tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor” refers to three cases:

- a faculty candidate to whom the School has been authorized to offer an Associate Professor or Professor position (consideration for tenure);
- a tenure-track Assistant Professor (consideration for both tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, in the member’s final probationary year or at their request);
- a tenure-track Associate Professor or Professor (consideration for tenure, in the member’s final probationary year or at their request).

### 4.2. Criteria

The three cases above are handled the same way. In order to reach a recommendation in favour of granting tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, the SoCS T&P Committee must determine that the following criteria are **ALL SATISFIED**:

- a)** The faculty member is at the *Good* or better level in all three areas of responsibility, and trending toward being near or at the *Very Good* or better level in TEACHING or SCHOLARSHIP.
- b)** Overall, considering the span of their career and their DOE history, the faculty member has made a reasonable contribution to graduate student advising and examining, has a good record of sound work in peer-reviewed publications, and has made a reasonable contribution to assigned internal service.

If their DOE history essentially balances SCHOLARSHIP and TEACHING, or clearly emphasizes SCHOLARSHIP over TEACHING:

- c)** The faculty member has an independent and sustainable scholarship program.

If their DOE history clearly emphasizes TEACHING over SCHOLARSHIP:

- d)** The faculty member’s teaching effectiveness is high. In addition, they have made a reasonable contribution to scholarship, or the amount, quality and impact of their contribution to the production of teaching materials are overall higher than normally required by the teaching assignments they were given.

## 5. Promotion to Professor

---

### 5.1. Occurrence

The term “promotion to Professor” refers to the following case: a tenured Associate Professor (consideration for promotion at the member’s request).

### 5.2. Criteria

In order to reach a recommendation in favour of granting promotion to Professor, the SoCS T&P Committee must determine that the following criteria are **ALL SATISFIED**:

- a) The faculty member has a long-term record of being at the *Good* or better level in all three areas of responsibility.
- b) Overall, considering the span of their career and their DOE history, the faculty member has made a reasonable contribution to graduate student advising and examining, has a good record of sound work in peer-reviewed publications, and has made a reasonable contribution to assigned internal service.

If their DOE history essentially balances SCHOLARSHIP and TEACHING, or clearly emphasizes SCHOLARSHIP over TEACHING:

- c) The faculty member has a long-term record of being at the *Very Good* or better level in SCHOLARSHIP, and has a long-term record of sustaining an independent and nationally- or internationally-recognized research program.

If their DOE history clearly emphasizes TEACHING over SCHOLARSHIP:

- d) The faculty member has a long-term record of being at the *Very Good* or better level in TEACHING, and has a long-term record of being highly effective in teaching. In addition, they have a long-term record of making a strong contribution to scholarship.

## Appendix

---

### *Grandfather Clause*

In some cases, a faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion on or after the effect date may request that their application be reviewed using the 2004 Guidelines instead of the 2019 Guidelines: the member must apply no later than six years after the ratification date, and their current position must be the same as their position on the ratification date or as the position they were offered before the ratification date (consider, e.g., a tenure-track Assistant Professor, applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, who was a tenure-track Assistant Professor on the ratification date; or a tenured Associate Professor, applying for promotion to Professor, who was not a faculty member on the ratification date but who was offered a tenured Associate Professor position before the ratification date).