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ABSTRACT

Teaching has always been and remains a core function of universities. However, there is a pervasive assumption that research activity is privileged over teaching contributions, particularly when hiring, tenure and promotion decisions are being made. Where do such beliefs come from? Are these assumptions based on policy or practice, or a combination of the two? Is research privileged, and if so, does teaching really matter? This dissertation considers the assumption that teaching is undervalued in Canadian universities, particularly within the context of institutional reward structures and more specifically in relation to the tenure review.

My dissertation examines the emergence of formal faculty evaluation systems in the second half of the 20th Century and considers various influencing factors on their development, including the evolution and adoption of tenure within academia and the move toward faculty collective bargaining.

The extensive body of literature on the evaluation of teaching provides a conceptual framework to examine the current Canadian landscape. Specifically, this involves a comprehensive review and analysis of tenure policies from 46 Canadian universities. This study reviews these
polices to determine the extent to which they reflect the recommendations emerging from the current literature.

The results of this review reveal that the recommendations from the literature are inconsistently reflected in current tenure policies at most institutions. In particular, a clear definition of “teaching effectiveness” is absent from the majority of policies. However, institutions have more consistently adopted the recommendation for multiple measures and means of assessing teaching effectiveness. For example, there exists a wide use of course evaluations and an increasing use of teaching dossiers to document teaching contributions at Canadian universities.

Subsequently, this study examines in detail five policies (from the universities of Alberta, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan and from York and Nipissing universities) that most thoroughly reflect the recommendations in the literature. These policies may be understood as models of emerging effective process.

By identifying inconsistencies, shifting practices, and emerging trends, this study provides a foundation for further research on the evaluation of teaching at Canadian universities and will aid universities in the process of reviewing their own tenure policies.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

“The defining characteristic of the academic profession is teaching. From the beginning, professors have taught” (Altbach, 1991, p. 23).

Discussions about teaching are a fundamental part of my professional work. As a faculty developer in a university, my work revolves around matters pertaining to teaching and learning: pedagogical approaches and philosophies, the use of technology, the diversity of learning styles, the development of learning outcomes, the role of mentors, undergraduate and graduate supervision, community-based and experiential learning opportunities, assignment, syllabus and course design, and the list goes on. A common theme that runs through these discussions and my work relates to evaluation. For example, faculty regularly ask about how best to assess student learning and how to measure the impact of their teaching on that learning, and my colleagues in teaching and learning centres consult and share with one another strategies for assessing the impact of our work on the quality of teaching at our institutions. Conversations about the way in which universities evaluate teaching contributions and teaching effectiveness are also common and can be overheard at conferences, in the corridors of university buildings and can be followed on listservs and in email discussions.

Over the past decade, in the context of this work, I have heard faculty and administrators assert with little hesitation that universities care less about teaching than they do about research, that new faculty should not waste their time on teaching, and that tenure is never granted on the basis of teaching contributions alone. These beliefs about the ways in which teaching is valued, or devalued, in universities are pervasive and at times difficult to avoid. For me, this has raised numerous questions, most prominent among them: where do
these perceptions come from? Is there something inherent in the way that our systems of higher education operate that engenders such beliefs? The goal of this study is, in part, to examine one potential source for these perceptions: institutional tenure policies. This study asserts that to counter beliefs that teaching is not valued, particularly for tenure, institutions must have clear, thorough and transparent evaluation policies that articulate institutional expectations for standards of performance and define how and by what measures teaching will be assessed. Without this, universities run the risk of sending a message that teaching is not valued or recognized and this can potentially lead members of the academic community and those beyond the institution to conclude that research is privileged.

As an administrator I am aware of the resources that my institution puts into teaching support and as a member of a large community of faculty developers from across Canada whose staff work to provide ongoing support to faculty at their own universities, I know that we are not alone in this regard. Teaching has always been and remains a core function of all post-secondary institutions. University mandates, goals, aims and mission statements frequently emphasize the quality of undergraduate and graduate student experiences, and highlight efforts to achieve excellence in teaching and learning. As such, at all Canadian institutions faculty are expected to engage in teaching at some level, undergraduate and/or graduate. But, as Kennedy (1997) notes “of the many expectations that society has of the modern university, the most important is that it will teach well (my emphasis)” (p. 59). And so, many institutions across Canada have put in place programs to support teaching and encourage excellence in this essential academic activity.
Today, most Canadian institutions have faculty development offices (or teaching and learning centres) that provide support for teaching enhancement. Such units first arose in Canada in the 1970s and continued to spread across the country over the next several decades. Typically, faculty development offices offer similar sets of programs and resources in support of teaching, including events (workshops, courses, symposia), assistance with educational technologies, consultations with faculty, and publications such as guides and tip sheets on a range of teaching topics. Some centres also administer peer mentorship programs (see for example, Alberta’s Centre for Teaching and Learning and Saskatchewan’s Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness).

Additionally, a number of Canadian universities have put in place programs that provide financial incentives or grants in support of research on teaching, and many have implemented initiatives that recognize and reward teaching excellence. While some have argued that teaching awards can do a disservice to teaching (Aron, Aucott & Papp, 2000; Chism, 2006; Evans, 2005), others have viewed them as an essential element in cultivating a culture of teaching. Award winners often become ambassadors of teaching excellence on their campuses, are called on to deliver public lectures, convocation addresses, and workshops for faculty, are asked to serve as mentors for new or junior faculty, to serve on tenure and promotion committees, to provide peer review of teaching for formative and/or summative purposes, and to advise on teaching-related policies and initiatives. In each of these roles, they can play a valuable part in enhancing and supporting teaching.

---

1 See the Society for Teaching & Learning in Higher Education web site for a full list of these centres at: http://www.stlhe.ca/en/stlhe/constituencies/edc/resources/index.php
Internal recognition is often enhanced when awards are bestowed by organizations external to the university. Such awards indicate that an institution’s teaching is being reviewed and recognized by external peers, something that more typically happens for research. The receipt of such an award signals to other universities that exemplary teaching is occurring at these campuses and could further reveal the presence of a strong teaching culture. Take for example, the 3M National Teaching Fellowship award. This is Canada’s most prestigious teaching honour, awarded to a maximum of ten individuals from across the country each year. The 3M nomination process is rigorous, with the expectation that candidates show clear evidence of both teaching excellence and educational leadership. A number of Canadian institutions have received a high number of these awards since the establishment of this program in 1986 (the University of Alberta holds the record with 31 awards received as of 2010 – out of a total of 260 awarded).

Faculty development centres and teaching awards have existed in some form or another at Canadian universities for the past several decades. While they can demonstrate a commitment to teaching, or arguably, a valuing of teaching within an institution, this has not stopped members of the academic community and the broader public from raising concerns about how universities structure and regard this fundamental activity. The Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education (1991), often referred to as the “Smith Report” for its author Dr. Stuart Smith, concluded that "teaching is seriously undervalued at Canadian universities and nothing less than a total re-commitment to it is required" (p. 63). Similarly, in Tenure, Teaching Quality and Accountability, Ormrod (1996) argued that “teaching

---

2 See the 3M National Teaching Fellowship web site at: [http://www.mcmaster.ca/3Mteachingfellowships/](http://www.mcmaster.ca/3Mteachingfellowships/) for a full description of the criteria for this award and the related selection procedures.
activities are under-sponsored and teaching performance is ineffectively assessed, especially when compared with the research activities of a tenured university professor” (p. 1).

These sentiments are not unique to the Canadian environment. Similar assertions have been made for the United Kingdom and Australian higher education sectors (see Court, 1999; Gibbs, 1995; Skelton, 2007b). In the United States, Fairweather (2002a) noted that “the perceived inattention to teaching and learning, particularly at the undergraduate level, is not off base” (p. 27). Such concerns have been echoed in American reports and studies spanning several decades, from the Boyer Commission in 1990 to the Spellings Commission in 2006.

Editorials and opinion pieces have also regularly highlighted issues relating to university teaching. For example, writing in the Globe and Mail newspaper, Margaret Wente (see for example, 2009) has often called into question the commitment of faculty members to teaching, suggesting that they devote little time to enhancing their practice or in the preparation of their courses. She has also criticized the increasing reliance on graduate teaching assistants for such activities as grading and the growing class sizes at many institutions, questioning the value of such experiences for student learning.

Interestingly, however, some items from the Globe and Mail (2010) and the Canadian University Survey Consortium (CUSC, 2010) surveys suggest that students themselves are generally satisfied with the overall quality of teaching they receive. The 2010 Globe and Mail Canadian University Report, a survey which gathered opinions to some 100 questions from more than 35,000 undergraduate students, revealed that Canadian universities fared reasonably well on a question about teaching quality, with institutions receiving grades ranging
Similarly, the CUSC survey (2010) asked students to respond to the statement: “Generally, I am satisfied with the quality of teaching I have received”. The data from 39 institutions and almost 12,488 first-year students indicates that 90% (or 11,239) of respondents “strongly agree” or “agree” with this statement (see Table 1.1 below).

Table 1.1 – CUSC Student Satisfaction with Teaching Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyndale</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Western</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s (Edmonton)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia (Edmonton)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Royal</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Xavier</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Allison</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trois Rivières</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant MacEwan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNB (Saint John)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary’s</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNB (Fredericton)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNBC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Declined to release this information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


See the Globe and Mail web site for a full overview of the results from this survey at: [http://www.globecampus.ca/]

Of course, students do not necessarily rate all items relating to their educational experiences positively, a fact which has certainly contributed to some of the negative perceptions held by the public. Growing concerns have been voiced about rising tuition costs, increasingly large class sizes, and an over-reliance on contingent faculty, which all suggest to the public that universities are not valuing teaching (see Findlay, 2011). Many continue to believe that higher education institutions need to do much more to improve teaching and learning on university campuses. Dr. Stuart Smith, the author of the 1991 *Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education*, agrees. In a 2010 interview with *Maclean’s* magazine, he suggested that in fact not much had changed over the past two decades (Lanau, 2010).

The broader public has questioned, and continues to question the ability of universities to successfully fulfill their teaching mission, and they are not alone in this. Within universities, many faculty also perceive that teaching is undervalued, and that the contributions of instructors are not appropriately recognized. As Ramsden and Martin (1996) concur, “teaching has become widely perceived to be less important in the academic reward system” (p. 300). In several jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States and Canada, this has led to calls for the increased recognition of teaching and the reform of internal processes, among them academic reward structures. As already noted, many Canadian institutions have developed resources to support faculty in their teaching (e.g. faculty development centres, grants for research on teaching) and initiatives to recognize teaching contributions (e.g. institutional awards). These programs and opportunities, while valuable to

---

5 See for example, the national and institutional data from the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) at: [http://nsse.iub.edu/html/reports.cfm](http://nsse.iub.edu/html/reports.cfm)
faculty, are perhaps less meaningful than formal institutional processes and reward structures, such as tenure.\(^6\)

Canadian universities were once primarily viewed as teaching institutions with an emphasis on undergraduate education. This focus began to shift by the 1960s and “the growing emphasis on the creation of new knowledge fundamentally altered the balance within the university. Research replaced teaching as the privileged activity of academics” (Neatby, 1985, p. 20).\(^7\) This balance was further disrupted by the development of more formalized evaluation frameworks, specifically tenure. By the 1970s common evaluation practices could be identified at most Canadian universities whereby faculty were assessed on the basis of their contributions in research and teaching (and to a lesser degree, service) (Clark, Moran, Skolnik & Trick, 2009). On one hand, this evolution of the evaluation framework would seem to be a positive change with teaching being officially recognized as a significant faculty contribution. However, with this change, teaching also became a discrete element of academic work. Did this result in a system that separated the once integrated academic activities of teaching and research? Did this new structure place teaching and research in competition with one another? Did formal evaluation frameworks place teaching in a more valued position? Or did this lead to the “ghettoization” of teaching? And if so, could this be the source for the ongoing pervasive belief that teaching is less valued in universities, particularly at the tenure review stage?

The tenure review process is a significant event in the academic life cycle. While faculty undergo substantial review at the point of hiring and during their probationary period, it is at

---

\(^6\) In the United Kingdom and Australia, tenure no longer exists; however, efforts to reform the promotion policies and processes mirror those focused on tenure in Canada and the United States.

\(^7\) Similarly, in the United States, this period saw an influx of funding for research, further stimulating an emphasis on this aspect of faculty work (see Cuban, 1999; Fletcher & Patrick, 1998).
the tenure juncture that their teaching, research and, to a somewhat lesser degree, service contributions are most thoroughly assessed. As a result, it is the tenure review that is perhaps the most important for faculty. With a positive review comes the confirmation of tenure and the security of a permanent appointment. Failure to obtain tenure, which signals that the individual has not met the standards of the institution, can lead to unemployment. As such, there is much riding on this review for the individual academic.

As noted above, it is often suggested that research is privileged during the tenure review (Cuban, 1999). I am regularly confronted with this notion in my professional work, sometimes framed as a definite fact, and at other times, phrased as a question. When probing further on this issue with colleagues and faculty, it became clear to me that the sources for such perceptions were varied but most often came from information that had been passed down from colleagues or academic administrators. In considering this issue, I was reminded of the work of James Fairweather, on issues relating to tenure, evaluation and faculty work. He has noted that faculty look for “clues about the value of different aspects of their work” in tenure processes, as “it is here that productivity is most meaningfully defined and evaluated” (2002a, p. 27).

This emphasis on institutional process led me to tenure policies. If faculty and administrators perceive that teaching is undervalued and that research activity is privileged, and as Fairweather suggests, the academic community looks to policies for information about institutional processes and values – what were these documents saying? Was there something implicit or explicit in tenure policies that suggested teaching was less valued than research? Would these documents reveal something about institutional approaches and practices that
could indicate insufficient regard for teaching? This was the case in the United Kingdom and Australia where reviews of promotion policies found that, in fact, teaching was not being acknowledged (Higher Education Academy (HEA) 2009a, b). Or, perhaps they would demonstrate, as Lewis (1980) found, the presence of poor evaluation strategies. In his review of personnel files for tenure candidates at a large northeastern university in the United States, Lewis concluded that “one is left with a very vivid impression that there are no hard and fast criteria... [and that] the entire process of evaluation is marked by floating standards” (p. 93).

Although I possessed a good knowledge of the tenure policies and related documents regarding the evaluation of teaching from my own institution, I was less familiar with processes from other institutions across Canada. I discovered quickly, that while aspects of the Canadian tenure process had been considered in the research (Horn, 1999a, b), including issues relating to gender bias (Acker 1995; Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Ornstein, Stewart & Drakich, 2007; Stewart, Ornstein & Drakich, 2009), and surveys and interviews had been conducted to assess faculty attitudes about tenure processes (Britnell et al., 2010; Wright & Associates, 1995), there was no comprehensive review or analysis of these policies on a national scale. Attitudes and perceptions about the recognition and evaluation of teaching permeated institutional and provincial boundaries and so, I determined that in order to unpack these often common and strongly-held beliefs, a review of institutional policies from across Canada was needed.

Academic appointments, faculty work, tenure and the evaluation of teaching have all been addressed in various forms by a wide range of research in other contexts. However, these areas have been covered to a lesser degree for Canada and a comprehensive understanding of current Canadian institutional policies is lacking, specifically those relating to the assessment of
teaching at the point of tenure. A thorough review of such policies and related processes will enable us to better comprehend the source of faculty perceptions and anxieties regarding tenure. What the policies state, or do not state, may reveal institutional values, and send particular signals to faculty undergoing tenure review. For example, a less than thorough consideration of teaching contributions, compared to that for research activity suggests that the latter may be privileged. On the other hand, such a positioning may simply reveal an institution’s lack of familiarity with the current literature on well-structured evaluation frameworks. A review of current policies will both highlight inconsistencies in policy and stated mandate and point to institutions with more developed systems of evaluation. As such, this study will aid universities in the process of reviewing their own tenure policies and processes and will provide a foundation for further research in policy analysis and in Canadian teaching evaluation practices.

Organization of this Study
To fully explore the ways in which teaching is evaluated within the tenure process, my research will be guided by four primary questions:

1. How can teaching in higher education most effectively and comprehensively be evaluated, according to the literature?
2. How have faculty evaluation systems developed historically in Canada, and in response to what factors?
3. What role does the evaluation of teaching play in current tenure policies at Canadian universities?
4. To what extent are the recommendations emerging from the current literature on teaching and teaching evaluation reflected in Canadian tenure policies?

In Chapter 2, I bring together two areas of the literature that are germane to this study. First, I
explore some of the scholarship on tenure, specifically that which addresses some of the challenges with the tenure system that scholars have been raising since the middle of the 20th century. I also look at the range of benefits that have been identified by those who support tenure and briefly at some of the calls for reform.

The second body of literature reviewed in this chapter focuses on the evaluation of teaching. To address my first research question, this section of my study brings together a vast body of scholarship that addresses a range of components relating to evaluation, including the methods and means of evaluation (e.g. course evaluations, teaching dossiers, peer review, in-class observations, and so on) and strategies for assessing evidence (e.g. teaching review committees). It also draws on broader conversations about teaching, including those that seek to foster more holistic understandings of teaching and teaching activities (e.g. Boyer, 1990; Colbeck, 2002; Pratt, 1997), and those that seek to define “teaching effectiveness” in meaningful ways. Additionally, this literature also incorporates research on evaluation frameworks and tenure processes more broadly. Emerging from these various sub-sets of the literature is a comprehensive overview of the recommendations pertaining to the evaluation of teaching from these bodies of literature. This chapter also provides a brief overview of the faculty development movement and work that shaped this body of literature.

My review of the literature brings together these two distinct, but related fields of scholarship to provide a foundation on which to build my overall study. It is essential to have an understanding of the challenges and strengths related to the structure and system of tenure since this study focuses specifically on this juncture in academic careers. The review of the literature on teaching evaluation and the recommendations that extend from this scholarship
provides a conceptual and structural framework through which to review and analyze contemporary Canadian tenure policies.

Chapter 3 outlines in detail the goals of my study along with my primary and secondary research questions. In addition, I describe my methodological approach and conceptual framework. My approach involves the review of institutional documents, specifically tenure policies and collective agreements as it is in these materials that institutions lay out their expectations regarding teaching responsibilities and the manner in which these activities will be formally reviewed. Sanctioned by and approved through institutional governance processes, these represent the official and formal procedures for the tenure review process and the evaluation of teaching within that process. As such, I use these to gain an understanding of institutional approaches to teaching, to assess ongoing perceptions about teaching, and to determine the level to which institutional policies reflect the recommendations from the literature.

Before looking more closely at the institutional policies, Chapter 4 offers a brief overview of the historical and contemporary context in which Canadian policies are situated, addressing my second research question. In particular, I look at the literature that focuses on the evolution and formalization of tenure within higher education in Canada and the United States. I also explore some of the influencing factors that shaped Canadian evaluation frameworks, including unionization and collective bargaining and discuss briefly how this plays out on campuses today.

A review of current tenure policies and related documents is undertaken in Chapter 5. This section draws on data collected from 46 Canadian universities examining the content,
focus and scope of these policies. This review is approached in relation to the recommendations from the literature addressed in Chapter 2, which will form a conceptual framework and a lens through which to view the contemporary Canadian landscape.

Based on my review of institutional tenure policies, I have identified a number of institutions that warranted further exploration. Chapter 6 is devoted to a more thorough look at five institutions that have implemented policies that more fully reflect current literature on teaching evaluation practices and frameworks and the recommendations from this scholarship. Through this in-depth look, I am able to delve more deeply into the policies from these universities and analyze more fully the content, focus and scope in relation to the literature.

My final chapter provides a synthesis of my overall findings and will identify any common or emerging themes. Here, I consider the extent to which the literature on teaching and evaluation frameworks is reflected in institutional policies in Canada and highlight any gaps that may exist. I also briefly consider additional issues related to teaching and the valuing of teaching in higher education beyond the scope of the tenure review, as supports, resources, practices and policies that universities put in place for pre- and post-tenure faculty can also impact the way in which teaching is valued and recognized.

Numerous studies undertaken in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia conclude that faculty question the value that universities place on teaching. Surveys and interviews conducted with individuals from each of these jurisdictions indicate that, overall, faculty believe teaching is important and should be recognized. However, more often than not, they note that their institutional policies and cultures do not reflect this view (see Britnell et al., 2010; Gibbs & Habeshaw, 2003; HEA, 2009a, 2009b; Ramsden & Martin, 1996;
Rather, there is a strong sense that research is given higher priority and that it is valued and rewarded more within universities and within higher education more broadly. Related to this is the suggestion that even when teaching is evaluated, the methods are not as rigorous as when compared to those used for research. In general, faculty perceive that university reward structures do not adequately recognize teaching contributions, creating a systemic culture that does not value teaching. As Elton (1991) notes, “If teaching is to take its rightful place by the side of research, there must be appropriate rewards for teaching excellence” (p. 112).

As already noted, these perceptions are not limited to those who operate within academe but regularly are voiced in the media, in provincial, state and national reports and in scholarly articles and texts. The common refrain: teaching does not matter. As Lewis and Gregorio (1984) suggest,

> It is taken on faith by many that teaching is valued but is not now adequately rewarded because of some oversight or the presence of competing priorities. It could be, however, that teaching is not equitably compensated because the professoriate and academic administrators alike are not totally convinced – in spite of lip service to the contrary – that it is as central an aspect of the academic roles as are other functions performed by faculty. Under such conditions it could hardly be expected that attempts to improve or excel in teaching would be recognized or rewarded (p. 33).

This study explores this notion and will seek to determine how institutions address and evaluate teaching or whether they prioritize teaching (and if so, how) within the context of tenure policies. It will also consider what this may or may not signal to faculty, administrators and the broader community.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Researchers in the field of Canadian higher education are often confronted by the fact that there is limited data and scholarship in a number of areas of interest. This lack of information is in stark contrast to the often vast amount of research available for other jurisdictions and it can be both a blessing and a curse. On the one hand, it means that for many of us each project requires new and frequently extensive data collection – a time-intensive venture. On the other hand, it also allows us to make new and, hopefully, significant contributions to the field. Currently, there is a growing body of scholarship on teaching in higher education in Canada (see for example, Christensen-Hughes & Mighty, 2010; Knapper, 2001; Knapper & Wright, 2001; Kreber, 2007; Pratt, 1997) and on tenure (see for example, Cameron, 1996, 1994, 1991; Horn, 1983/4a, b, 1994, 1999a, b, 2002, 2009; Tudiver, 1999). However, there are few studies that specifically address how teaching is evaluated at the tenure review at Canadian universities – which is the focus of this study. Some scholars have looked at faculty attitudes toward tenure (see Britnell et al., 2010) or how faculty experience tenure (Acker, 1997; Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Acker, Webber & Smyth, 2009, 2010, 2011a, b). Others have addressed recommendations for reform of Canadian evaluation practices (see Knapper, 2001), but there are no extant reviews of Canadian tenure policies and how these documents outline procedures for the evaluation of faculty teaching contributions.

This chapter brings together several bodies of literature that focus on tenure, teaching and evaluation frameworks which, while related on many levels, are also distinct areas of study.
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8 I would like to thank Professor Sandra Acker for providing me with copies of these papers.
More specifically, this chapter addresses the strengths and challenges of tenure as a system of faculty evaluation, the impact that tenure has had on teaching and perceptions about the recognition and reward of teaching within universities. I also review the scholarship on initiatives that have sought to refocus attention on teaching in higher education (such as faculty development and the scholarship of teaching and learning) and provide a synthesis of the extensive body of literature on teaching evaluation practices and frameworks. These bodies of literature provide a useful and necessary foundation upon which to build my discussion and frame my analysis of current evaluation policies. Moreover, this scholarship also illuminates the historical contexts from which tenure policies emerged and the range of factors that have shaped North American approaches to the evaluation of teaching and the policies within which institutional procedures are defined and articulated.

The Formalization of Tenure
While tenure has existed in principle within higher education for hundreds of years (Metzger, 1973), it was not until the last half of the 20th century that it was formalized, and as such, became the primary means through which faculty work was assessed at North American universities. In Canada, the notion of tenure shifted from something that in the late 19th to the early 20th century was granted in a discretionary fashion, “at the pleasure of the board”, to a system that up until the mid-1960s awarded tenure during “good behavior” (Horn, 1999a, b). By the 1970s, tenure had evolved into what is often referred to as “juridical tenure” and had become, in essence, an employment contract (Horn, 1999a, b). This form of tenure emerged in part due to unionization and collective bargaining efforts that had swept across Canadian (and
American) campuses in the late 1960s and early 1970s. By this stage, tenure was no longer discretionary; rather, faculty were being evaluated formally, anywhere between three and seven years after their initial appointment through a more formalized evaluation process known as the “tenure review”.

While I will explore the evolution of tenure and some of the factors that shaped its current form, specifically unionization and collective bargaining, in more detail in Chapter 4, first, I briefly address some of the arguments for and against tenure that have been voiced since its emergence and implementation as a framework for evaluation.

*The pros and cons of tenure: scholarly debates*
As the concept of tenure was shifting, being formalized and being embedded in institutional documents and collective agreements, questions regarding the value and relevance of tenure were being voiced from within and from outside the academic community. A significant portion of this scholarship was and is framed around the pros and cons of tenure. Supporters have argued that tenure is necessary to protect academic freedom. As William Tierney (2004) notes, “[a]cademic freedom codified the belief about the search for truth. Tenure was the structure that ensured the belief would not be violated” (p. 161).

It was for this reason that organizations like the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) supported tenure, highlighted its benefits and called on institutions to formally adopt tenure policies (see Horn, 1999a, b; Tudiver, 1999). Other
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9 This relationship between tenure and academic freedom is widely addressed in the literature. See for example, Altbach, 2001; Cameron, 1996; Ceci, Williams & Mueller-Johnson, 2006; De George, 1997; Elkins, 1998; Horn, 1999a; Keast & Macy, 1973; Machlup, 1964; Malloch, 1983; Metzger, 1973; Monahan, 1983/84; Perley, 1998; Vaccaro, 1972.
arguments in favour of tenure note that it contributes to institutional stability through faculty commitment (Keast & Macy, 1973; Monahan, 1983/84), that it ensures faculty are evaluated professionally (Keast & Macy, 1973), and that its presence helps to make academic work attractive as a profession (Keast & Macy, 1973; Monahan, 1983/84; Vaccaro, 1972).

Alongside arguments in favour of tenure are an even higher number of those that call into question or reject outright its value within academia. Well-documented and discussed in the literature, these assertions include:

1. Tenure imposes an inflexible financial burden upon institutions, resulting in serious fiscal problems (see Horn, 1999b; Keast & Macy, 1973; Monahan, 1983/84; Tierney, 2002; Vaccaro, 1972).
2. Tenure restricts recruiting and hiring efforts (see Keast & Macy, 1973; McGee & Block, 1997; Rosenfeld, 2009) rather than serving as a lure for potential faculty.
3. Tenure fosters mediocrity or protects “deadwood” or unproductive faculty and makes accountability impossible (see Chait, 2002; Horn, 1999b; Keast & Macy, 1973; Machlup, 1964; Mallon, 2001; Perley, 1998; Tierney, 2002; Vaccaro, 1972).
4. Tenure makes individuals risk-averse and stultifies creativity (see Horn, 1999b; Kingwell, 2009).
5. Tenure hurts undergraduate teaching as faculty, once tenured, prefer to focus on graduate teaching and research (see Keast & Macy, 1973; Trower, 2000). Tenure devalues teaching since most institutions value research more highly and therefore less time and effort is devoted to teaching (see Kennedy, 1997; Mallon, 2001; Taylor, 2009; Tierney, 1998 and 2002).
6. Some have also suggested that tenure diminishes the role of students through the empowerment of faculty (see Keast & Macy, 1973), although this argument is voiced less frequently than it once was.
7. Tenure does not protect the untenured (see Austin & Rice, 1998; Dobbie & Robinson, 2008; Mallon, 2001; Monahan, 1983/84)
8. Tenure provides unfair security to faculty and gives universities a bad image (see Horn, 1999b; Lesk, 1998; Mallon, 2001).
9. Tenure processes may be subject to inequities based on gender or race (see Acker, 2009; Ornstein, Stewart & Drakich, 2007; Stewart, Ornstein & Drakich, 2009).
10. Tenure is no longer a necessary safeguard for academic freedom in light of emergent employment contracts, unionization and collective bargaining (see Cameron, 1996; Finkin, 1996; Keast & Macy, 1973; Savage, 1999; Shils, 1991; Tierney, 2002; Vaccaro, 1972).
Tierney (2002) notes that many of these criticisms of tenure are not new and have existed almost since its very inception. He raises his own objections to several of these arguments, countering for example the suggestion that tenure decreases innovation by pointing out that many of the most significant changes were discovered by professors with tenure (although he does not provide any specific examples). Tierney further asserts that even though not all faculty may express or call upon academic freedom during their career it does not mean that it should be abolished outright. To illustrate his point, he draws an analogy between tenure/academic freedom and free speech – noting that although many individuals may never test the limits of free speech, the First Amendment in the United States should not be discarded.

Reforming tenure

To resolve some of the problems within the tenure system, some have suggested that life tenure be eliminated (Amacher & Meiners, 2004; Vaccaro, 1972). In Canada this argument has been voiced at various levels: in the 1990s provincial governments in Ontario and Alberta talked about abolishing tenure (Savage, 1999), and individual faculty, the Canadian Association of University Business Officers, the Conference Board of Canada and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council have all publicly called for tenure to be abandoned at various levels. However, as Savage (1999) points out, the Ontario conservative provincial government under Premier Mike Harris used tenure “as a device for political attacks on universities” (p. 253). In any event, the Court argued, faculty are sufficiently protected by the tenure system against any abuse of their rights of free speech. The Court then gave a ringing defence of tenure” (p. 253).
times (see Bercuson, Bothwell & Granatstein, 1997). For some, this suggestion arises out of changing economic environments with critics calling into question the rationale for job security when many professions may be experiencing downsizing and underemployment (see Lesk, 1998; Mallon, 2001). This line of argument sees tenure privileging the professoriate over other types of professions.

In the United States, the conversation has become a matter of state-level debate with governments calling for the adoption of state-wide tenure standards, as in Colorado. In other countries, the calls for the elimination of tenure have moved beyond discourse and have found application in educational policy. For example, in the United Kingdom tenure has effectively been abolished. When this occurred any “pre-tenure” faculty were transferred to long-term contracts, and those with tenure ran the risk of losing it if they moved toward promotion. Court (1998) provides a useful overview of the rise of and fall of tenure in the United Kingdom, noting that the Education Reform Act of 1988 led to this change in practice.

Other scholars have suggested reforms to current institutional practices that aim to increase productivity and bring about some form of accountability, which many feel are jeopardized by the current tenure system. One proposed solution calls for the creation of long-term renewable contracts that allow for fiscal flexibility and the ability to release unproductive
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12 See also Bliss (2009) and Kingwell (2009) for calls to abolish tenure in the Canadian context. Bliss points, in part, to the “intense unpopularity of the word and concept ‘tenure’ outside the universities” (n.p.) as something that cannot be overlooked. Kingwell argues that “tenure tends to make academic departments conservative. Since tenure decisions are made by senior faculty, all of them tenured themselves, there is a natural tendency to reproduce the status quo” (n.p.).

13 Several articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education address the recent situation at the University of Colorado, see for example: Gravois (2006) and Fogg, P. (2006b). These articles highlight the controversy that has arisen in relation to comments made by a tenured faculty member, Wade Churchill, and note the calls for his dismissal and the unusual circumstances under which he was granted tenure.
faculty (Bercuson et al., 1997; Miller, 1987; Vaccaro, 1972). Vaccaro (1972) has suggested that such contracts enable more effective evaluation and allow faculty and the institution more flexibility in defining the terms of employment. Horn (2009) and Tierney (2002) are among those who do not feel term contracts offer a valid solution. Tierney (2002) argues that contracts “void the import of academic freedom” (p. 63). and notes that there is no concrete evidence to show that universities have more “deadwood” or unproductive faculty than businesses. If that is true, the problem cannot be causally linked to tenure. However, the notion that contracts can replace tenure persists as evidenced by an op-ed piece in the New York Times in which Mark C. Taylor, chair of the English Department at Columbia University, calls for the abolishment of tenure. He argues that it was initially intended to protect academic freedom but has resulted in institutions with little turnover and professors impervious to change. After all, once tenure has been granted, there is no leverage to encourage a professor to contribute to develop professionally or to require him or her to assume responsibilities like administration and student advising. Tenure should be replaced with seven-year contracts, which, like the programs in which faculty teach, can be terminated or renewed (2009, April 27).

Some American institutions have heeded these calls and have moved to contract-based appointments (as at the Kentucky Community and Technical College System). In Canada, Quest University, a private, non-profit university (established in 2002) has opted to offer individual contracts instead of tenure-stream appointments. Dobbie and Robinson’s study
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14 A survey conducted by the Chronicle of Higher Education suggests that the majority (53%) of university presidents in the United States favour abolishing tenure and believe it should be replaced with long-term contracts (see Fogg, 2005).
15 Taylor addresses concerns regarding tenure and offers suggestions for institutional reform of the system in Crisis on Campus: A Bold Plan for Reforming Our Colleges and Universities (2010).
16 See Moltz’s articles in Inside Higher Ed (3 December 2008 and 16 March 2009) for an account of this change in Kentucky.
(2008) provides a useful overview of Canadian and American trends in relation to the reliance on casual non-tenure track faculty. They demonstrate that in both Canada and the United States there has been a steady increase in the reliance on contingent faculty since the early 1990s but that this has occurred at a much higher rate in American institutions. They note that with fewer full-time tenure-stream and tenured faculty, the power balance on campuses is disrupted and leads to the erosion of the principles of shared governance.

Others (see Aper & Fry, 2003; Licata, 1987; Licata & Morreale, 1997; Morreale, 1999; Vaccaro, 1972) have suggested the implementation of a post-tenure review process, that would not only address concerns about faculty productivity, but would also help to ensure that quality is being maintained. Such processes are also designed to provide faculty with ongoing assistance that serves to enhance their performance. The 1990s in the United States witnessed a rapid growth of post-tenure review programs, implemented by institutions and in some cases mandated at the state level (Aper & Fry, 2003). Although, if the post-tenure review process could reverse tenure, Tierney (2002) questions its value and worries about the impact it could have on academic freedom. In Canada, Bercuson et al. (1997) note that CAUT believes that “formal, regular review of the entitlement of faculty members to continue in tenured appointments is unnecessary….Periodic review…would distort individual research schedules to the detriment of the advancement of knowledge” (quoted on p. 148). The Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Association’s (OCUFA) president at the time also agreed, stating that “university professors are already reviewed more vigorously than any other profession that I’m aware of” (interview quoted in Bercuson et al., 1997, p. 148).
Suggested reforms of the tenure system often address financial concerns. As Tierney (2002) notes, some have suggested that institutions decouple salaries from tenure and adopt a new funding model whereby faculty are paid by the institution and through external funding sources (e.g. grants). Another solution proposes that tenure be granted at the departmental level (rather than the institutional level) to ensure that the university as a whole would not have to carry the burden of the tenured faculty member.

Bercuson et al. (1997) admit that they are not supporters of the tenure system, but argue that if it is to continue to exist it will require serious reform. Specifically, they take issue with the lengthy processes involved in evaluating faculty for tenure. They argue that too much time is spent by faculty gathering and presenting documentation as evidence of their contributions in research, teaching and service and by committees reviewing these materials. Moreover, they believe that tenure decisions are often arbitrary and not based on solid evidence, particularly in relation to teaching. To alleviate some of these concerns, they recommend that tenure evaluations be based primarily on research contributions. However, Marc Bousquet, co-chair of an AAUP committee that is reviewing tenure, disagrees. He argues that it’s a “mistaken idea the tenure should be reserved for research-intensive” careers, noting that an AAUP draft policy document states “in short, tenure was framed to unite the faculty within a system of common professional values, standards and mutual responsibilities” (quoted in Jaschik, 2009a).

In spite of all of the issues raised by its opponents, the formalized notion of tenure that emerged during the late 20th century is still in place today at universities across Canada. Under this system, faculty responsibilities are defined in tenure polices and/or collective agreements
as are the criteria against which faculty are assessed. Within these institutional documents it is established that faculty will be responsible for teaching, pursuing research, and engaging in service to the discipline, institution or the broader community (Gravestock, Gregor Greenleaf & Jones, 2009). Since this form of faculty evaluation is still in place today across Canadian universities and because the tenure review is a significant stage in the academic life cycle where teaching activities and contributions are assessed, the tenure review structure will provide the focus for this study.

Impact of Tenure on Academic Work: Teaching and Research

As universities across Canada shifted from informal review practices to institution-wide policies, teaching, research and to a lesser extent service were identified as three categories of academic work for which faculty would be evaluated for tenure and promotion. Critics of tenure argued it led to a devaluing of teaching and privileging of research, effectively placing the two in competition with one another. However, long before the formalization of tenure, teaching and research were already being treated differently within universities. As Eble and McKeachie (1985) note,

Institutional practices in support of their faculties have largely, almost exclusively, been in support of research or scholarly capacities. The sabbatical leave, begun at Harvard in 1810, is the oldest form of faculty support (p. 5).

As they further point out, the sabbatical very quickly became associated with research, not teaching.

Externally-based research funding had also emerged in the 19th century (Buchbinder & Newton, 1985) and over the course of the next hundred years research had become “an
integral part of higher education” moving “ahead with increased vigor as an instrument capable of promoting scholarship” (Baker, 1986, p. 54). By the 1950s, “the growing hegemony of research”, according to Baker (1986) had “occurred at the expense of teaching” (p. 51) with teaching “lagging behind in a period of drift and uncertainty” (p. 54). In the United States, research expenditures more than tripled between 1958 and 1968 and universities focused their attention on providing supports for faculty in relation to their research agendas (Fletcher & Patrick, 1998). Over the course of the 1960s, “the growing emphasis on the creation of new knowledge fundamentally altered the balance within the university. Research replaced teaching as the privileged activity of academics” (Neatby, 1985, p. 20).

This focus on new knowledge further subordinated teaching to research through reform and organizational change (Cuban, 1999). Cuban (1999) argues that departmental and professorial autonomy also led to the privileging of research as academic priorities are typically identified at these levels and tend to favour or emphasize research pursuits. And while “research was never justified as an end in itself... it often became more prestigious, and better rewarded, than mere instruction” (Neatby, 1985, p. 20). Gamson (1998) further attributes “the preeminence of the research culture” to institutional ranking systems that, not only ensure visibility to those at the top but also legitimate an institutional hierarchy based on measures that are closely related to the research culture. To some extent, this can be said of the category system invented by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and widely used by researchers and granting agencies. These categories have spurred many a doctorate-granting university to be reclassified as “research university” and “research university II” to be classified as “research university I”...By these means, a kind of invisible hand has guided the competition for (p. 105) faculty reputation, power, and prestige and, by extension, institutional prestige (p. 106).
Teaching and the Evaluation of Teaching: Perceptions, Policies and Practice

By the 1970s, there was a growing sense, and for many a concern, that research was becoming the primary focus on university campuses (Elen, Lindblom-Ylanne & Clement, 2007). A number of studies from the 1970s through to the 1980s revealed that faculty and administrators believed teaching contributions should be the primary criterion for tenure and promotion. This was certainly the finding of Keast and Macy’s study (1973) in which 80% (or approximately 48,000 of 60,000) of faculty surveyed “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that teaching should be the primary criterion. They also found that 56% of faculty believed they could achieve tenure even if they did not publish (this number was slightly lower at 36% for the respondents from universities).17

While faculty and administrators may have believed that teaching should be the primary consideration in tenure decisions, institutional reward structures told a different story. In their review of American practices and policies, Keast and Macy’s (1973) commission on academic tenure (sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges) found that

All institutions insist upon evidence of teaching ability as a condition of reappointment, tenure and subsequent rewards and most assert that teaching is the most important criterion in personnel decisions; however, few institutions have developed reliable methods to evaluate teaching ability and to promote its improvement. As a result, other criteria predominate in personnel decisions. This is injurious to students, to faculty development and to the success of the institution’s program.

In addition, the lack of reliable methods of evaluating and improving teaching permits some tenured faculty to decline in teaching skill, to fail in adapting their techniques to new generations of students, to escape the consequences of their deficiencies as teachers when it comes to salary increases, further promotion and other awards (p. 35).

17 The item on the survey asked faculty to respond to the statement: “It is difficult to attain tenure if you don’t publish”.
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As a result, the commission recommended,

...that each institution develop methods of evaluating the teaching effectiveness of both its nontenured and its tenured faculty and procedures for reflecting these evaluations in pertinent personnel actions (Recommendation #12, p. 36).

By the 1970s, teaching and research had very much become two discrete activities of faculty work (Barnett, 2003, 2005). According to Crase and Crase (1976) this was creating faculty with a “scoreboard mentality” who were,

studying the guidelines for the purpose of determining what counts most. Is there a hierarchy among expectation? Is publishing in one journal more worthwhile than publishing in another? Is student evaluation or peer evaluation a more significant input as a measure of teaching ability?... Is it more rewarding to write for publication or devote time to course development? (p. 57).

This was confounded by the fact that in many cases, the reward structures in place at most institutions, including tenure, promotion, and faculty salaries, were favouring research over teaching (Fairweather, 2005).

In spite of this fact, some academic administrators continued to identify teaching as the single most important consideration for tenure decisions, as evidenced by Seldin’s (1999a) surveys of university deans. Seldin found, in surveys conducted across some 600 American institutions in 1978, 1988 and 1998, that deans repeatedly over time emphasized the importance of teaching for these personnel decisions (see Table 2.1 below). Faculty also placed a strong emphasis on their teaching but felt that their contributions in this area would not be appropriately recognized, as Baker (1986) writes

Most faculty consider teaching their primary career goal and believe that it should be rewarded ahead of research. In addition, most faculty are equally convinced that they will not receive extrinsic rewards for teaching. While many faculty indicate that teaching is very important to them and to their schools, they also believe that teaching is unimportant for career advancement (p. 51).
In fact, Seldin (1999a) found that, over the course of thirty years, there had been an increase in the amount of emphasis placed on research contributions in tenure decisions, shifting from 25% to 41% (see Table 2.1 below). He concluded that the evaluation of research was becoming more systematic, with additional sources of data being introduced into the review processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1 - Evaluation Trends in the United States, 1978-1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of student ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by department chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of classroom visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of course syllabi and exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: Seldin, 1999a.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the 1990s, contradictory experiences and perceptions regarding the recognition of teaching and research were revealed in a number of studies. The Smith Report (1991), which focused on the quality of undergraduate teaching and the contributions of faculty development in Canada, concluded that “[t]eaching is seriously undervalued at Canadian universities and nothing less than a total re-commitment to it is required" (p. 63). In their survey of some 51,000 Canadian and American faculty, Gray, Diamond and Adam (1996) found that although faculty and academic administrators indicated that they supported a balance between research and teaching they each believed that the other group privileged research. Respondents further indicated that even though their institutions stressed the importance of teaching, there was no “tangible evidence of change” (Gray et al., 1996, p. 21) in personnel decisions (merit, tenure and promotion).
Studies from the United Kingdom in the 1990s found that not only was there a general perception that promotions were based solely on research contributions, there was also insufficient recognition of teaching across the higher education sector (National Committee of Inquiry Into Higher Education (NCIHE), *Dearing Report*, 1997). These findings were corroborated by Court (1999) who found that the majority of the faculty he surveyed (n = 561) believed their institutions placed too much emphasis on research in appointment and promotion decisions and too little on teaching. Beyond attitudes and perceptions, Gibbs (1995) cites a United Kingdom study that found even though 96% of institutions included teaching excellence in their promotion criteria, only 11% of promotions were actually made on this basis, with 38% of institutions reporting that no promotions were made on teaching excellence.

Initiatives such as the Higher Education Academy and the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme were put in place to address what were viewed in the *Dearing Report* (NCIHE, 1997) as shortcomings in relation to the recognition of teaching in the United Kingdom. However, the 2003 *White Paper on the Future of Higher Education* identified many of the same issues as the *Dearing Report*, suggesting that change had yet to be fully implemented across the United Kingdom sector. In their findings the authors of the *White Paper* once again called for improved recognition of teaching. Further studies have revealed that sustained local and national efforts to reverse this trend have had limited impact. In his examination of these initiatives, Parker (2008) found that institutional promotion criteria and policies still did not yet reflect a level of parity between research and teaching activity that they had hoped to manifest. Here, many have pointed the finger at national schemes that focus on research, specifically the Research
Assessment Exercise, arguing that this resulted in a diminished emphasis on teaching (Court, 1999; Greenbank, 2006).18

A number of Australian studies have also revealed a disconnect between policy and practice through an examination of existing reward structures and interviews with faculty (Ramsden, Margetson, Martin & Clark, 1995; Ramsden & Martin, 1996). Findings indicate that faculty have doubts about the impact of certain initiatives that aim to enhance teaching and recognize effective teaching.

The results of this study demonstrate two important discrepancies: between what universities and their senior managers say they do to recognize good teaching, and what the staff themselves perceive they do; and between the value that staff would like teaching to be accorded, and the value which they believe that it is in fact accorded. The general picture is of a higher education system that is making progress towards greater recognition of teaching but whose component institutions have yet to develop a comprehensive approach consistent with best practice, to reward their academic staff (Ramsden et al., 1995, p. 14).

In contrast to the studies cited above, a 1997 survey conducted by Diamond and Adam found that American faculty and administrators reported a renewed emphasis on teaching was occurring at their institutions. This study revealed that in eight of eleven doctoral and research universities surveyed in 1996-1997, “faculty, department chairs’ and deans’ perceptions about their institutions have shifted away from a research emphasis toward a balance between teaching and research” (1997, p. 1). Similarly, a national survey of college and university faculty conducted by the Carnegie Foundation in 1997 found that 45% of faculty reported that teaching was counting more in personnel decisions than it had in the previous five years (Huber, 2002, p. 77).

---

18 See also Trowler, Fanghanel & Wareham (2006) for more on the impact policies and of government initiatives to enhance teaching and learning in the United Kingdom.
By the early 21st century, the pendulum appeared to be swinging in favour of research again. A report released by the United States’ Spellings Commission (U.S. Department of Education, 2006) found inconsistent and often insufficient attention being paid to teaching. Remler and Pema (2009) point out that “in recent decades, institutions of higher education have increasingly emphasized research, with faculty being promoted and rewarded more and more on the basis of research” and note that many have argued that “higher education is neglecting teaching in favour of research to the detriment of students’ education” (p. 1).

A number of studies and surveys support this claim. For example, in a small study of twelve departments at a southwestern university in the United States, Yon, Burnap and Kohut (2002) found that research was considered the most important criterion in tenure decisions, with teaching coming second. Similarly, a national survey (Rothgeb & Burger, 2009) of chairs (n=384) found that research was also dominant in tenure decisions in political science departments. This study also found that superior research frequently compensated for mediocre teaching (with 55% of those departments offering doctoral studies reporting this to be the case, 34% of those offering master’s institutions and 17% of those offering bachelor’s degrees). However, the study did find that at 64% of the departments focusing on undergraduate education, mediocre research could compensate for superior teaching. Overall, the study found that research was identified as the most important factor in tenure decisions in 76% of PhD granting departments (with 21% and 6% at master’s and bachelor’s degree granting departments respectively); conversely teaching was identified as the most important factor at 48% of institutions offering BAs (with 24% at those offering master’s degrees, and 3% of those
offering PhDs); and in some cases teaching and research were rated equally (20% at BA, 37% at master’s and 16% at PhD institutions).\textsuperscript{19}

In a 2007 review conducted in the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) at Harvard University, the committee’s final report concluded that,

The problem lies, for the most part, not in individual values but in what the institution seems to prioritize and reward in its official, publicly visible routines. In principle, FAS expects all faculty members to do what many in fact do: devote comparable time during the academic year to teaching and research, and teach undergraduates as well as graduate students. But in institutional practice cutting-edge academic research is what FAS celebrates and most consistently rewards. A similar situation certainly prevails at other leading research universities... The ways we appoint and promote faculty; our modes of training graduate students; the stories we feature in Harvard’s publications and on its websites; and our discussions of scholarly ideas – all focus overwhelmingly on individual, professionally certified breakthroughs in academic research (Harvard University, 2007, p. 6).

Here, the committee argued that the Faculty steer away from adopting a dual career track system, whereby some faculty focus on teaching and others on research. Instead, they put forth a series of recommendations to improve and enhance current reward structures that emphasize and recognize contributions in both teaching and research.

In Canada, over a decade ago, Bercuson et al. (1997), without any direct evidence, raised the concern that “the assessment of teaching has increasingly come to be pronounced the most important component of the road that leads to tenure” (p. 132). They argued that this tendency will only “weaken Canadian universities even more, ensure that they become truly mediocre and brain dead, and likely drive out the best researching faculty, the ones with

\textsuperscript{19} Similar findings are reported by Mundy & Premeaux (2001) in their survey of department faculty, deans and chairs at American institutions. They found that 36% of deans, 34% of chairs and 39% of faculty felt research was afforded too much importance in tenure decisions.
international and national reputations” (p. 132). It is not evident that this projection has played out in practice at Canadian universities.

In a 2010 study (Britnell et al., 2010) that surveyed 876 Canadian faculty and administrators most respondents indicated that teaching was “very important” (78.2%) or “important” (17.5%) to their overall professional practice (p. 22). When asked about whether their institutions viewed teaching accomplishments as important for personnel decisions (annual reviews, promotion, tenure, merit) a high number said they felt teaching was viewed as “very important” (29.7%) or “important” (31.8%) and a similar number of respondents indicated that teaching was viewed as “somewhat important” (26.4%) (p. 23). However, the majority of these respondents also indicated that they “strongly agreed” (39.3%) or “agreed” (34.6%) that “research, not teaching pays off in enhanced reputation, respect of peers and access to funds” (p. 36).

The belief that research is privileged in the academic reward system is longstanding in the Canadian context. Here, faculty and administrators have continued to reveal concerns about the lack of recognition for teaching across our higher education landscape (Smith, 1991; Wright & Associates, 1995). Moreover, Canada, unlike the United Kingdom or the United States, has lacked significant national efforts to encourage (or pressure) universities to address this situation (Kreber, 2007). Instead, any initiatives to recognize or reward teaching at Canadian universities have primarily emerged at the institutional level.

**Emphasizing Teaching in Higher Education**

Due to these attitudes and realities about the positioning of teaching, many working in the field of higher education began calling for reform. One of the most cited and arguably most
influential voices calling for institutions to rebalance their focus on research and teaching was that of Ernest Boyer. In *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), Boyer challenged traditional notions of academic work. This seminal text, which was, in part, a response to concerns about the quality of higher education helped to mobilize the increased focus on and attention to teaching practice. In Boyer’s estimation, the heavier emphasis on research over teaching, particularly in relation to tenure and promotion had led to a lack of recognition of one of the key aspects, and obligations, of faculty - ultimately restricting creativity. He also raised concerns that teaching was often considered a “routine function” (p. 23); however, in his view, if defined as *scholarship* teaching both educates and entices future scholars. As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must, above all, be well informed, and steeped in knowledge of their fields... Teaching is also a dynamic endeavor... Pedagogical approaches must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and relate directly to the subject taught. With this vision, great teachers create a common ground of intellectual commitment. They stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over. Further, good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners....teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well...Without the teaching function, continuity of knowledge will be broken and the store of human knowledge dangerously diminished (pp. 23-24).

Boyer called on higher education to “break out of the tired old teaching versus research debate and define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar” (p. xii). His four categories of scholarship were presented as an antidote to this systemic problem, and included:

- **the scholarship of discovery** – the pursuit and investigation of new knowledge and subsequent contributions to the field;
- **the scholarship of integration** – the connection of knowledge and discovery into broader contexts and the building of connections across disciplines.
- **the scholarship of application** – the application of knowledge involving engagement and broader notions of service; and,
- **the scholarship of teaching** – the transmission, transformation and extension of knowledge.
For Boyer, there was no hierarchy in this paradigm - each of the four areas of scholarship was, and should be, equally weighted. He argued that higher education needed a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar – a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching. We acknowledge that these four categories – the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching – divide intellectual functions that are tied inseparably to each other. Still, there is value, we believe, in analyzing the various kinds of academic work, while also acknowledging that they dynamically interact, forming an interdependent whole (pp. 24-25).

With this categorization, and with the scholarship of teaching in particular, Boyer recognized and helped to legitimize a scholarly approach to teaching – already being undertaken by faculty and educational developers across North America (as will be discussed below). While the study of pedagogy had previously been primarily confined to faculties of education with a particular focus on kindergarten through to high school, Boyer called on the entire academic community to conduct similar research in and apply findings to the area of higher education.  

Boyer’s paradigm challenged scholars of higher education to broaden their understanding of teaching, which included a shift from thinking about teaching solely in terms of actions to viewing it as something that faculty can study and explore in more depth. This approach influenced the research on what it means to be an effective teacher and that which focuses on the evaluation of teaching overall. Boyer’s approach has not only impacted the work of other scholars, but it has also informed institutional tenure policies and related documents.

---

20 For a look at current understandings and perceptions of the Scholarship of Teaching see Kreber (2002).
21 In the United States, a number of institutions have incorporated Boyer’s categories into their evaluation guidelines. Huber (2002) discusses how this was done at Oregon State University and Kent State University, for example.
Faculty Development Initiatives in Canada and Abroad

Long before the publication of Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered (1990), a group of faculty and administrators within higher education were already working to focus attention on teaching and its improvement. Faculty developers “working in the trenches” can be credited for, at least in part, as Knapper (2001, 2003) has suggested, ensuring that conversations about teaching were occurring in higher education. This section provides a review of the rise of “faculty development”.

In Canada, the term “faculty development” has been used to define a wide range of activities that most often includes programming related to teaching and learning initiatives and strategies (e.g. workshops, seminars, courses), formative assessment activities (e.g. peer assessment, on-site teaching observations), and one-on-one consultations (e.g. on the development of teaching dossiers, review of teaching materials and award nominations). These initiatives are now frequently located in and organized through the efforts of formal teaching and learning centres which can now be found at most universities across Canada.22 The term “faculty development” is often used interchangeably with “educational development” and those engaged in this sort of work are commonly referred to as faculty or educational developers.

Gaff (1975) categorizes faculty development into three areas: faculty development which incorporates programs and supports to assist faculty in knowledge and skill acquisition; instructional development which includes programs dedicated to the facilitation of student learning, which may include assisting with the design of teaching materials or courses; and,  

22 The Society for Teaching & Learning in Higher Education web site lists many of these Canadian centres and provides direct links to individual sites at: [http://www.stlhe.ca/en/links/teaching_centre.php](http://www.stlhe.ca/en/links/teaching_centre.php)
organizational development which addresses efforts to create effective teaching and learning environments. Curriculum development is another category that could be added to this framework, as suggested by Bergquist, Phillips and Quehl (1975). For Eble and McKeachie (1985) “faculty development is both a comprehensive term that covers a wide range of activities ultimately designed to improve student learning and a less broad term that describes a purposeful attempt to help faculty members improve their competence as teachers and scholars” (p. 11).

The first wave of formalized faculty development initiatives in Canada can be traced back to the late 1960s and early 70s, a period that saw the emergence of teaching centres and committees at institutions of higher education (Wilcox, 1997). These developments followed on the heels of similar efforts across the United States, Britain and Australia (Centra, 1976; Gaff & Justice, 1978; Wilcox, 1997). In some cases, early initiatives could be attributed to one or two individuals or small groups of faculty dedicated to exploring teaching improvement practices, whereas other institutions established more formal units, as was done at McGill in 1969 with the opening of their Centre for University Teaching and Learning – one of Canada’s first centres (Wilcox, 1997).

Through the 1970s and 80s, a number of other significant developments occurred within this field of practice in Canada, including: the establishment of CAUT’s Professional Orientation Committee, which became the Teaching Effectiveness Committee; the creation of the Ontario Universities Program in Instructional Development (OUPID), which from 1973-1980 provided grants to institutions to explore a range of teaching and learning initiatives and projects; the founding of the Canadian Society for Studies in Higher Education in 1970 and in 1981 of the
Society for Teaching & Learning in Higher Education (STLHE); and the creation of the 3M National Teaching Fellowship (1986) and the Canadian Journal of Higher Education (1971; CJHE). By the late 80s and 90s new university-funded centres for teaching and learning were emerging across Canada (Wilcox, 1997).

A similar scenario was playing out in the United States during this period, by the mid-1970s, over half of higher education institutions had programs for faculty development (Centra, 1976; Fletcher & Patrick, 1998; Gaff & Justice, 1978). The development of a number of national agencies can also be traced to this period including the Danforth Foundation’s Centers for Teaching and Learning, the Lilly Endowment, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation’s Center for the Teaching Professions, all of which provided funding for faculty development-related projects. This period also saw the establishment of the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education which continues to bring together professionals and academics from across the country for faculty development training, resources, support and annual conferences (Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Gaff & Justice, 1978).

Over the past decade in Canada, faculty developers have extended their reach and are frequently asked to provide input relating to policy directions and development at the institutional level and/or at the provincial level. In Ontario, for example, the Council of Ontario Education Developers (COED), established in 2007, with representation from colleges and universities across the province, has entered into partnerships, collaborated with, and consulted with the Council of Ontario Universities and the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents. Similarly, members of the national body, the Society for Teaching & Learning in
Higher Education (STLHE), have engaged in similar activities with both provincial, national and international agencies and organizations.

Centra (1976), Gaff and Justice (1978) and others have attributed the rise of faculty development initiatives to a range of issues, among them changing enrolment patterns which resulted in an inequitable distribution of faculty across disciplines; wider variance in student preparedness resulting from shifts in admissions standards; new budget restrictions; decreased faculty mobility; and, a high number of tenured faculty which limited hiring opportunities. Eble and McKeachie (1985) add to this list “increased requirements for accountability, and a faculty adversely affected by these and other conditions” which led institutions to look to faculty development initiatives. (Interestingly, many of these are also factors that influenced the rise of bargaining on university campuses.) Centra (1976) argues that all of this led to a situation whereby institutions were losing vitality, and thus “[t]eaching improvement programs and faculty renewal efforts of various kinds have become a partial remedy for this steady state condition” (p. 1). He further asserts that rising disenchantment with the quality of instruction in higher education – among students, parents and legislators – also contributed to the increasing focus on faculty development. Gaff and Justice (1978) suggest that faculty development provided a means to address these concerns and bring “about change within institutions” while “potentially address[ing] their needs for flexibility, efficiency, and effectiveness. It was a means for reordering priorities within departments or across the entire institutions” (p. 86).

This early period of faculty development efforts was supported by a growing body of related scholarship that helped to define current practices, which included such works as: Centra’s *Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities* (1976); Eble’s
Professors as Teachers (1972); A Handbook for Faculty Development (1975) by Bergquist, Phillips and Quehl; Smith’s Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education (1976); Gaff’s Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty instructional and organizational development (1975); and Knapper’s If teaching is important... (1977).

Research in the field of faculty development has continued to expand in Canada and abroad. Much of this scholarship provides information, strategies and advice for practitioners. Increased attention is being paid to the assessment of faculty development initiatives (Britnell et al., 2010; Kreber & Brook, 2001; Elen et al., 2007). A few scholars have produced histories of faculty development in other jurisdictions (see for example, Centra, 1976; Gaff & Justice, 1978; and Fletcher & Patrick, 1998 for the US) but there has been significantly less attention paid to this in Canada. One study, conducted by Wilcox (1997) provides a useful summary of the rise and spread of faculty development efforts in Canada, but is limited in scope. Knapper has discussed in brief some of the origins of faculty development in Canada, as have Wright and Associates (1995), Konrad (1985), and Boehnert and Moore (1983); however, additional thorough reviews have yet to be undertaken.23

Impact of faculty development initiatives on teaching practice, institutional culture and policies
A comprehensive understanding of the overall impact of faculty development initiatives on individual teaching practice, institutional culture and university policies is not entirely easy to obtain. Only a handful of studies on a provincial, national or international scale have been undertaken. Evaluation of efforts at the local university level has not been systematic and

23 Some studies of the history of faculty development initiatives within the medical disciplines have been conducted, see McLeod, & Steinert (2010).
existing studies are rarely longitudinal in scope. In fact, there remains general inconsistency in
the level and frequency of program review at teaching and learning centres and the evaluation
that does occur is typically focused on participant satisfaction with particular programs or on
specific aspects of faculty development work (e.g. workshops, courses, consultations; see Rust,
1998, for example). Such studies can, and have, successfully demonstrated the effectiveness of
certain faculty development activities and initiatives, and the less than stellar impact of
others. Further studies have continued to demonstrate that instructors adapt their teaching
methods or philosophies following involvement with faculty development offices and/or
initiatives (Evers & Hall, 2009; Gibbs & Coffey, 2000, 2004; Stes, Clement & Van Petegem, 2007;
Sword, 2008) or that faculty conceptions of teaching shift (Britnell et al., 2010; Gibbs & Coffey,
that faculty development can lead to change at the level of the instructor, hypothesizing that “if
there is a (strong) positive impact in terms of individual changes, participants will also be able
and prepared to contribute to creating a new organizational teaching culture” (p. 103). Unfortu-
nately, while the qualitative data from this study indicated that individuals made
changes to their own teaching practice and that the training altered their thinking about and

Centra’s (1976) study of 756 two and four year colleges and universities in the United States examined the
perceived effectiveness of some 45 faculty development practices which he grouped into five categories:
institution-wide; analysis or assessment; workshops, seminars, or similar presentations; media, technology, and
course development; and, miscellaneous. Centra found certain practices to be less effective including: annual
teaching awards (38% of institutions surveyed ranked this as effective); and the distribution of a newsletter (27%
found this to be effective). However, a higher number of institutions found other practices more effective,
including: summer grants for projects to improve instruction (70%); sabbatical leaves with at least half salary
(66%); temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision or research area (64%).
Periodic review of the performance of faculty members (tenured or not) was ranked as effective at 59% of
institutions surveyed. See also studies conducted by Gray & Radloff, 2008 and Piccinin, 1999.

The study posed the following question: What is the relationship between the individual impact (in terms of
changes in teaching behaviour and instructional conceptions) and the institutional impact (in terms of involvement
in teaching at the organizational level?
approaches to teaching in general, the collected data could not affirm that institutional change had or could occur.

While some research has outlined how a more systematic and comprehensive evaluation of faculty development initiatives might be undertaken (Friedman & Stomper, 1983; Gibbs, 2005; Hoyt & Howard, 1978; Kreber & Brook, 2001), such thorough studies have not yet been satisfactorily conducted (Donald, 1986; Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Konrad, 1983; Kreber & Brook, 2001; Prebble et al., 2005; Rust, 1998; Stes et al., 2007). As Sword (2008) notes “academic developers have thus far failed to ‘prove’ the direct impact of such initiatives on undergraduate education” (p. 88). However, anecdotally, those with decades of experience working in the field can attest to the fact that “there are more conversations about teaching, more reflection about teaching practice and effects on learning, and here developers have played an important role in taking teaching out of the closet and validating the efforts of those faculty who care deeply about education” (Knapper, 2003, p. 6). Although, in his report card on educational development, Knapper cautions, “if we are to judge the success of educational development by our growth in numbers and acceptability we perhaps merit a B grade; in terms of effects on higher education practice, however, we would earn at best an A for effort, but probably a C for impact, with one or two As for specific accomplishments in particular contexts” (p. 7). Thus, “[p]roviding a definite, evidence-based answer” to the question as to “whether the quality of teaching and learning in higher education has indeed improved since the inception and spread of educational development world-wide...is clearly not possible” (p. 6). Therefore, the sustained impact of faculty development programs at the institutional level remains difficult to gauge.
However, without a doubt, current understandings of teaching and teaching practice and the scholarship of teaching and learning owe a great deal to the work and contributions of the faculty development community. Knapper (quoted in Wilcox, 1997) has argued that “educational developers have helped promote an approach to teaching which is more thoughtful and methods that are more varied; and they have legitimized conversations about teaching and learning on university campuses” (p. 9). They have done this at the local, institutional, regional and national levels while continuing to carry out programming through both informal and formal efforts. While some of this impact still lacks formal analysis, there is no doubt that in areas such as the development and administration of course evaluations and the rise and spread of teaching dossier use across North America owes much to professionals working in the field of educational development. In fact, faculty developers were instrumental in introducing these mechanisms to higher education and in supporting their use within this environment. They have also published extensively on these two topics but their contributions extend beyond course evaluations and teaching dossiers. Faculty developers have continually researched their own work and that of the faculty they support and are responsible for much of the formal and informal research on teaching, tracing back several decades and continuing today. Their contributions form a part of a burgeoning field of research that has addressed a wide array of teaching topics and issues including:

- Teaching enhancement strategies and creative pedagogies (Brookfield, 2006; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; McKeachie, 2006)
- Reflective practice (Biggs, 2001; Brookfield, 2006; Hubball, Collins & Pratt, 2005; Pratt & Collins, 2000; Shulman, 1993)
• Teaching assessment mechanisms, such as course evaluations (Cashin, 1995; Gravestock and Gregor Greenleaf, 2008b; McKeachie, 1996; Ory, 2000; Ory & Ryan, 2001; Theall & Franklin, 2001); peer observation (Centra et al., 1987; DeZure, 1999); dossiers (CAUT, 2007a; Knapper, 2001; Knapper & Wilcox, 2007; Seldin, 1984a, 1999a, 2004, 2006)
• Teaching evaluation frameworks (Arreola, 2000; Cashin, 1996; Centra, 1993; Colbeck, 2002; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; Pratt, 1997; Seldin, 1999a, 2006).

Effective Teaching Evaluation Frameworks: Recommendations from the Literature

Calls for increased attention to be paid to teaching in higher education have been consistently voiced for more than forty years in numerous jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States and Canada. These have come from both within and from outside universities and have led to a range of efforts that aim to heed these calls. While there is disagreement about the ability of some initiatives to bring about the necessary change, there is general agreement in the literature that reward structures can impact teaching quality and enhancement within institutions (Fairweather, 2002a, b, 2005; Gibbs & Habeshaw, 2003; Knapper, 2003; Ramsden & Martin, 1996). As Fairweather (2002a) writes,

The principal expression of academic values about faculty work lies in the promotion and tenure decisions. It is here rather than in institutional rhetoric that the faculty seek clues about the value of different aspects of their work. It is here that productivity is most meaningfully defined and evaluated (p. 27).

A significant portion of the research on teaching evaluation has focused on ways to improve tenure policies and frameworks. In Canada, scholars such as Knapper (2003) have identified this as an area that requires significant improvement,

...[T]here is a great deal about university teaching that remains problematic, and which stubbornly resists the precepts about good practice that developers have been preaching for several decades. A contributing, if not causal factor, to this
state of affairs is the academic rewards system, which has been the subject of much pointed criticism by educational developers (for example, Knapper, 1997). Notwithstanding arguments about how teaching and research mutually reinforce one another, there is no question that funded research and publication of results in scholarly journals has become increasingly prestigious and dominant in universities worldwide. One is tempted to believe that this is in part not because of any measurable impact on quality of life or human productivity, but because dollars and numbers of publications are easy to measure and count, whereas measuring the effects of university education on student learning through life is almost impossible (pp. 6-7).

The notion that teaching contributions are impossible or difficult to measure effectively is raised frequently in the literature (Adell & Carter, 1972; Bercuson et al., 1997; England, 1996; Knapper, 2003). In part, this notion stems from the idea that teaching approaches vary significantly, but this very fact makes the need for empirical evidence all the more essential. As Knapper (2001) points out,

Evaluation will take place, even in the absence of solid evidence, based on such sources as hearsay and gossip. And teaching is such an important activity for universities that we would be well advised to make the process as informed and helpful as possible (p. 4).

Others have questioned the way in which judgments of faculty work are made, by whom and based on what criteria and evidence, and more specifically on the way in which teaching is assessed at the tenure juncture. Following interviews with faculty, Adell and Carter (1972) concluded that,

few Canadian universities have made sustained efforts to find out how well their members are discharging their traditional duties. Contributions to departmental, faculty, or university administration are highly visible, quite easily evaluated and therefore given more weight than they deserve. Publications and other research are also visible and are readily susceptible to peer evaluation...As for teaching, although it is generally acknowledged to be comparable in importance to research and of greater importance than administrative work, it is carried on behind closed doors for the benefit of a group of non-peers, whose views on how well it is done are not often enough solicited. Even if such views are obtained – and more departments have in fact begun to obtain them – their
reliability is commonly suspect, either because of a fear that students will not be frank or that they will base their opinions on wrong criteria. Indeed, there is no sign of much agreement among academics on what are the right criteria (p. 9).

Many have expressed concern that tenure decisions are often arbitrary and lack objectivity and that they are guided by personal perceptions or beliefs about the type and value of academic work. Bercuson et al. (1997) have criticized the tenure process for these very reasons, noting that “[t]he quality of the appraisal varies depending on the university…” (p. 137), suggesting that tenure decisions are often made arbitrarily, with committee members often “turning a blind eye to the lack of evidence” (p. 131). Furthermore, they argue that “what one assessor might believe is excellent teaching, another may consider weak” (p. 131) and they therefore conclude that tenure is a “joke” at some institutions and simply a “hurdle” for faculty to clear. It is for this reason that Miller (1987) writes,

I believe that the quality of the promotion and tenure system depends on excellent faculty evaluation. In fact, the components of the faculty evaluation system constitute the foundation on which credible and effective promotion and tenure systems are built (p. xi).

The corollary to the line of reasoning that believes teaching is impossible to assess effectively is one that believes research is intrinsically easy to evaluate. Some have suggested that this is in part why research tends to be emphasized during the review process (Elfrick & Gillespie 1985). However, Remler and Pema (2009) have challenged this notion and argue that

...what is ground-breaking and really important in the creation of new knowledge is frequently unclear. In contrast, teaching is a more uniform product. Moreover, those who have the knowledge to understand cutting-edge research are often few in numbers and may be prone to their own biases and agendas. Those with the knowledge to evaluate good teaching are more numerous. Thus, the comparative ease of measuring research quality may not be as intrinsic to the natures of research and education (p. 20).
They go on to suggest that research may simply appear to be easier to evaluate because of the significant resources that are available to do so, noting that “there is an extensive existing system of peer-review for research, including journal rankings, academic presses and grant review agencies” (p. 20). Added to this list are publication records, awards and membership, citation data and testimonials from international colleagues, means of evaluation which are all viewed as “persuasive and credible judgments about research quality” that “have an aura of objectivity” (Kennedy, 1997, p. 73). In contrast, similar resources have not been developed for the evaluation of teaching (Remler & Pema, 2009) and those used most often come from students and/or departmental colleagues “and are therefore perceived as being more subjective and potentially influenced by friendship, personal loyalty, or other forms of bias” (Kennedy, 1997, p. 73).

**Improving Evaluation Frameworks: Comprehensive Teaching Evaluation Systems**

Over the past four decades, a significant amount of research has focused on addressing the concerns and criticisms regarding tenure and the valuing of teaching, discussed above, through the development of recommendations for improvement. This scholarship has primarily been produced within and about the American higher education system; to a lesser degree within Canada. Much of this work has looked specifically at how the effective evaluation of teaching can be achieved through reward structures, such as tenure and promotion. Many of the recommendations outlined below, apply more broadly to the tenure review process (e.g. Diamond, 1999; Miller, 1987; Seldin, 1980, 1984, 2006), while others address more specifically how teaching is evaluated within this process (e.g. AAUP, 1990b; Arreola, 2000; Cashin, 1996; CAUT, 2007a, b; Colbeck, 2002; Cannon, 2001; Knapper, 2001; Pratt, 1997; Seldin, 1999a, b, c).
Together, they aim to improve the overall evaluation framework and the manner in which teaching is assessed.

The recommendations from this literature have shifted slightly, with some elements being de-emphasized over time and new ones being introduced. But overall, there has been remarkable consistency over the past several decades with a high level of agreement among scholars working in this field of research who have recommended the same, or very similar, evaluation practices for institutions. Additionally, this literature has also considered ways to counter and alter perceptions that teaching is undervalued and that research is overvalued at universities and in tenure decisions. What follows is an overview of the findings of this scholarship. These findings will provide a basis upon which current Canadian practice can be reviewed in the following chapters. More specifically, this study will draw on these ideas and recommendations to analyze current Canadian policies.

_Evaluation goals and purpose_

The scholarship on faculty evaluation advises that well-designed systems must first consider broader overarching goals (Cannon, 2001; Cashin, 1996; Geis, 1977; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Miller, 1987; Ramsden & Martin, 1996; Seldin, 1984; Svinicki & Menges, 1996). As Knapper (2001) cautions there is no question that before institutions, units, or individuals undertake an evaluation of teaching, they should carefully consider the motives for evaluating, the purpose the information will serve, and what actions might be taken as a result to undertake possible future change. If these questions have not been considered (and satisfactorily answered), it is doubtful that the evaluation will achieve anything of value (p. 6).
Further, Knapper recommends that evaluation frameworks should articulate whether or not the assessment serves formative or summative purposes, or both. To this end, the literature recommends that institutions develop a clear statement of purpose for tenure and promotion which will help to provide a context and framework for the establishment of related policies and procedures (Miller, 1987; Seldin 1999a). Such a statement might address tenure and promotion goals, which may include demonstrating an interest in strengthening the academic component of the university and in ensuring students that faculty are effective and able to contribute to a high quality educational experience (Miller, 1987).

Criteria for evaluation: faculty roles and responsibilities
Once institutions determine the purpose and goals of evaluation, they should articulate what will be evaluated. This relates directly to institutional expectations regarding the nature of academic work (ACE, 2000; Diamond, 1999; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Seldin, 2006) and as such is seen as an important component of any tenure policy. However, several reviews of policy and practice in the United States (see Kawar, 1983; Park & Riggs, 1993) have found that institutional policies often lack clarity in relation to tenure criteria which hinders an institution’s ability to make explicit their goals and priorities.

For the most part, tenure-stream faculty are expected to engage in teaching, research and service throughout their careers. Chapter 5 will discuss in more detail how these roles and responsibilities are outlined in institutional documents (policies and/or collective agreements). Typically, institutional evaluation frameworks discretely assess faculty contributions in each of these three areas. However, over the past several decades, many scholars have argued that
this fragmented approach may not effectively evaluate academic work, and more specifically, that it hinders an institution’s ability to accurately assess teaching (Baker, 1986; Boyer, 1990; Colbeck, 2002; Pratt, 1997).

Institutional policies typically state that tenure and promotion to full professor will be granted on the basis of an evaluation of teaching, research and service. While there are certainly common expectations for both processes, there should be some variation in the level of criteria. As tenure is generally granted early in an academic’s career evaluations are based on a shorter length of time. As such, tenure criteria should evaluate contributions made in the pre-tenure period, but should also take into consideration future promise. In contrast, candidates moving forward for promotion have typically passed the mid-point of their career and therefore evaluations should be more firmly based on the range of contributions over the span of their career (ACE, 2000; Diamond, 1999; Miller, 1987; Seldin, 2006). For each, the measures of teaching effectiveness may be the same, or similar, however, institutions may wish to weigh the evidence slightly different for each process. Typically, the bar is set at a higher level for promotion, than that for tenure.

What constitutes teaching?
As already noted, Canadian and American institutions continue to evaluate faculty contributions in three categories: teaching, research and service; however, these areas are not mutually exclusive and faculty typically see the three working together. In recognition of this Colbeck (2002) and others have recommended that institutions develop more integrated
systems of evaluation that recognize all facets of faculty work. As Colbeck (2002) suggests, doing so can impact how faculty view and approach their work. She writes,

[w]hether their work is evaluated in distinct categories or as an integrated whole may affect the extent to which faculty jointly produce teaching, research, and service. Faculty members’ perceptions of how their institutions define and evaluate roles affects how they do their work....It is likely that the more institutional evaluations and rewards separate faculty activities and products into mutually exclusive categories, the less faculty will enrich their teaching with their research, inform their research with lessons learned from their professional services, or engage in public scholarship that integrates teaching, research, and service (p. 44).

Biggs (2001) has argued that faculty evaluation systems often reflect what he calls “distorted priorities” with an over-emphasis on research activity and contributions. In his view, this has resulted in a failed system. Further, as noted earlier, this imbalance in institutional policies can certainly send a message that research is privileged and that it counts more in tenure decisions – regardless of how an institution defines its priorities or mission. The adoption of the four categories of scholarship from the Boyer paradigm (discovery, integration, application and teaching) would further help to break down the research-teaching divide and could help to establish equitable status for teaching by framing it as a form of scholarship. A related approach that also seeks to more effectively integrate teaching and research, recommends adopting the four roles of the teacher-scholar model: teacher as undergraduate research collaborator; teacher as pedagogical expert and consultant; teaching as instructional innovator; and, teacher as textbook author and critic (Baker, 1986). Some have argued that this model not only benefits undergraduate education, but also encourages and supports stronger tenure candidates due to the successful integration of teaching and research (Teagle Working Group, 2007).
Teaching is perhaps most often conceived of in terms of particular activities: undergraduate and graduate classroom teaching, graduate supervision, assessment and course design and curriculum development. However, much of the research recommends moving beyond this type of descriptive and limited understanding of teaching activity (Cannon, 2001; Macfarlane, 2007; Pratt, 1997). Pratt (1997) has argued that we move away from focusing primarily on what teachers do because it ignores an instructor’s “underlying intentions and beliefs that give meaning and justification to these actions” (p. 29). Focusing on the “what” over the “how” results in “technical, rather than substantive, approaches to evaluating teaching” (p. 26). He encourages a multi-dimensional understanding of teaching that moves beyond the classroom and traditional understandings of teaching in terms of activities. Similarly, Cashin (1996) has called for more flexibility to be built into institutional understandings of teaching and into their evaluation systems, which he argues will also allow for the recognition of a broader range of diverse teaching approaches and contexts.

Teaching effectiveness

Once an institution identifies what teaching is, or is not, within its contexts, it is also essential to define how instructors can be effective in that practice (Cashin, 1996; Centra et al., 1987; Gibbs & Habeshaw, 2003; HEA, 2009a, b; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Knapper, 2001; Paulsen, 2002; Ramsden & Martin, 1996). Thus, a key element of any good evaluation framework is its ability to clearly articulate an institution’s understanding of “teaching effectiveness”. If a system fails “to distinguish between poor, adequate, and good teaching” it will, in Seldin’s view, be unsuccessful and will do little to motivate faculty to improve their teaching (Seldin, 1999a, p.
Establishing a clear understanding of what effective/competent or excellent teacher means in relation to the expectations for tenure will also help to ensure clarity and transparency and will frame the institutional understanding and culture of teaching. Such an approach will also help to ensure that individuals involved in assessing teaching are not applying their own definitions.

A number of scholars suggest that there is no clear consensus regarding what constitutes “effective teaching” (Gross Davis, 1988; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Trigwell, 2001). Johnson and Ryan (2000) note that this is problematic for the development of evaluation systems; however, Gross Davis (1988) suggests that there are commonly cited characteristics that can inform our understanding of teaching effectiveness. Seldin (1980) notes that in the past fifty years, a number of research methods have been used to identify some characteristics of good teaching. These include observational analysis, correlation studies, faculty analysis and the critical incident approach (pp. 8-9).

As a result, there is a fair degree of consensus regarding the characteristics of effective teaching (see Bain, 2004; Berk, 2005; Centra et al., 1987; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Eble, 1970; Elfrick & Gillespie, 1983; Gibbs & Habeshaw, 2003; Gross Davis, 1988; Lowman, 1996; Ramsden, et al., 1995; Seldin, 1980; Trigwell, 2001). In general, it is agreed that an effective teacher should be:

- Organized and prepared for class;
- Knowledgeable about and demonstrate a strong interest in the subject matter;
- Able to motivate students;
- Fair and reasonable in their evaluation of student work;
- Able to assist with and encourage student learning;
- Able to encourage discussion;
- Dynamic and energetic in the classroom and possess effective presentation skills; and,
- Interested in their students learning.
Elfrick and Gillespie (1983) found that faculty and students agree on some common characteristics of effective teaching, including: the ability to stimulate student thinking and learning, clarity and organization of presentation, instructor knowledge, quality of course content, and the ability to evaluate fairly and constructively. Further, many have argued that teaching should not be judged as effective without clear evidence of student learning (Angelo, 1996; Astin, 1985, 1999; Bain, 2004; Barr & Tagg, 1995; Ramsden & Martin, 1996). Chickering and Gamson’s often cited Seven Principles of Good Teaching (see Table 2.2 below) reflect this belief. This has led some, including Fenwick (2001) and Knapper (2001), to encourage the development of a more thorough definition of effective teaching that links teaching methods with specific learning outcomes. While a difficult and time consuming process, Knapper argues that in the end it will lead to a more effective evaluation system. Centra, Froh, Gray and Lambert (1987) suggest a broad definition that aims to capture these elements,

Effective teaching produces beneficial and purposeful student learning through the use of appropriate procedures (p. 5).

Such a definition could serve as a starting point for institutions. While some agreement may be possible in terms of effective teaching behaviours, some scholars, including Pratt (2002, 2005) have raised concerns about adopting a narrow definition of “teaching effectiveness”. Pratt cautions that this may lead to the exclusion of some teaching approaches, including those that may be discipline-specific.

Gale (2007) argues that teaching excellence “requires more than knowledge, expertise and commitment to improving learning” but also “a scholarly approach to the practice of teaching and learning” which he refers to as “braided practice” (p. 32). He suggests that there is a baseline competence shared by all successful teachers which includes: knowledge of their
subject matter; an understanding of how to assess student learning; being up-to-date in their field; being excited about the material and the practice of teaching; being reflective and responsive; and the ability to foster critical engagement and active learning (p. 33). Beyond this baseline is “scholarly teaching” which involves “a different kind of commitment and a different way of approaching their profession”. Scholarly teachers are “not only knowledgeable about their field but also well-informed with regard to the latest ideas about how the field is taught and how students learn the discipline” (p. 34). Moreover, according to Gale, “scholarly teaching presupposes improvement; embracing the idea that teaching can and should be enhanced through systematic understanding of practice” (p. 34).

Table 2.2 – Chickering & Gamson’s Seven Principles of Good Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Encourages contacts between students and faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uses active learning technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gives prompt feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emphasizes time on task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communicates high expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Respects diverse talents and ways of learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Chickering & Gamson, 1987)

Standards of performance
Scriven (1981) has defined evaluation as “the process of determining the merit or worth or value of something, or the product of that process” (p. 53). And so, once the goals of evaluation and the criteria are identified institutions must also address expectations relating to standards of performance (ACE, 2000; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Paulsen, 2002; Seldin, 1980, 1984). Aside from indicating the areas of activity upon which a faculty member will be evaluated, institutions must also clearly define the overall criteria and the range of expectations for each activity. If, for example, institutions require that faculty demonstrate “high quality”, a
“strong record of performance”, “scholarly competence” in teaching, or “competence” in either teaching and research and “excellence” in the other, these terms should be defined to ensure transparency in the process and equitable evaluation practices (Gibbs, 1995, 1996; Ramsden & Martin, 1996).

The term “teaching excellence” has garnered much attention in the literature and its meaning and use have been challenged (Skelton, 2005, 2007). As Dobson and Mori (2007) note, Teaching excellence is a slippery term. For anybody who works in a HEI, it is commonly heard and generally regarded as something that should be worked towards. However, many academics and students would agree that it tends to be inchoate and subjective. Nobody is likely to dispute the desirability of excellence in teaching and learning that takes places in higher education institutions (HEIS). However, what teaching excellence means concretely, beyond simply having a flair for teaching, often goes unexplained (p. 183).

In *International Perspectives on Teaching Excellence: Improving Knowledge and Practice* (2007b), edited by Alan Skelton, a series of essays explore the topic of excellence across multiple jurisdictions and in relation to various initiatives, including academic reward structures. In her contribution, Clegg (2007) raises questions about the use of the term “excellence” arguing that this term emerges from an organizational change approach to higher education and is used as a tactic to re-describe and refine efforts at improvement. She further challenges the notion that teaching can only be excellent if it leads to high quality learning outcomes. She argues that learning may be the result of good teaching, but it need not be “excellent”. Since “teaching excellence” has multiple understandings and may be context-specific, when used in institutional policies to establish standards of performance it should be clearly defined to ensure transparency.
Disciplinary contexts

Scholars have long emphasized the need to locate expectations regarding performance standards within the disciplines. As Becher (2001) notes, language, methods, values, attitudes and standards are formed in relation to disciplinary cultures. Moreover, as B.R. Clark argues (1986) “the discipline rather than the institution tends to become the dominant force in the working lives of academics” (p. 30). As such, “higher education must be centred in disciplines, but it must simultaneously be pulled together within enterprises” (p. 32), such as institutions. Therefore, expectations for teaching contributions and effectiveness should also consider and recognize diverse disciplinary teaching approaches and contexts (Colbeck, 2002; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Paulsen, 2002; Rhoades, 2000; Shulman, 1993; Zukas & Malcolm 2007).

Angelo (1996) has suggested that institutions work together to develop “communities of shared reflective judgment” (p. 56) since “assessing teaching is a highly contextual process, which requires the development of ‘communities of shared reflective judgment’ at departmental and institutional levels” (p. 58). As Paulsen (2002) notes, “disciplinary differences also affect the nature and construction of pedagogical content knowledge as well as views of what constitutes effective teaching and how it should be evaluated” (p. 6). Moreover, although institutions set standards and expectations, these are typically communicated through departments.

Mechanisms for evaluation and forms of evidence: how and by whom?

While there is general agreement about the characteristics of effective teaching, some have taken a somewhat different approach to how these elements are assessed. Pratt’s (1997) framework identifies measures that can stand as evidence for each aspect of teaching (see
Table 2.3 for an overview of Pratt’s framework). He recommends a substantive approach to the evaluation of teaching that looks at three particular aspects of teaching: planning; implementation, and results. For each, he suggests particular elements that should be evaluated and the particular measures that can stand as evidence. The literature indicates that such an approach is key to ensuring that the evaluation system is aligned. Keeping in mind that “[t]o be rigorous in the evaluation of teaching requires a fundamental change in approach – one that shifts the focus of evaluation from surface features to deeper structures, and one that asks ‘why’ as well as ‘how’ (Pratt, 1997, p. 41). Trigwell (2001) concurs, and recommends that evaluation frameworks involve both quantitative (e.g. course evaluations and assessment results) and qualitative measures (e.g. the teacher’s philosophy, planning and strategies) and that they look for evidence of a scholarly approach to teaching, teaching plans and strategies derived from a student-focused conception of teaching.

Building on Boyer’s work, and following an examination of existing policies and practices, Glassick, Huber and Maeroff present guidelines and frameworks that aim to establish rigorous evaluation methods in Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate (1997). The authors recommend six qualitative standards for the evaluation of scholarship: clear goals; adequate preparation; appropriate methods; significant results; effective presentation; and, reflective critique. In their view, these can be applied to each of Boyer’s four categories of scholarship, ensuring equitable assessment. Within the Canadian context, McAlpine and Harris (2001) have developed a framework that aims to provide a mechanism for the effective evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions. This framework identifies and defines categories of teaching tasks (similar to those discussed above in relation to the
characteristics of effective teaching): subject matter expertise, design skills, delivery skills, management skills, mentoring/supervision, personal and professional development and departmental development. For each, they have identified sample criteria, relevant artifacts and sources that could be used for evaluation purposes and then based on this, established standards ranging from acceptable to exemplary for each category.

Table 2.3 – Framework for a Substantive Evaluation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Teaching</th>
<th>What to Evaluate</th>
<th>Forms of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Planning: assessment of intentions and beliefs** | • Mastery of content  
• Selection of content  
• Appropriateness of goals/objectives  
• Appropriateness of course materials and requirements  
• Articulation with other programmatic elements | • Reflective memo that discusses the goals for the course and how assignments contribute to these goals  
• Course materials  
• Classroom observation |
| **Implementation: assessment of the fit between actions, intentions, and beliefs** | • Particular technical skills and duties, including: fair treatment of students, clarity of explanations, distribution of discussion, and so on. | • Classroom observation (following established guidelines and practices) |
| **Results: student assessment of learning, course and instructor** | • Estimate of progress on course goals.  
• Information on learning beyond course goals.  
• Overall assessment of the value of the course.  
• Overall assessment of the instructor’s effectiveness. | • Customized student evaluations (that address the four areas for evaluation). |

(Based on Pratt, 1997, pp. 30-39.)

It is well-established that summative decisions should be made on the basis of more than one piece of evidence (Arreola, 2000; Berk, 2005; Cashin, 1996; Centra, 1977, 1979; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Paulsen, 2002; Pratt, 1997; Seldin, 1980, 1984; Wright, 1998), particularly since as Centra (1979) asserts, multiple forms of evidence allow for convergence.
and help to ensure that the evaluation system is comprehensive. Cashin (1990, 1996) and many others (Centra, 1979; Diamond, 1999; Miller, 1987; Seldin, 1980) have cautioned against the use of single indicators when evaluating teaching, as Centra (1977) notes,

no one method of evaluating teaching is infallible for making personnel decisions. Each source is subject to contamination, whether it be possible bias, poor reliability, or limited objectives. And, of course, each shortcoming becomes especially important when the results are to be used in making decisions about people. How then does an institution make fair judgments about teaching performance? Only by using several of the methods as a system of checks and balances, so that the limitations of one method are balanced by the strengths of another (p. 104).

As Berk (2005) further articulates “multiple sources can provide a more accurate, reliable and comprehensive picture of teaching effectiveness than just one source” (p. 49). Many have strongly urged institutions not to rely solely on data collected from student course evaluations. As Fletcher and Patrick (1998) argue, “teaching will not take its full measure of importance in the reward structure if faculty do not believe that the judgments about the quality of instruction are based on objective data” (p. 44). Thus, to ensure equity, they recommend that personnel judgments be “based on a richer picture of a colleague’s scholarly contributions” in line with Boyer’s understanding of scholarship (p. 44). Evidence should also come from more than one type of evaluator, including students, colleagues, administrators and the candidate themselves (Diamond, 1999; Seldin, 1999b) and policies should be clear about the types of evidence they require for tenure review and who should be providing this evidence. (See Table 2.1 above for an overview of trends in the United States in relation to the types of evidence collected for tenure decisions.)
Evidence from the tenure candidate
At one time, the literature on teaching evaluation questioned the utility and validity of instructor self-assessments for use in tenure and promotion decisions (Centra, 1977, 1979). But scholars now agree that evidence of teaching contributions should, in part, come directly from the instructor (including Angelo, 1996; Berk, 2005; Knapper, 2001; Knapper & Wright, 2001; Seldin, 2004, 2006). There are a number of areas for which candidates for tenure can provide a self-assessment of their teaching. These include a reflective appraisal of their course design and delivery, an overview and assessment of their teaching approaches and presentation skills, details about any contributions to curriculum development, and any research, presentations or publications on teaching, information on the design of instructional materials, and their knowledge of the subject area(s) (Gross Davis, 1988). At many institutions in Canada, the United States, Australia and the United Kingdom, it is now common practice for an instructor to compile data related to these areas into a dossier or portfolio.

Teaching dossiers
As Wilcox (1997) notes, the teaching dossier “is the initiative most clearly/commonly identified with educational development in Canada and is recognized as an important contribution to the international educational development scene” (p. 23). The origins of these documents can be traced back to the early 1970s and the recommendation of CAUT to develop a “more broadly based approach to evaluation that would use multiple sources of information and place responsibility for compiling the documentation on the individual faculty rather than a remote
The dossier, in effect, demonstrates an individual’s teaching effectiveness and as noted in the introduction to the CAUT Guide to the Teaching Dossier (2007a),

is a summary of an academic’s major teaching accomplishments and strengths. It is to an academic’s teaching what lists of publications, grants, and academic honours are to research. The teaching dossier is intended to provide short statements which describe the scope and quality of the academic’s teaching (p. 2).

The most common elements found in a dossier today include a comprehensive list of teaching responsibilities (courses taught, students supervised), a teaching philosophy statement, information on pedagogical strategies used inside and outside the classroom, representative course materials, sample student work, and evidence of teaching awards, professional development, mentorship, and research on teaching and learning (Seldin, 1991, 2004). Additional evidence pertaining to course and curriculum development, and contributions to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning may also be requested. (See Appendix A for a list of items recommended by CAUT for inclusion in the teaching dossier and Table 2.4 below for a list of items commonly found in dossiers).

One of the central components of a teaching dossier is the philosophy statement, prepared by the candidate. This document is intended to clarify an instructor’s approach to teaching but to also help contextualize his/her strategies. Such narrative statements allow faculty to “tell the story of what they do and how well they do it” (Braskamp & Ory, 1994, p. 109). They need not be static, but should be revised regularly to address changes in teaching

---

26 Knapper & Wright (2001) track the evolution of this document in Canada and the spread of this practice worldwide.
behaviours and approaches. Furthermore, narrative statements are also an opportunity for faculty to demonstrate how their teaching activities integrate other aspects of their work (research and service) and meet institutional goals (Colbeck, 2002).

Teaching philosophy statements are also particularly useful for those involved in reviewing an individual’s teaching contributions. As Pratt (2005) notes,

in an evaluative review, a personal philosophy statement should help reviewers understand the logic and the heart of someone’s teaching. More than a mere description of aims and means, a philosophy of teaching statement should reveal the deeper structures and values that give meaning and justification to an approach to teaching (pp. 33-34).

However, Pratt (2005) has also highlighted some concerns in relation to the use of these statements within review processes. Specifically, he points out that their use in this context implies that reviewers “will be open to more than one philosophy of teaching” (p. 33) and that an individual instructor’s “philosophy of teaching will be given serious consideration within the review process” (p. 33). To effectively integrate these statements in evaluation processes expectations need to be clear, particularly for those conducting the assessment.

The representative course materials that also form a standard and essential part of a teaching dossier are intended to illustrate a candidate’s knowledge of their discipline; how they organize and present relevant information to students; and, how they develop assignments and assess student learning (CAUT, 2007a; Seldin, 2004). In addition, they contextualize the candidate’s approach to teaching as defined in their philosophy statement, and reveal the strategies they employ to meet teaching and learning objectives.

For many years, Seldin has advocated for the use of teaching dossiers in formal evaluation frameworks and he has helped to popularize this means of documentation and
evaluation. He has been researching and writing about teaching dossiers since 1991, and his work *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions* (2004), is now available in its 3rd edition. Seldin’s (1991) early description of a dossier still reflects current understandings of this document,

> It is a factual description of a professor’s major strengths and teaching achievements. It describes documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor’s teaching performance. It is to teaching what lists if publications, grants and honors are to research and scholarship...It can be used: (1) to gather and present hard evidence and specific data about teaching effectiveness for those who judge performance; and/or (2) to provide the needed structure for self-reflection about which areas of teaching performance need improvement...The teaching portfolio makes no pretense to be an exhaustive compilation of all the documents and materials that bear on teaching performance. Rather, it presents selected information on teaching activities and solid evidence of their effectiveness (pp. 3-4).

Moreover, dossiers allow faculty to demonstrate the integration of their work and illustrate alignment of goals and practice (theirs, that of their department/discipline and the institution).

**Table 2.4 – Ten Most Common Items in a Teaching Dossier**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student course and teaching evaluation data which suggest improvements or produce an overall rating of effectiveness or satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>List of course titles and numbers, unit values or credits, enrollments with brief elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>List of course materials prepared for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participation in seminars, workshops, and professional meetings intended to improve teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Statements from colleagues who have observed teaching either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attempts at instructional innovations and evaluations of their effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unstructured (and possibly unsolicited) written evaluations by students, including written comments on exams and letters received after a course has been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Participating in course or curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Evidence of effective supervision on Honors, Master’s, or Ph.D. thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Student essays, creative work, and projects or field work reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Wright & O’Neil, 1995)
Since the publication of Seldin’s 1991 guide, a proliferation of research on teaching dossiers has occurred with increasing attention being paid to this form of documentation and assessment in the last decade (see for example Knapper & Wright, 2001; Zubizarreta, 1999). This has filtered down to the level of the institution, and in some cases divisions or particular disciplines, with the development of guides and handbooks for faculty (see for example, Baird, 1999; Dawson, 2001; Knapper & Wilcox, 2007). Such documents typically draw on existing research by Seldin and others but also align dossier design and content with institutional criteria for the evaluation of teaching: a practice advocated for by Seldin himself who has repeatedly urged institutions to develop and communicate clear and transparent policies to faculty.

Formal research on the reliability and validity of dossiers is limited (see Anderson, 1993; Centra, 1993; Hutchings, 1996a, b); however, given that they provide thorough and useful contextual evidence regarding teaching responsibilities, accomplishments, objectives and approaches (see Centra, 1977; Seldin, 2004) they are generally viewed as valuable, particularly by members of tenure and promotion committees (Anderson, 1993; Centra, 1993; Knapper & Wright, 2001). Moreover, the evidence provided within dossiers avoids judgments based on reputation or hearsay (Centra, 2000). As Knapper and Wright (2001) note, “the lack of common format for portfolios and the fact that they are compiled by the person being evaluated often leads to suspicion about their reliability and objectivity” (p. 26). Therefore, establishing a list of common items will help to ensure that the decision-making process is more equitable, effective and efficient. Paulsen (2002) also recommends that those assessing dossiers should receive training to enable effective evaluation and that a minimum of four to six reviewers be used in
the evaluation process. In addition, while self-evaluation is certainly an important aspect of teaching evaluation, it can by no means be the primary source of evidence. As Centra (1973, 1977, 2000) and others (see Blackburn & Clark, 1975) point out, faculty do not necessarily see their teaching as others do and in fact, a faculty member’s self-evaluation, may not always agree with assessments made by students, peers or academic administrators.

Evidence from students
Gathering evidence from students is considered to be essential for the comprehensive evaluation of teaching (Cashin, 1996; CAUT, 2006, 2007a, b; Murray, 1980; Seldin, 2004, 2006). In some cases this evidence may be provided by a faculty member or his/her home unit in the form of graded student work, standardized test scores or copies of student publications (Seldin, 2004). The literature suggests several means through which feedback can be collected more directly from students, including through the conducting of interviews, the solicitation of letters, and most frequently the administration of course evaluations (or student evaluations of teaching).

Course evaluations have long been a standard form of evidence for the evaluation of teaching, in Canada and the United States, dating back to the 1960s when they were first introduced through student efforts to voice their opinions about their educational experiences (Gravestock & Gregor Greenleaf, 2008b). In his review of evaluation practices spanning thirty years, Seldin (1999a) notes a 30% increase in student course evaluations with 54% of institutions reporting they were used in 1978 and 88% in 1998 (see Table 2.4 below).27

---

In Canada, faculty development offices were engaged early in conversations about and initiatives relating to the student evaluation of teaching and many were tasked with developing or reforming institutional evaluation systems in the 1960s and 1970s (i.e. McGill, see Wilcox, 1997). Since that time, ongoing efforts have been made by institutions and professional associations to improve course evaluation practices and processes in the belief that “a better system of accountability for teaching would increase attention to teaching effectiveness in the distribution for rewards...” and “that better evaluation systems would help faculty diagnose the extent to which they reached students” (Gaff & Justice, 1978, p. 88). An AAUP and Association of American Colleges project (Project to Improve College Teaching, 1969-1971), funded by the Carnegie Foundation, encouraged the increased use of course evaluation instruments “for it was felt that by identifying and evaluating teaching skills, ways might also be found to assist faculty in acquiring further teaching competence” (Gaff, 1975, p. 9).

Course evaluations are now consistently recommended in the literature as an essential means of gathering data for the evaluation of teaching (see Seldin, 2004, 2006; Theall & Franklin, 2001). When these tools first emerged and during the early years of their administration there was less consensus regarding their ability to provide useful information for such purposes. Studies conducted through the 1970s and into the 1980s revealed a fair amount of skepticism about their effectiveness. In more recent decades, most of the criticism regarding course evaluations tends to be voiced in editorials or opinion pieces, rather than in scholarly studies.

Course evaluations have been extensively studied over the past several decades, more so than most other areas relating to teaching in higher education (see Gravestock & Gregor...
Greenleaf, 2008 for an overview of this research). This substantial body of scholarship has addressed the development of evaluation questionnaires, the focus and wording of questions, and the administration, interpretation and use of evaluations. Much of this literature has also been devoted to examining issues of validity, reliability and bias. The reliability and internal validity of these instruments is now widely accepted by scholars and overall, this literature has concluded that course evaluations can be an effective measure of teaching within certain parameters (see Abrami, 2001; Cashin, 1995; CAUT, 2006; Feldman, 1996; Greenwald, 1997; Kulik, 2001; Marsh, 1987; Ory & Ryan, 2001; Theall & Franklin, 2001 and others). This literature does acknowledge that bias may potentially be introduced when evaluation instruments are poorly constructed, the goals and purpose of such evaluations are not aligned with the instrument and its questions, when the administration of evaluations is inconsistent or improperly managed and when data are misinterpreted or over-analyzed. However, when these conditions are controlled, course evaluations can and are a valid measure that can be effectively used as part of a larger teaching evaluation framework.

Additionally, the literature on course evaluations has also concluded that these instruments need to ask questions that are both meaningful to students and those to which they can accurately respond. Evaluations should ask students to provide feedback on their learning experience and the instructor’s ability to positively impact this experience. Studies have demonstrated that students are reliable and effective at evaluating teaching behaviours (for example, presentation, clarity, organization, and active learning techniques), the amount they have learned, the ease or difficulty of their learning experience in the course, workload, and the validity and value of the assessment methods (Nasser & Fresko, 2002; Ory & Ryan,
2001; Scriven, 1995; Theall & Franklin, 2001; Wachtel, 1998; Wagenaar, 1995). Additionally, students can be asked to comment on course design (including in-class activities, readings, and assignments) and the presentation of material as these pertain to their learning (Gross Davis, 1988; Paulsen, 2002). It has also been demonstrated that data collected from students on these elements correlates well to that gathered from other sources including peers and the instructor (Kulik, 2001). In contrast, there are particular aspects of teaching that researchers agree students should not be asked to provide feedback on, primarily the instructor’s knowledge of a particular subject matter (Cashin, 1995, 1999; Ory & Ryan, 2001; Seldin, 2004, 2006; Theall & Franklin, 2001). It is widely recommended that this is better assessed by academic colleagues.

Evidence from peers
The literature stresses the importance of engaging peers in the process of evaluating teaching. However, while peer review is a common method for assessing research contributions, it is less so for teaching. This may be due in part because teaching is often viewed as a private activity or as Cavanagh (1996) suggests, may result from a certain level of discomfort on the part of faculty who are unclear about what constitutes effective teaching. Or it may relate to the belief that

Peer evaluation of faculty as it pertains to teaching produces oftentimes no more than a personality evaluation since many actually are not trained in identifying behaviors constituting good teaching. With increased pressure to succeed, some faculty may have become competitive and would welcome opportunity to underrate a colleague (Crase & Crase, 1976, p. 57).

Peer review can help to ensure that teaching is valued and respected, as it has for research (Elfrick & Gillespie, 1985; Hutchings, 1996; Paulsen, 2002). Since peer review “brings content-
based contextuality to the evaluation of teaching” (Paulsen, 2002, p. 10), peers are considered to be an ideal source for the evaluation of course design, teaching materials, command of the subject matter, presentation skills, curricular contributions, the effectiveness of pedagogical approaches, assessment measures and the direction of student research (Angleo, 1996; Arreola, 2000; Berk, 2005; Gross Davis, 1988; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Seldin, 2004). Paulsen (2002) has further argued that the work of individual faculty members is valued more when it is subjected to rigorous peer review and argues this is why research is more highly valued. Shulman (1993) states that teaching must be seen as something whose value we have an obligation to peer review. Moreover, Paulsen (2002) also believes that like research, teaching quality could improve through a peer review process involving dialogue and debate. To assess these elements, it is recommended that colleagues review course materials, student work, and observe the instructor teaching (Gross Davis, 1988) using a standardized set of procedures (Arreola, 2000).

While the peer evaluation of teaching tends to occur within an institution, efforts have been made to extend this to those outside the tenure candidate’s university, following a process similar to that undertaken for the review of research. A number of initiatives currently in place, like MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching, www.merlot.org), the Peer Review of Teaching Project (www.courseportfolio.org) and the American Sociological Association’s project TRAILS (the Teaching Resources and Innovations Library for Sociology, http://www.asanet.org/teaching/resources/TRAILS.cfm), provide opportunities for faculty to have their teaching-related materials peer-reviewed. The TRAILS
system uses a two-level process for vetting entries so that teaching materials will garner greater respect when included as part of a tenure dossier.

There is much discussion in the literature about the benefits of integrating classroom observation into the evaluation process. While this was once considered an unreliable method of evaluation “fraught with hazards” (Crase & Crase, 1976; see also Centra, 1977, 1979), others suggest that well-designed procedures can help to ensure an effective process (Cavanagh, 1996; DeZure, 1999; Paulsen, 2002). Classroom observations are increasingly common and are viewed as potentially effective forms of teaching evaluation for both summative and formative purposes (Cavanagh, 1996; DeZure, 1999; Seldin, 1980, 1984; Wright & O’Neill, 1995). Moreover, in-class observations allow for the assessment of an instructor’s knowledge of course content, curriculum development, and course design all of which, as noted above, cannot be evaluated by students. There is evidence to show that colleague ratings correlate well with other forms of teaching assessment and thus, they are now generally viewed as a valid and reliable source of data (Aleamoni, 1987; Arreola, 2000). Most have cautioned, as with other forms of evidence, that personnel decisions should not be based solely on classroom observations (DeZure, 1999; Paulsen, 2002; Seldin, 1980).

Assessing the evidence and making decisions
Evidence on teaching effectiveness can also be gathered from other sources, including alumni, departmental chairs and external colleagues (Centra, 1979; Diamond, 1999; Gross Davis, 1988; Murray, 1980; Seldin, 1999a, 2004), although the literature has focused more heavily on indicators and assessments from the instructor and his/her peers and students. The bottom line
is to ensure that multiple forms of evidence are gathered from a variety of sources and that they are reviewed by several members of a review committee and taken into account throughout the various levels of evaluation (Centra, 2000). The goal is to enable and look for alignment from all sources so that a comprehensive, fair and objective evaluation can be conducted. In an effort to acknowledge the integrated nature of faculty work, Colbeck (2002) recommends that institutions adopt activity reports that enable instructors to demonstrate how various facets of their work intersect. She suggests several options including, teaching and research reports that capture how instructors have brought research findings into the class, how they have prepared students to conduct research and/or involved them in research projects. A teaching and service report might demonstrate efforts to assist new faculty in the development of pedagogical skills and/or an instructor’s efforts in relation to curriculum planning. The literature also recommends that an effective evaluation framework will put in place clear administrative and committee structures and decision-making and approval processes. These should be addressed in tenure policies and made explicit to all those involved in the tenure review so that roles and responsibilities are transparent (Diamond, 1999; Ory, 2000).

**Training and support**

Any evaluation system, regardless of how comprehensive, can only be effective if those applying it are well-prepared and trained. As such, the literature on faculty evaluation consistently stresses the need for developing training programs and resource materials for those involved in personnel decisions. Although administrators and members of tenure and
promotion review committees are likely themselves teaching faculty, this does not guarantee that they are effective evaluators. Theall and Franklin (2001) and others (Cashin, 1996; Pratt, 1997; Seldin, 1980, 1999b) have noted that this is a crucial part of any effective evaluation system. As Cannon (2001) notes

In higher education, we have been reasonably successful in developing ways of collecting evidence about teaching, especially at the level of the individual teacher or course. But our understanding of how that evidence is used and by whom in order to make judgments and decisions is relatively poor. In fact, if we look at the way evaluative data are used, the situation is even gloomier: indeed, there seems to be good evidence that much of the information generated through surveys and the like is not actually used at all (pp. 94-95).

Therefore, Pratt (1997) recommends more focused training be given to those responsible for “making the tenure case” to help ensure that teaching is well-documented and in-line with institutional policies.

In addition, institutions should ensure that those involved in the tenure process are aware of the criteria and are applying them consistently and equitably (ACE, 2000; Miller, 1987). Miller (1987) recommends committee members meet before reviewing the tenure file to discuss the criteria, expectations and standards and to seek clarification, if necessary, on any of these elements. This sort of information could be translated to committee members through training, guidelines or handbooks. Such materials should highlight the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the tenure process and should also include information on how to review the teaching materials in the tenure file, including dossiers and course evaluation data (Seldin, 1999b). For example, some institutions have prepared a form for classroom observations that guides the reviewer through the process and highlights particular
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28 The ACE guide, Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators (2000), was produced for institutions with this in mind.
areas that should be addressed (see Centra et al., 1987 for examples of these and other forms that may be used in the evaluation process); others have developed something similar for the assessment of teaching materials which may be based on Braskamp and Ory’s (1984) list of items to consider. When reviewing course-related materials they suggest that all items be reviewed in relation to three broad categories: course organization (e.g. objectives, syllabus design); course content (e.g. relevant readings and selected texts, variety of assignments); and course evaluation (e.g. appropriateness of assignments in relation to course goals, fair grading practices).

Communicating expectations
It is not enough to develop a sound policy; expectations must be communicated to faculty clearly and in a timely manner: the success of any evaluation system depends on it (Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Cashin, 1996; Kennedy, 1997; Paulsen, 2002; Seldin, 1980). Regular discussions with faculty, from the start of their appointment, throughout their probationary period, pre-tenure review and leading up to the formal review should occur. This is likely to happen at the departmental level and should involve the provision of feedback on their teaching and details on relevant support and resources to assist them in improving if necessary. Similarly, open and regular communication should also occur with faculty moving toward promotion. As Acker Webber and Smyth (2010, June) have found, junior faculty often comment on the lack of clarity provided regarding institutional tenure procedures. Therefore, institutions may also wish to develop guides or handbooks to supplement formal policy to assist faculty as they move through these processes. Such materials could include a graphic representation of the overall
process and key players, information on teaching support services and resources, timelines and important dates, and useful checklists (Arreola, 2000; Seldin, 1980).

Integrated and aligned evaluation frameworks
Together the elements discussed above enable the development of a comprehensive evaluation framework. To further enhance such institutional systems, scholars have recommended that they also be aligned and integrated with institutional mandates and cultures. Cannon (2001), Cashin (1996), Diamond (1999), Miller (1987) and others suggest that tenure and promotion policies reflect and substantiate an institution’s mission statement or mandate. Those that value teaching and wish to foster and recognize excellence in teaching might then include wording to that effect in official statements of purpose.

A good evaluation system will itself define and shape institutional priorities related to teaching, while allowing for the inclusion of divisional goals and the recognition of differences in disciplinary culture and approaches to teaching (Cashin, 1996; Miller, 1987; Paulsen, 2002). To enable this, institutions may wish to develop a broad policy that addresses overarching expectations, criteria, and processes, and require divisions to draft complementary policies that capture and recognize the range of pedagogical approaches from its representative discipline(s). Further to that, similar exercises can be undertaken at the departmental level where teaching activities are assigned (Paulsen, 2002). The result is “a contextually aligned system” where “the institutional mission, strategic objectives, educational methods, assessment, and evaluation approaches are congruent” (Cannon, 2001, p. 88). In Bigg’s (2001) view, the constructive alignment of teaching, whereby teaching methods, assessment and
classroom climate are aligned to ensure that students can acquire instructor identified skills and knowledge, will enable the development of a clear and precise criterion referenced evaluation system.

One additional aspect of a comprehensive, aligned and integrated evaluation system is its relationship to institutional teaching cultures and the presence of teaching support for faculty. Much of the scholarship highlights the importance of the presence of faculty development offices (or teaching and learning centres) on university campuses (Arreola 2000; Braskamp, 2000; Cashin, 1996; McAlpine & Harris, 2001; Seldin, 2006; Wright & Associates, 1995). Not only do such units provide support to individual faculty and the institution more broadly in matters relating to teaching, they also reflect institutional cultures and the attitudes toward and recognition of teaching. As such, much of the literature recommends that evaluation frameworks make explicit the presence of these centres and encourage faculty to engage with them. As Arreola (2000) states,

faculty evaluation and faculty development are really two sides of the same coin. Ideally, faculty evaluation programs should work hand-in-hand. The operational rule of thumb assumed here is if some aspect of faculty performance is to be evaluated, then there should exist resources or opportunities which enable faculty to develop that performance (p. 3).

He further argues that when an evaluation system is not linked to a faculty development program it is likely to fail.

Some forty years of research provides a rich and thorough set of recommendations for improving teaching evaluation practices, in general, and more specifically for the purposes of personnel decisions, such as the tenure review. In sum, scholars have recommended that a comprehensive, integrated and aligned evaluation framework:
1. Establish evaluation goals and purpose that align with institutional mandates.
2. Provide a clear understanding of faculty responsibilities.
3. Define teaching effectiveness.
4. Identify criteria for the evaluation of faculty work and articulate the related standards of performance.
5. Use a range of evaluation mechanisms and seek multiple forms of evidence.
6. Establish clear and transparent governance structures.
7. Provide sufficient support and/or training for all involved in the review process.
8. Ensure effective and consistent communication to all relevant constituents.

Chapters 5 and 6, focus on current Canadian policies in an effort to determine the level to which any or all of these recommendations are reflected. (See Appendix B for a more detailed overview of these recommendations from the literature.)

**Summary: Gaps in the Research**

This review of the literature demonstrates that there has been extensive consideration of tenure, its development, formalization, and its pros and cons. This scholarship has also included a fair amount of discussion about how tenure has impacted the organization and scope of faculty work and the methods by which these contributions are evaluated. Scholars have also addressed the manner in which teaching is valued within the tenure system, considering whether tenure leads to the prioritizing of research over teaching, and how expanding university research agendas have impacted the attention paid to teaching. As a result, we see a growing interest, both from scholars and provincial, state and national organizations, in reward structures for teaching.

While this body of literature sheds light on the historical context for our current landscape, it does not provide sufficient consideration of contemporary Canadian practice. At present, there is no comprehensive overview of current policies in place for the evaluation of
teaching at Canadian universities, specifically in relation to the tenure review. A number of
years ago, Trower’s (2000) study provided a snapshot of policies and practices at 1,380
American four-year institutions. This volume uses a national data set and provides details
regarding academic appointments, the location of policies, information on probationary
periods, tenure criteria and post-tenure review processes. However, a similar set of data and
related summary are not available for Canadian institutions. Over the past several years,
 attempts have been made by those working in teaching and learning centres or in academic
administration to informally gather this data for a range of purposes. Some are seeking this
information as they review and revise their own existing institutional policies, others are
looking for specific data about the role of faculty development offices in relation to evaluation
procedures (see Gravestock & Gregor Greenleaf, 2008a). In spite of this, the field still lacks a
thorough understanding of how institutions across Canada evaluate teaching for the purposes
of merit, annual review, tenure review, or promotion. In fact, even if we informally asked the
question: how does your institution evaluate faculty teaching, we are likely to receive a less
comprehensive answer than had we asked about the mechanisms for evaluating research
contributions.

Several studies provide the closest parallel to the type of analysis that I will undertake
here. One is a two part report produced in the United Kingdom for the Higher Education
Academy (HEA) and the GENIE Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at the University
of Leicester (HEA, 2009a, b). The first looks at current promotion processes in the United
Kingdom and focuses on faculty perceptions about the impact of institutional and national

29 In my own work in faculty development, I regularly receive requests to complete surveys relating to my
institution’s tenure policies and practices from colleagues at other university centres.
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practices and policies that recognize and reward teaching contributions. This study found that most faculty felt research had a higher status and was therefore given more recognition and weight in reward structures (including promotion). The second part of this research study looks at the content and scope of promotion policies from 104 United Kingdom institutions, with a particular emphasis on criteria and the degree of emphasis on teaching and learning. This review revealed that the “inclusion of teaching in promotion criteria is inconsistent and often absent” (HEA, 2009b, p.19). It found that 73 out of 104 institutions reported including teaching and learning activities in promotion policies; however, only 45 of the 73 incorporated explicit criteria for the evaluation of teaching. In contrast, all of the institutional policies surveyed were explicit regarding the criteria related to research. The authors suggest this is why faculty feel teaching is not valued or accorded the same status as research. A similar study that looked at policies and faculty attitudes, noted above, was conducted within the Australian context (see Ramsden & Martin, 1996) with comparable results.

To be sure, a number of other scholars have addressed particular aspects relating to tenure and the evaluation of teaching in Canadian universities. Acker’s (1997), Acker and Feureverger’s (1996) and Stewart, Ornstein and Drakich’s (2009) work on the relationship between gender and tenure decisions; Kreber’s (2007) research on reward structures; and Wright and Associates (1995) and Britnell et al.’s (2010) analysis of the attitudes of faculty and administrators toward tenure, are all important contributions that shape our understanding of the role of tenure in Canadian higher education. My study aims to further this work and to fill a gap by examining current tenure policies in relation to the recommendations from the
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30 See also Ornstein, Stewart & Drakich (2007).
literature on evaluation practices and frameworks and to explore whether Canadian university
tenure policies reflect, or do not, these recommendations. A look at current policies and
related documents can build on the data from other studies that have examined faculty
attitudes and perceptions about tenure. Moreover, this review may also uncover patterns in
Canadian approaches to teaching and tenure, which heretofore may not have been visible due
to the fact that Canada lacks a systematic analysis of current policies.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH FRAMEWORK AND APPROACHES

This chapter provides an overview of my approach to and goals for this study. Specifically, it outlines the conceptual framework that was used to structure this research and reviews in brief some of the additional bodies of scholarship that, while not directly related to the overall focus of this project, have certainly informed and influenced my thinking and my approach. Further, I also address in this chapter the methodology, including the rationale for using institutional policies as the foundational documents for this study, how and why I selected particular institutions for this review, and the primary and secondary research questions that I sought to address in my study. Finally, attention is given to the scope and the limitations of my approach and to the contributions I hope that this study makes to the broader body of scholarship.

Goals of the Research
This study aims to provide a comprehensive overview of current practices related to the evaluation of teaching for tenure at selected Canadian universities in an effort to understand how teaching responsibilities and teaching effectiveness are recognized and rewarded. My research explores the assumption that teaching is undervalued by universities and not fully recognized during the tenure review. More specifically this study asks: how do Canadian universities assess teaching at the point of tenure?

The vast majority of continuing faculty in tenure stream appointments at Canadian institutions are expected to engage in both teaching and research activities as outlined in
institutional appointment policies (Clark, et al., 2009). While these policies rarely outline specific expectations regarding the percentage of time that faculty are to dedicate to each of these academic activities (teaching responsibilities are, however, often detailed in letters of appointment or in divisional/departmental guidelines), at many institutions the general rule of thumb is that faculty will devote an equal amount of time to each of these pursuits (Clark, et al., 2009). And while this may be true, a sense that institutions do not weight these two activities equally in hiring, tenure, promotion and merit decisions persists. The predominant view, from within and from outside the university, is that research contributions are more highly valued and as such are weighted more heavily in decision-making processes (e.g. for hiring, merit, tenure and promotion; see Remler & Pema, 2009; Rhoades, 2000). This belief that teaching plays second fiddle to research is commonly shared among faculty colleagues, often reinforced by the words and actions of academic administrators, and is frequently cited in the media and the literature. But from where do these beliefs arise? How are universities sending the message that teaching matters less? What implications does this belief have in the broader community? If there is an overarching sense that universities care little about the quality of the teaching at their institutions what does that communicate to current and potential students, to community partners, and to the public sector and future employers? What does it say to faculty who are expected to spend a significant portion of their careers in classrooms and in supervisory roles?

Institutional policies are an essential component for understanding these issues. Such documents articulate a wide range of university expectations and goals, and, if Fairweather’s (2002a) suggestion holds true, this is where faculty typically look for institutional norms and
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31 The exception being those faculty with research-only appointments, most often found in the health sciences, and those with teaching-stream appointments.
values. In particular, policies that outline tenure criteria can reveal the emphasis that an institution places on the various aspects of a faculty member’s work. It is here that expectations in relation to teaching, research and service contributions are laid out. To fully explore the questions raised above, a review of existing tenure policies and related documents is required.

An institution can signal that it values teaching through its established assessment measures and frameworks. More specifically, it can indicate to its communities the range of teaching activities that it values and supports, thereby shaping the culture and attitudes toward teaching on its campus. For example, a policy that understands teaching as simply the delivery of lectures or seminars might signal the institution’s lack of encouragement for or unwillingness to support a broader range of teaching activities and approaches. In contrast, policies that provide more extensive or more flexible definitions of teaching could reveal an institution’s willingness to consider more innovative pedagogical approaches. Or, a policy that does not articulate the mechanisms by which a faculty member’s teaching will be evaluated, or the types of evidence it will review, might suggest that decisions about teaching are based on narrow evidence and/or made without much rigour. Conversely, policies that clearly identify the ways in which teaching will be evaluated, by whom, and by what measures, might send a message that assessments are made systematically, following consideration of multiple forms of evidence from a range of sources. Such policies could suggest that evaluations are conducted in a more rigorous manner. When institutions fail to develop and communicate expectations regarding teaching activities and standards of performance they run the risk that community members will reach the conclusion that teaching is not valued. They also potentially enable ineffective or insufficient evaluations to be made. Clear, transparent evaluation frameworks
signal what an institution values and what it supports – be it undergraduate and graduate teaching, innovative pedagogical approaches, student-faculty interaction, or out-of-class learning experiences. Such frameworks also reveal how an institution defines teaching quality and how it measures that quality.

The focus of this study is the Canadian higher education environment, and more specifically the university sector. The majority of the current scholarship on tenure and the evaluation of teaching is produced in and about other jurisdictions, primarily the United States, Australia and the United Kingdom. While this literature provides a rich source of information and data, the Canadian higher education landscape has its own set of unique characteristics and historical contexts. These features include the fact that there is no coordinated federal higher education system or agenda in Canada, that universities fall under provincial jurisdictions, that Canadian universities have systems of collegial governance that involve faculty associations (or unions) and collective agreements, that only universities have the ability to grant degrees, that most Canadian universities are public, and that Canadian institutions enjoy a high level of autonomy relative to other jurisdictions, whereby each university sets its own policies, processes and standards. Individually, these characteristics may be found in other sectors; however, combined they create a uniquely Canadian landscape. Moreover, a significant portion of the literature in higher education on the evaluation of teaching has been produced in the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States. In the United Kingdom and Australia, universities no longer grant tenure, and in the United States many institutions have abandoned tenure or have significantly altered the nature and/or number of tenure stream appointments. In addition, to date there has been no broad scale study of how teaching is evaluated as
outlined in Canadian university tenure policies and so this research aims to provide a
doundation to not only address the questions at hand, but to also provide a base for further
study of related issues.

**Conceptual Framework**

Through the framework of evaluation, universities identify their priorities and establish or
influence institutional cultures. Therefore, processes and policies that clearly and rigorously
evaluate teaching can reveal an institution’s valuing of this aspect of academic work. In stating
this, I do acknowledge that there are a number of contemporary, and some longstanding,
debates that may challenge my assertions in relation to the need for rigorous evaluation
frameworks. However, I do not believe that they undermine my fundamental argument: that to
effectively and rigorously assess teaching, institutions require comprehensive, integrated and
well-articulated evaluation frameworks.

*The role and value of tenure*

First, this study focuses on the evaluation of teaching during the tenure process, a juncture
generally regarded as a seminal moment in an academic's career and as a fundamental
institutional procedure. It is at this point when faculty are most thoroughly evaluated for the
first time and as such, the tenure review establishes institutional values and norms. Much
emphasis and effort is placed on preparing junior faculty for their tenure review and similar
attention is paid to the administration of the review process (see institutional guides and
programs, sessions and materials offered through faculty associations and CAUT). While tenure
remains a valued tenet by some, the role of and the need for tenure has been debated for
decades in various settings, including Canada, the United Kingdom, and perhaps no more vociferously than the United States. There have been ebbs and flows in this discussion and it has attracted both supporters and detractors from within and outside the university as the literature review demonstrates. Critics have typically called for the abolishment of the tenure system, arguing that it protects deadwood, places unnecessary fiscal constraints on university administration, stifles creativity, creates ill-will toward universities on the part of the public, hurts teaching, and does not protect the untenured.

Supporters, on the other hand, argue that tenure not only provides job security but that it provides a means of protecting academic freedom (the latter being the most common argument in favour of its continuation). For the most part, academic freedom is most often associated with an individual’s scholarship (e.g. publications or the presentation of one’s research), although its application does extend into the classroom enabling a faculty member to make decisions about what he/she teaches (CAUT, 2005a; Horn, 1999a, b). Rarely do proponents of tenure suggest that it is a mandatory safeguard for innovative pedagogy although some opponents do believe that it undermines quality teaching. However, tenure is also about professional disciplinary expectations and a university’s ability to assure and measure the quality of its members’ teaching, research and service contributions. It represents a key point in the life cycle of a university when an institution makes decisions about whether or not faculty members meet its standards. Thus, tenure is also about process and policy although it is interesting to note that most of the attacks on tenure do not address procedural issues, such as the means of evaluating candidates for tenure or the criteria upon which these
decisions are based (see Chapter 2 for an overview of these arguments, see also Jaschik, 2007a, b, 2008a, b, 2009a, b; Lederman, 2007, 2009; Mullens, 2002; Redden, 2007).

While the arguments for and against tenure are numerous – and long-lasting – they have little direct bearing on the focus of this study. My assertion that teaching requires a rigorous evaluation framework to demonstrate that it is an activity valued in universities does not require the presence of the tenure system in and of itself. Rather, it is the evaluation processes embedded within the tenure review procedure that are of primary significance. More specifically, it is the evaluation criteria, the expectations regarding standards of performance and the forms of evidence that can reveal whether or not teaching is valued, equitably rewarded and effectively assessed.

Having said that, the tenure review process is the dominant system through which teaching is formally assessed in Canadian universities, and as such, is the focus of this study. The positioning of teaching here aligns it with research and suggests that it can also be understood as a professional activity. Like research, teaching is also protected by the tenet of academic freedom and both activities are subject to institutional assessment through collegial governance processes – giving them both professional status. Given this, it might be expected that the evaluation process for teaching would be more closely aligned with those employed for the assessment of research. For example, an evaluation framework that recognizes teaching and research as professional academic activities, and weighs contributions in these two areas equally, might utilize peer assessments in the tenure review process. Peer review is the common form of evaluation for research and some have argued, as discussed in Chapter 2, that
teaching should be evaluated using the same methods to ensure it has equal status within higher education.

As is further developed in Chapter 5, without fail Canadian institutions identify teaching and research as the primary activities of its academic members. The requirement and expectation that all faculty engage in both is evident in institutional policies from coast to coast. Embedding the evaluation of both activities in tenure policies is a further acknowledgement of the centrality of each to the institutional mission. One might expect that parallel and rigorous evaluation mechanisms would be in place for each to ensure quality at all levels within the university. However, a call for a more formal and rigorous evaluation system often raises concerns about the changing nature of academic responsibilities and the increased attention to documenting faculty activities, viewed as a symptom of growing bureaucratization in the sector.

_The changing nature of academic work, the bureaucratization of higher education, and the new managerialism_

As Musselin (2007) notes, academic work was once clearly delineated along the lines of two primary categories: teaching and research. However, as Rhoades (2000) asserts, “[f]aculty work is more complex than doing teaching or research. And, an accurate understanding of faculty work must recognize that there is no such thing as a typical university faculty member” (p. 29). Over the past several decades, faculty work has diversified with academics taking on a multitude of other responsibilities, including proposal writing, technology transfer initiatives, community engagement, and so on. As a result, “[t]here is clearly no ideal, universal, and
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32 See Archer (2008) for an account of how younger academics construct their professional identities.
stable state of the academic profession. Like all social bodies, this profession is a living entity, adaptive and responsive to external changes, but it also seeks to enact its own environment” (Musselin, 2007, p. 1). Current research on the changing nature of academic work has addressed the increasing demands being placed on faculty, the limited resources to support these growing expectations, and whether or not this workload is unreasonable or inequitably applied and assessed (see Acker, Webber & Smyth, 2010; Clark et al., 2009; Dearlove, 1998; Gamson, 1998; Harris, 2005; Kennedy, 1997; Lucas, 1996; Rhoades, 2000; Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Out of this diversification arises a parallel increase in the “diversification of the forms of control exercised over academics” (Musselin, 2007, p. 5); characteristic of the trend toward bureaucratization within universities. Currie and Vidovich (1998) define bureaucracy in this context as, “highly centralized decision making with control through close supervision and an emphasis on standard operating procedures to produce uniformity across the institution” (p. 114). This top-down approach to university administration is problematic since “the whole way of doing things in a professional organization like a university is decidedly anti-bureaucratic and hostile to the very notion of orders from above” (Dearlove, 1998, p. 72).  

Such actions – which have emerged from changes within the institution (often in the form of new policies or guidelines or the requirement for enhanced reporting mechanisms), and as a result of external pressures (through the implementation of accountability and quality assurance frameworks) that necessitate internal change – are frequently viewed and criticized as means of weakening faculty autonomy and power (Harris, 2005; Rhoades, 2000). Across
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33 See also Bourdieu’s *Homo Academicus* (1988) for a discussion of hierarchies and power relations within the academy.
Canada, multiple accountability or quality enhancement frameworks and systems are at play in the various provincial jurisdictions, each establishing a different set of performance indicators or metrics which individual institutions are judged against (see Cutt, Trotter & Lee, 1993).

Clark et al. (2009) identify five different entities within Ontario alone that ask universities to report on a range of items such as access, types of resources available, library holdings, student-faculty ratios, programs offered, graduation rates, class size, and so on, in an effort to gauge quality and institutional performance. Though these may not translate into professional accountability at the level of the individual faculty member, institutions may use such indicators to shape or inform evaluation policies.

According to Currie and Vidovich (1998), “[p]erformance management (inherent in the system of accountability associated with managerialism) has been criticized for distorting and narrowing the work of academics in favour of the most readily documented and measured activities and therefore ignoring issues such as quality, potential, and reflective practice” (p. 116). While provincial accountability frameworks may ask about the mechanisms institutions use to assess teaching (i.e. course evaluations), they do not directly evaluate teaching quality or effectiveness; however, the requirement to produce data on a range of institutional activities and initiatives may impact the methods universities adopt to collect information on faculty teaching performance and contributions. For example, much discussion over the past decade or so has focused on learning outcomes and the belief that accurate assessments of student learning requires closer attention be paid to teaching goals and practices. As such, there is an
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34 As Clark et al (2009) note, quality assurance measures and accountability frameworks first emerged from within and were designed by universities during the 1960s and 70s. By the 1990s provincial governments entered the arena and began to develop and implement their own frameworks.
increased interest in, and requirements for, the development of teaching dossiers which incorporate self-assessment measures alongside evidence of student learning.

Some scholars have also argued against the growing trend in universities to require faculty to document their work through annual activity reports and teaching dossiers, suggesting that this is not an effective use of faculty time but rather a means of meeting internal and external accountability measures. At the centre of this debate is the issue of whose interests are being served. Is this shift in the best interest of faculty, the university, the broader community or other stakeholders? Musselin (2007) argues that,

there is a great deal of evidence that professional power often supports institutional power. Thus, rather than a decrease in academic power, there is an emergence of other forms and other instruments of control in addition to academic regulations. As a result, academics are no longer evaluated only by their peers, but also by their own institution or by national measures developed by public authorities to control, rank, and benchmark academic activity. As a whole, there is a global increase in the level and intensity of controls which are often enacted through the peer review process (p. 6).

Indeed, quality assurance and accountability frameworks have required higher education institutions to report on a range of metrics and to demonstrate successes in particular areas (see Harris, 2005). However, while the growing interest and attention being paid to teaching and the evaluation of teaching may appear to be a part of these larger efforts it should not be viewed solely as another indicator of bureaucratization. The effective, transparent and consistent evaluation of teaching is essential to ensure that universities fulfill their mandates and stated missions for undergraduate and graduate education. It is also necessary to overcome persistent beliefs that teaching is undervalued. Thus, the evaluation of teaching has far less to do with the bureaucratization of universities and much more to do with efforts to value our stakeholders – students, faculty, administrators, employers, and the
broader community. The evaluation of teaching then is about accountability, not in relation to the bureaucratization of universities, but in relation to key stakeholders and efforts to engage these groups as part of the academic community. Arguably then, the evaluation of teaching is a professional mechanism of peer evaluation. Moreover, the very fact that tenure policies are embedded in, or linked to, collective agreements, signals that they are not managerial in nature, but rather the result of a negotiation between faculty and management.

Another aspect of this bureaucratization that has been addressed in the literature is the move toward managerialism within universities and the increasing dependence on professional managers within the academic community (see Deem, 1998; Harvey & Knight, 1996; Räsänen, 2008; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). In particular, scholars have debated the impact of this shift from collegial governance practices to a business model of management. However, as Musselin (2007) notes, the control mechanisms that remain in place, still, by and large, involve review and assessment by academic peers (for promotion, tenure, hiring, publications, etc.). As such, the tenure review process, and the evaluation of teaching, remains a collegial process; one that involves peer review and assessment undertaken by academic colleagues. Decisions regarding hiring, tenure and promotion remain in the hands of university colleagues and not administrative staff or professional managers. Albeit, there has been a shift, perhaps influenced by the introduction of new managerialism within institutions, whereby professional managers are more frequently involved in helping to shape processes and policies relating to academic appointments.\footnote{Many institutions now have positions in the professional/managerial stream with responsibility for policy development, as at the University of Toronto with the Director, Policy and Planning, a position that sits within the provostial portfolio.} Harvey and Knight (1996) refer to this as a “new collegialism” which “sees the
collegial group as the forum for academic decision-making but is prepared to enlarge that group to allow discourse and negotiation with significant others, not least students. It emphasizes accountable professional expertise rather than inviolable academic integrity” (p. 71). Similarly, as Dearlove (1998) has argued,

Notwithstanding the problems of organizing research, teaching in mass higher education is an activity that quite simply has to be organized, co-ordinated and planned. More than this, much of it has to be organized bureaucratically according to clear formal rules and accepted procedures, if only to ensure that particular degree programmes are up and running; that properly qualified students are admitted to study on these programmes; that teachers and students come together at the same time, in the same place and expecting to study the same course; and that students are finally assessed on the basis of written rules before they graduate and move back into the outside world. It may not be possible for high quality research to be delivered to order (and so no academics expect to receive research orders) but most academic do expect to be required to deliver teaching to order, even though they may reserve the right to only teach on course where they judge themselves to be expert at the same time as they will be keenly alive to the informal understandings that will enable them to secure ‘remissions’ from a full teaching ‘load’. The fact that increasing amounts of teaching are now being contracted out to temporary workers has heightened the need to organize the whole teaching operation in a more bureaucratic way that relies very much less on informal collegial understandings of rights and responsibilities in these matters (p. 70).

He further asserts that,

peer-based judgments are fundamental for the career progress of individuals; and that academic assessments are of the essence in judging the quality of teaching and research across the higher education system. Now, the value which we professionals place on autonomy, self-regulation and peer control, in combination with the authority which they enjoy, does pose a particular problem when they are employed in large organizations that quite simply cannot be governed on the basis of a simple partnership of equals, a senior staff model, or an easy collegiality (p. 70).
Gender, equity and teaching

One additional area of research that informs this study must also be acknowledged, that which focuses on the issues of gender and equity as it applies to academic work (Acker, Webber & Smyth, 2010, 2011; Brooks & MacKinnon, 2001; Ornstein, Stewart & Drakich, 2007; Stewart, Ornstein & Drakich, 2009)\(^{36}\), and specifically teaching (Acker, 1997, 2009; Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Brooks, 1997). On the one hand, there is an assumption that teaching is a gendered role, more closely associated with women who tend to spend more time on teaching (and service) (Rhoades, 2000). As a result, the careers of female academics suffer due to this imbalance and unequal emphasis on research and teaching. Some have also posited that since teaching is often viewed as a gendered role, women have a stronger affinity to this work and an ability to excel in their contributions, over and above men. In studies of female academics in various jurisdictions, including Canada, Acker (1997, 2009), Brooks (1997) and Blackmore and Sachs (2000) have found that women tend to take on more teaching than male faculty members. As such, women’s teaching contributions may be valued less than those of their male peers.

One criticism of tenure posits that it disadvantages women. In the United States, data collected by the AAUP reveals that, since the 1970s, approximately 47% of women with full-time faculty appointments have had tenure compared to 70% of full-time male faculty (AAUP, 2005). Stewart, Ornstein and Drakich (2009) and Ornstein, Stewart and Drakich (2007) have found, through an analysis of data available through Statistics Canada, that women faculty achieve tenure (and promotion from assistant to associate professor) at rates that are comparable to men in Canadian universities. For men, promotion from assistant to associate

---

\(^{36}\) Articles in the collection edited by Brooks and MacKinnon address issues relating to gendered power, the role of women in the management and leadership of universities, and women and tenure.
professor occurs on average within 4.92 years versus 5.39 years for women (Ornstein, Stewart & Drakich, 2007). They note, however, that “women are disadvantaged in promotion from associate to full professor” (Stewart, Ornstein & Drakich, 2009, p. 60) where the median time is 8.83 years for men and 9.74 years for women (Ornstein, Steward & Drakich, 2007).

Concerns have also been voiced that the types of teaching some women engage in may be beyond the norms of their male counterparts and subsequently are not recognized, nor appropriately assessed (e.g. feminist pedagogical approaches, see Körner, 2002; Marchbank & Letherby, 2002; Moore, 2002; Welch, 2002). A more formal and inclusive recognition of teaching may be a way to more effectively acknowledge women in the academy. Therefore, the evaluation of teaching is necessary for the support and promotion of teaching as an institutional value and one that promotes equity and recognition of academic workloads.

Scholarship in the areas discussed above – on the value of tenure, bureaucratization of higher education, managerialism in universities, and the changing and gendered nature of academic work – do indeed inform my approach to this study. In fact, I would argue that the findings of the research in these areas support my belief that universities need to carefully consider and creatively rethink what teaching, as a fundamental aspect of academic work, is, and how it should be evaluated equitably within changing administrative structures and academically and culturally diverse institutions. As Musselin (2007), Rhoades (2000) and others have noted, the nature of faculty work has changed: this change includes the nature of teaching and the understanding of what teaching encompasses. Teaching is no longer simply delivering lectures; it also includes contributions to curriculum development, the use of educational technologies, the counseling and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, and
often publications and presentations on pedagogical approaches. Institutional policies that establish the criteria for the evaluation of teaching need to reflect and respond to this growing understanding of teaching practice. In doing so, they reveal what aspects of teaching are recognized and valued.

**Methodological Approach and Research Questions**

This thesis will review policies and related documents to determine how teaching is currently being evaluated at the point of tenure at Canadian universities. This review will also consider the level of rigour found within these policies and will examine whether they reflect the recommendations from the previously reviewed literature on teaching evaluation practices and frameworks. The literature recommends that teaching evaluation be comprehensive – defining effective teaching within a range of contexts, articulating specific criteria, detailing the “what” (means of evidence) and the “how” (mechanisms and governance structures) of evaluation; that it be integrated and aligned with institutional goals and mandates; and, that it recognize and acknowledge the range of teaching contexts and approaches within and across an institution. This literature on evaluation frameworks will provide the lens through which to review and analyze current tenure structures in subsequent chapters.

Much of my research will rely on institutional policies and related documents. Here, following Codd (1988), policy is “taken to be any course of action (or inaction) relating to the selection of goals, the definition of values or the allocation of resources.” (p. 235). For the purposes here, this will include those documents that outline a university’s definition of teaching roles and responsibilities, its understanding of teaching effectiveness, and its tenure
criteria, focusing specifically on the elements related to the evaluation of teaching. Drawing on the methodologies for policy analysis outlined by Ball (1993), Taylor (1997), and Codd (1988), I examine these documents as both text and discourse. In viewing policies as texts, I acknowledge the multiple authors involved in developing these documents and the various forms which these documents may take (policy, guideline, collective agreement, mandate/mission statement); and as discourse, I recognize that there are multiple interpretations and re-interpretations dependent on the reader and the context in which they are read. Deconstructing the discourse, through an analysis of various policy documents, “treats such texts as cultural and ideological artifacts to be interpreted in terms of the implicit patterns of signification, underlying symbolic structures and contextual determinants of meaning” (Codd, 1988, p. 243). Moreover, “[d]iscourse theories are useful for investigating how policies are read and used in context; in other words, for documenting the politics of discourse during policy implementation” (Taylor, 1997, p. 29).

Following Taylor (1997), I also recognize the importance of considering the range of consequences deriving from policy, which here could impact culture, perceptions, and actions within the academy. As Ball (1997) notes, “[p]olicies do not normally tell you what to do; they create circumstances in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed (p. 12)...Policies typically posit a restructuring, redistribution and disruption of power relations, so that different people can and cannot do different things” (p. 13). Taking all of this into account, my approach will be based on the notion that policy informs and shapes practice (through the range of evidence required to document teaching contributions) and culture (in relation to how teaching activities and contributions are
understood and emphasized) within the university context. As Taylor (1997) states, “[d]ifferences in terminology reflect the particular historical cultural context, and have implications for the ways in which particular concepts are used and understood” (p. 28). To that end, my review of current teaching evaluation policies will highlight both deficiencies and best practices in an effort to develop recommendations for policy improvement (Codd refers to this approach as “analysis for policy”, 1988, p. 235).

There are four primary questions that guide my research and shape my methodology. In addition to these four questions, my research will also address a series of secondary questions, outlined below. Both the primary source documents (i.e. policies and collective agreements) and secondary sources (current scholarship, historical overviews) will inform and shape my exploration of these research questions.

1. **How can teaching in higher education most effectively and comprehensively be evaluated, according to the literature?**
   - How have approaches to teaching, and the evaluation of teaching, shifted over time?
   - How has the emerging scholarship on teaching and learning shaped our understanding of teaching practice?

Essential to the framing of this study, and for the analysis of the current Canadian landscape, is the literature on teaching and teaching evaluation frameworks. As such, Chapter 2 provides a synthesis of the scholarship in this area – past and present – to track shifting understanding of and approaches to teaching and its evaluation. To develop this synthesis, a thorough review of the relevant literature was conducted. Many of the key texts were identified through relevant databases (e.g. Education Resources Information Center [ERIC]) or other bibliographic searches and were accessed through the appropriate library or archives.
The literature on teaching and the evaluation of teaching, spanning half a century, was emerging in parallel to the faculty development movements in Canada and the United States with each influencing and shaping the other to varying degrees. The literature review includes a look at the rise of faculty development initiatives and a discussion of the impact that these initiatives had in focusing attention on teaching, its recognition and its evaluation. The review in Chapter 2 highlights the scope and nature of recommendations from the literature on teaching and evaluation. These recommendations inform and frame the analysis of current policies in Chapters 5 and 6.

2. How have faculty evaluation systems developed historically in Canada, and in response to what factors?
   o From where did the notion of tenure arise and how was it adopted and implemented at universities across Canada?
   o What impact did the concept of tenure have on hiring practices and on evaluation processes (e.g. tenure and promotion review)?
   o How and when did faculty unionization efforts develop on Canadian campuses?
   o What initial impact did unionization and collective bargaining have on academic appointment policies (e.g. hiring, tenure and promotion)?
   o How has unionization continued to impact institutional policies?

Having a clear understanding of the historical foundations of tenure, tenure policies and the factors that shaped these emerging policies over time – including unionization and collective bargaining – is essential for reviewing the current landscape. To address these questions, I conducted a review of the literature; some of this is addressed in brief in Chapter 2 but is given more thorough consideration in Chapter 4. Given that tenure is the lens through which I will be reviewing the evaluation of teaching, Chapter 2 also includes a discussion of the ongoing debates about its value and purpose. In Chapter 4, I provide an overview of the current unionization structures and bargaining arrangements on Canadian university campuses and
identify the location of evaluation policies – indicating whether they are found in collective agreements, institutional policies, or both.

3. What role does the evaluation of teaching play in current tenure policies at Canadian universities?
   - How are the criteria for teaching defined (e.g. competence vs. excellence)?
   - What materials are collected for the evaluation of teaching and how are they reviewed?
   - What forms of evidence are tenure candidates required to provide?
   - Can candidates be considered for tenure on teaching contributions alone?
   - Do current policies suggest that research is privileged?
   - Are the structure, wording and content of current policies the source for faculty beliefs about the value of teaching in higher education?

As there is no comprehensive account of the way in which teaching is evaluated for tenure in Canada my third research question aims to address this gap. Building on a review of historical trends and practices, a portion of this study examines how teaching is understood in institutional policies and more specifically, how tenure policies outline the means for evaluating faculty members’ teaching contributions. Chapters 5 and 6 focus on a review of institutional policies from selected Canadian institutions.

While there are 95 universities across Canada, this study focuses on 46 publicly-funded, universities in Canada. The selected institutions (outlined in Table 3.1 below) were drawn from the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) list of degree granting institutions. This list excludes university-colleges, federated universities, and special interest and private institutions, including Athabasca University, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, University College of the Fraser Valley, University of King’s
College (Alberta), University of Sudbury. Some of these were not included in the study as they were undergoing changes to their procedures when policies were being reviewed (i.e. Kwantlen), while others were excluded because their policies were associated with another institution (i.e. Sudbury). French language universities in Quebec were not included in this study, in part, because their policies were only available in French. Laurentian and Ottawa, both bilingual institutions, are included as their policy documents were available in English.

To address my third research question, and the related secondary questions, I conducted a comparative policy review and analysis. To gather the necessary data, I collected all current and relevant policy documents from the universities under review (listed below in Table 3.1). Specifically, these include policies and/or collective agreements (or memoranda of agreement) that address hiring and tenure processes, academic appointment types, faculty responsibilities, and definitions or explanations of teaching effectiveness. To locate this full range of documentation, I conducted key word searches on publicly accessible university and faculty association web sites using such terms as: “tenure”, “tenure and promotion”, “tenure criteria”, “tenure policy”, “collective agreement”, “memorandum of agreement”, “evaluation of teaching”, “assessment of teaching”, “teaching evaluation”, “teaching assessment”, and “faculty association”. All institutions under review have made this information publicly available. All of these materials are posted on publicly accessible university web sites and were collected between March and August 2010.

37 Athabasca University has a policy for “promotion” in which “tenure” is referenced (see: http://www.athabascau.ca/policy/humanresources/040_002.htm); however, they do not have a separate tenure policy.
Table 3.1 – List of Canadian Universities Reviewed for this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland &amp; Labrador</td>
<td>Memorial University of Newfoundland</td>
<td>St. John’s</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Acadia University</td>
<td>Wolfville</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Breton University</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Saint Vincent University</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Francis Xavier University</td>
<td>Antigonish</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary’s University</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>University of Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>Charlottetown</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>Mount Allison University</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Thomas University</td>
<td>Fredericton</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of New Brunswick</td>
<td>Fredericton</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Bishop’s University</td>
<td>Sherbrooke</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Algoma University</td>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brock University</td>
<td>St. Catherine’s</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakehead University</td>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laurentian University</td>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nipissing University</td>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen’s University</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryerson University</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trent University</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ontario Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Windsor</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York University</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Brandon University</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Winnipeg</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These rating types are based on those used in Maclean’s and which have become a commonly used means of referring to institutional types across Canada.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>University of Regina</td>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Lethbridge</td>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson Rivers University</td>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Medical/Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Northern British Columbia</td>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My review focuses primarily on institution-level documents and does not drill down to division-specific information. While it is certainly true that there may be more detailed information in relation to the ways in which divisions evaluate faculty, my interest here is to identify the approach to the evaluation of teaching that is established at the institutional level. A further study could examine the faculty-specific documentation, policies and guidelines for a closer, “on the ground”, look at how teaching contributions are understood and evaluated. Such a review is beyond the scope of this study, which adopts a macro-level approach rather than a micro-level one.

Once relevant documents were collected, I conducted a comparative review and analysis based on a range of indicators, including: details outlining expected teaching responsibilities; stated criteria for tenure; stated criteria for teaching; required and recommended evidence for teaching; the presence, nature and scope of definitions/understandings of teaching effectiveness; the use of any metrics or rubrics for evaluation; and, the selected language and terminology in evaluation frameworks. These indicators are based on the recommendations from the current literature on evaluation frameworks, outlined in Chapter 2. This process enabled me to uncover patterns, common
themes, atypical practices, and to identify similarities and differences in policy at provincial and national levels.

This documentation also allowed me to produce a comprehensive overview of current Canadian policies – something that is absent from the literature and may be of interest to institutions undergoing policy revisions. Moreover, I was also able to identify common practices in the evaluation of teaching for tenure from a Canadian perspective. For example, while there is a common understanding that faculty are evaluated on the basis of their research and teaching contributions, less is known about how institutions specifically define teaching contributions, teaching effectiveness, the criteria they use to evaluate such contributions, and the materials they request to demonstrate effectiveness in this regard.

4. To what extent are the recommendations emerging from the current literature on teaching and learning reflected in Canadian tenure policies?
   - Do evaluation systems reflect the recommendations from current scholarship?
   - Do institutions possess comprehensive evaluation systems?
   - Are current evaluation frameworks aligned with institutional missions?
   - Are teaching support services available to faculty? Are these integrated into evaluation frameworks?

As I examine the Canadian landscape in Chapter 5, I use the recommendations from the literature on teaching and the evaluation of teaching as a conceptual framework for my discussion of the current policies. In doing so, I explore whether or not these recommendations are reflected in any of the institutional policies reviewed. I also seek out any atypical or innovative practices, or examples of institutional policies that more fully reflect these recommendations and will examine these institutions in more detail in Chapter 6.

Finally, a review of institutional resources to support and reward teaching was also undertaken. This involved web-based searches for information on the following: the presence
of teaching support/faculty development offices (e.g. teaching and learning centres); the
delivery of programming to support and enhance faculty teaching; the existence of teaching
awards; additional documentation to complement or supplement institutional policies (e.g. 
guides for developing teaching dossiers). These elements are explored in more detail in
Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

**Terminology**
For the purposes of this study, the term “tenure” is understood as a permanent appointment
which faculty attain following a process by which they are reviewed, in relation to their
contributions in teaching and research/scholarship (and sometimes service). This understanding
is informed by the Canadian Association of University Teacher’s (CAUT) statement on tenure
first drafted in the 1960s and regularly amended since that time. CAUT asserts:

Tenure constitutes the primary procedural safeguard of academic freedom, and is essential for the maintenance of intellectual liberty and high standards in post-secondary education and in scholarship. It is the means by which academic staff are protected against personal malice or political coercion. Tenure, following rigorous evaluation by peers, ensures secure continued academic employment. Once academic staff receive tenure, they retain that status should they move from one position to another, or from one rank to another, within the institution (CAUT, 2005b; see Appendix C for a copy of the full statement). 39

“The Teaching”, while broadly understood as the act of imparting knowledge and skills to
others will be considered in terms of the expectations and norms of individual institutions.

39 The AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (1940) also shapes the understanding of this
term for the purposes of this study. It notes that “Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of
 teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the
 profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are
 indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society”. The full
 statement is available online at: [http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm](http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm)
The term “policy” is used here to include documents that pertain to and articulate principal/key university structures, systems or functions and that are sanctioned through institutional governance processes, including collective bargaining. Moreover, “policy” also refers to those documents that attempt to change or shape practice within an institution and therefore includes, in some cases, “guidelines” that are developed by senior-level academic administrators or committees.

Scope and Limitations
At present, there is a gap in the literature regarding current teaching evaluation frameworks within the Canadian context. Moreover, there is no comprehensive overview of the content of these tenure policies as they relate to the evaluation of teaching. This study aims to fill these gaps; however, given the scope of this undertaking it will have certain limitations. While it is certainly true that faculty themselves could prove to be a rich source of data regarding current attitudes and perceptions about tenure policies and the evaluation of teaching, I did not conduct interviews or administer surveys for this study (in part, also because there is existing data that captures current perceptions; see for example Britnell et al., 2010; Wright & Associates, 1995). Instead, as noted above, much of my research relies on current institutional documents and draws on the large body of literature on the scholarship of teaching and learning. With this foundation further studies that involve faculty interviews can be more easily undertaken. In essence then, this study takes the shape of a policy analysis, considering policy as both text and discourse (as noted above), drawing primarily on current documentation; and as such, it does not consider or review policy in practice and any variations or discrepancies that may exist between the two. I do acknowledge that it is possible that there may be
differences between policy and practice, in part due to multiple interpretations, as Ball (1993) and Codd (1988) note.

Given the scope of this study, which involves a review of 46 Canadian institutions and their related policy documents, my review is limited to the evaluation of teaching for tenure. There are likely some differences in the way that teaching is reviewed at the point of hiring and the way in which it is assessed for the purposes of promotion to full professor; however, a thorough examination of these processes could make this review unwieldy. Since tenure is the point at which faculty typically obtain permanency of appointment, it makes sense to begin with a focused review of this process. Having said that, a subsequent review of hiring practices, in light of current recommendations from the literature, would further highlight how this literature is, or is not, impacting institutional consideration and valuing of teaching and could point to ways in which institutions might enhance their review of teaching when faculty are being considered for academic appointments. Additionally, a subsequent study might consider how teaching is evaluated during the probationary period or pre-tenure review.

The review is also limited to looking at tenure-stream faculty appointments. Twelve Canadian institutions now have teaching stream appointments which in many cases require faculty to move through a tenure-like review process resulting in a permanent appointment (Gravestock, Gregor Greenleaf & Jones, 2009). These academic roles focus on teaching and teaching-related activities (e.g. curriculum development, program coordination, educational leadership, and so on) and therefore the evaluation structures in place typically, due to the nature and scope of the roles, require more extensive evidence of teaching contributions at

---

40 These universities include: Bishop’s, Carleton, Dalhousie, Laurentian, McMaster, Simon Fraser, and Thompson Rivers Universities, and the Universities of British Columbia, New Brunswick, Regina, Toronto, and Victoria.
levels superior to that expected from tenure-stream faculty. A comparative analysis of the expectations for these two groups of faculty appointments would be of great interest but does not form a part of this study. Non-tenured and contractually-limited appointments, sessional and part-time faculty are also excluded from this study, since due to the nature of these appointments they are not eligible for tenure. However, given the increasing reliance on contingent faculty to teach at Canadian institutions an examination of how the teaching activities of sessionals are assessed would be a valuable contribution to the research.

The primary goal here is to understand institutional expectations for tenure in relation to teaching and the ways in which universities assess teaching quality at this juncture. As evidenced by institutional policies and collective agreements in Canada, tenure-stream faculty are expected to partake in teaching, research and service. Presumably, these faculty are thus responsible for a significant amount of teaching on university campuses and so, it is essential to understand how institutions are assessing this aspect of academic work.

**Summary**

The tenure review is a significant stage in the academic life cycle whereby faculty work is to be thoroughly assessed and permanency of appointment is achieved following a positive recommendation. Moreover, it is within this process and its related policies that institutional expectations are defined. As such, the tenure review is an ideal process through which to analyze institutional expectations regarding teaching. Overall, Canada maintains a high number of tenure stream faculty appointments (see Chapter 4, Table 4.1), particularly in comparison to the United States where between 1997 and 2007 the proportion of tenured or tenure track
faculty dropped from 51% to 40% in 4-year institutions (Rosenfeld, 2009).\footnote{Rosenfeld (2009) posits that Canadian institutions have maintained higher proportions of these faculty than our US counterparts, due in part to unionization and collective bargaining efforts.} I recognize that the notion of tenure is problematic on a number of fronts. I am also cognizant of the literature that addresses concerns regarding the role and value of tenure and the challenges that tenure presents in relation to conceptions of academic work, specifically gendered work and identities, and the management of that work. While these literatures are significant and inform our discussions about tenure, they have not yet led to the abandonment of such systems within the Canadian higher education environment. Unlike other jurisdictions, tenure-stream appointments and tenure reviews remain at universities across Canada, including those selected for this study, and so the tenure juncture will provide the lens through which to review the evaluation of teaching.

This study will draw primarily on publicly available institutional policies to assess how selected Canadian universities evaluate teaching during the tenure review process. In treating these policies as both text and discourse, I analyze them in relation to the current literature on teaching evaluation and the recommendations that emerge from this scholarship. My goal, in part, is to determine how institutional policies understand teaching contributions and teaching quality and the mechanisms that they identify for assessing this aspect of academic work. Additionally, this review allows me to explore perceptions about teaching, and its valuing, held by members of the academic and broader communities and to determine the extent to which policies may shape or influence these beliefs.
CHAPTER 4
THE EMERGENCE OF FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEMS IN CANADA

This study focuses on the evaluation of teaching within the context of the tenure review. In Chapter 2, I briefly summarized the emergence of formalized tenure systems at North American universities in the latter half of the 20th century and provided an overview of the scholarly literature pertaining to the strengths and challenges of tenure. Before turning to a look at contemporary tenure policies, some additional historical context regarding tenure is necessary. This chapter addresses in more detail the evolving nature of tenure and the factors that shaped faculty evaluation systems, including unionization and collective bargaining. While the primary focus here is the Canadian context, I also include information on how tenure was evolving in the United States during the same period as this offers an interesting comparison.

This chapter ends with an overview of the broader structure of the evaluation frameworks in place at the 46 Canadian institutions being reviewed for this study. In particular, this includes a look at the role faculty unions and collective bargaining play on these university campuses today in relation to tenure policies and a review of the location of these policies. These details provide useful contextual information for the forthcoming analysis in Chapters 5 and 6.

The Formalization of Tenure
The scholarship pertaining to tenure falls into two, often overlapping areas: histories of tenure, in and across jurisdictions; and, debates regarding the value of tenure, which frequently involve arguments for improving or overhauling tenure systems, or the calls for the abandonment of it altogether. Outside of the scholarly literature, discussions regarding tenure can also be found in
popular media. Here, frequently the focus is also on the pros and cons of tenure, or may include reports of tenure denials or faculty dismissals at particular institutions. In particular, those cases which escalate to the level of the courts are often covered in local and national media. 42

The historical roots of tenure have been thoroughly addressed in the literature for a range of contexts, including the United States and Canada (see for example, Keast & Macy, 1973; Metzger, 1973; Perley, 1998; Tierney, 1998, 2002, 2004 for the United States and for Canada, see Cameron, 1996; Horn, 1999a, b; Monahan, 1983/4). 43 Much of the research on tenure within the Canadian jurisdiction traces the stages of tenure in the higher education environment, identifying several phases in its development and various factors that impacted these stages. Michiel Horn has addressed tenure extensively in his work, providing some of the most comprehensive examinations for the Canadian context. Horn traces the origins, development and shifting nature of tenure from a discretionary arrangement, “tenure at the pleasure of the board” or “during good behaviour” to a concept embedded in institutional policies and collective agreements. He also examines the range of influences that shaped the Canadian approach and provides a comparative look at this evolution in relation to other jurisdictions, including the United States and Britain. Additionally, the work of Monahan (1970, 1983/84), Penner (1994), Savage (1994a, b, 1999), Acker (2009), Axelrod (1982), Allen and Dale

42 For example, Inside Higher Ed, an online journal, regularly includes news items relating to tenure as does the Chronicle of Higher Education. See for example, Jaschik, 2007a, b, 2008a, b, 2009a, b; Lederman, 2009; and Redden, 2007. Less frequent are reports in national newspapers, but these do appear from time to time, particularly in the form of editorials. Maclean’s magazine has also featured a number of articles and opinion pieces on tenure in recent years (see, for example Findlay (2011), and also http://oncampus.macleans.ca/education/tag/tenure/).

43 See also, Horn’s extensive bibliography (2002) for resources on academic freedom, tenure, and university governance in Canada.
(1972) and Ponak, Thompson and Zerbe (1992) all contribute to our understanding of tenure at Canadian universities.

**Informal tenure**

The notion of academic tenure can be traced back to medieval universities where scholars, as members of academic guilds, were granted immunity from civic and ecclesiastical authorities and with this autonomy the ability to self-govern (Monahan, 1983/4). For centuries, universities operated without a formal system of faculty evaluation. Instructors were commonly appointed based on their particular area of expertise but were rarely, if ever, put through a hiring process involving interviews, reference checking and the scrutinizing by peers of their teaching and research credentials and accomplishments (Horn, 1999a). Further, once employed by the institution faculty were not expected to undergo any form of performance assessment to secure their position. In fact, up until the mid-twentieth century many faculty in Canada and the United States had informal employment arrangements with universities (Baldrige, Kemerer & Associates, 1981) and appointments were often initially made on an annual basis (Monahan, 1983/84). While tenure existed in principle during this period and long before, most institutions lacked formal procedures for granting or denying tenure or for dismissing faculty. By the 19th century, however, a more modern concept of tenure was beginning to emerge as the terms and conditions of academic appointments were, in many cases for the first time, being defined and written down (Monahan, 1983/84).
Tenure “at the pleasure of the board” and “during good behaviour”

From the late 19th century through to the early 20th century faculty appointments at most Canadian universities were presumed to be for life or to the age of retirement more specifically. This belief arose, in part, due to the fact that most university charters or statutes were silent in relation to the length or term of appointment or probationary period (Horn, 1999a, b). Writing in 1965, Soberman notes,

> Until the last ten years or so, and with one or two exceptions, neither the statutes nor the regulations of Canadian universities recognized tenure expressly as a legal right of the university teacher to remain in service until retirement (p. 13).

With continuing appointments, after a time, faculty were presumed to have tenure; however, during this period tenured status did not necessarily guarantee a faculty member the legal right to a permanent position. Rather, from the 19th century through to the end of World War II, faculty held their appointments “at the pleasure of the board”, as noted in institutional charters from this period (Monahan, 1983/84; Horn, 1999a, b; Soberman, 1965), as for example at Toronto44, Manitoba, British Columbia, Victoria, McGill and Saskatchewan (Horn, 1999a, b). Metzger (1973) refers to this as “tenure by courtesy”, a de facto status, which involved no formal probationary period or formal granting of tenure and as such the institution had no contractual commitment to the faculty member.45

The caveat of this arrangement: faculty who no longer pleased the governing board could be dismissed at will. Although, as Horn (1994) points out, “[i]t would be wrong to imply or

---

44 See the University of Toronto Act, 1906.
45 Metzger (1973) organizes tenure into three historical periods: tenure as privilege (dating back to the High Middle Ages); tenure as time (from the 17th through to the 19th Centuries); and tenure as judiciality (beginning in the early 20th century).
infer that the universities were governed by capricious oligarchies or presided over by malevolent despots. But the potential for arbitrary and oppressive action was always present. Sometimes it became actual” (p. 42). Further, he notes “on occasion boards exercised their legal right to dismiss those professors who had ceased to please” (Horn, 1999b, p. 269). This was certainly true in 1958 at Winnipeg’s United College with the dismissal of Professor Harry Crowe, one of Canada’s earliest and perhaps most famous cases.46 Here, Crowe was dismissed after he wrote a letter to a colleague that criticized the administration of the College and that questioned the extent of religious and political influences on its management. As Horn (1999b) has written, this case “was a defining event in the history of the Canadian professoriate, of academic freedom and of tenure (p. 268)... The Crowe affair heightened awareness of the difference between tenure as custom and tenure in law” (p. 269). This case also engaged CAUT in a thorough investigation of Crowe’s dismissal through the establishment of a special committee which concluded that Crowe’s academic freedom had been violated.47

The uncertainty of faculty appointments and the lack of internal mechanisms to address faculty appeals regarding dismissals, combined with the fact “that the courts offered little or no redress” (Horn, 1999a, p. 282) in such cases had led in the United States to the establishment of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915.48 The AAUP founders believed faculty should either be fully tenured with the guarantee of a permanent appointment

46 See Fowke (1964) and Horn (1999a, b) for an account of other Canadian dismissal cases. There have been far more court challenges relating to tenure and promotion in the United States. Seldin (1984b) provides an overview of some of these and discusses the root causes.

47 The report of the committee investigating the Crowe case was published in a special edition of the CAUT Bulletin in 1959 (see Volume 7, Issue 3).

48 In the majority of situations tenure denials and dismissals resulted in litigation, with some reaching the level of provincial Supreme Courts. Although, writing in 1965, Daniel Soberman noted that in Canada at that time there were only six reported decisions, whereas the United States had many more on their books.
following the completion of their probationary period or let go. They further argued that after achieving tenure faculty should only be dismissed for cause following “a fair hearing from a committee of their peers, whose recommendation would be binding on a governing board” (Horn, 1999a, p. 282).

In time, tenure “at the pleasure of the board” shifted to tenure “during good behaviour” with dismissal only for cause49, a permanent appointment following a probationary period and subsequent review. This form of tenure, which has also been termed “tenure by moral commitment under an accepted academic code”, was a common arrangement in North American universities following World War II and up until the mid-1960s (Monahan, 1983/84). At this time, tenure was attained following a brief term of service and could only be revoked for cause following a review by peers. During this period, “tenure, in short, was more a matter of expectation than of right, and it involved responsibilities as to behavior as well as rights as to employment, both of which were ultimately subject to the judgment of the president and board” (Cameron, 1996, n.p). By the middle of the 20th century, many institutions were formalizing their procedures for appointment, tenure and promotion in statutes and policies, clearly outlining appointment terms and lengths and probationary periods (see Horn, 1999a for details from various universities). Although some of the procedures relating to the granting of tenure were becoming clearer, the specific criteria for tenure remained vague under this framework (Metzger, 1973).

49 “Cause”, although not always clearly defined, typically includes such things as moral turpitude, academic incompetency or dishonesty, ongoing neglect of or refusal to perform academic duties. In cases where a faculty member is to be dismissed for cause and have their tenure revoked, the onus is on the institution to demonstrate the case (Monahan, 1983/4).
Tenure as employment contract

By the 1960s a more formalized notion of tenure as a contractual commitment was developing prompted, in part, by the efforts of the both the AAUP and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). During this time tenure was evolving into what some refer to as “juridical tenure” or “tenure as employment contract”, a system under which faculty could only be dismissed for cause (Cameron, 1996). In essence, this was an extension of “tenure during good behaviour” and represents, for the most part, the tenure system in play at Canadian institutions today.

Juridical tenure, evolved in part out of the statements issued by and the work conducted through the AAUP and CAUT, which placed an emphasis on due process (Monahan, 1983/4). Tenure was not an initial focus for CAUT, “a loose federation of local faculty associations” (Horn, 1994, p. 41) founded in 1951 “to promote the interests of teachers and researchers in Canadian Universities and Colleges and advance the standards of the profession” (cited in Fowke, 1964, p.199). However, the Crowe case had raised concerns about the fragility of tenure and the lack of formal policies to protect it. In part motivated by and in response to this and other cases, CAUT established a Committee on Academic Freedom and

---

50 See Fowke (1964) for more on the early years of the association and its focus. Fowke suggests that the financial crisis that was occurring at that time in Canadian higher education was the primary impetus for its establishment.  
51 As Fowke (1964) and Monahan (1970) note in their individual histories of CAUT activity, the association did not engage directly in matters relating to tenure and academic freedom in its early years, nor was this the primary reason for the establishment of this organization. While the founders “certainly recognized the importance of protecting the academic freedom of faculty in Canadian universities and of developing proper conditions of tenure” (Monahan, 1970, p. 80), initially, their focus was on other concerns raised by members such as faculty salaries. And as Fowke (1964) notes, the initial document announcing the establishment of the association stated it was founded “out of a widely felt need for a national association to represent the interests and viewpoints of the university teaching staff in a world made up of highly organized groups” (quoted, p. 197).
Tenure in 1958 and in the following year drafted a statement of principles (similar to that issued in 1940 by their sister organization, the AAUP\textsuperscript{52}) on the same issues which states that:

> Tenure constitutes the primary procedural safeguard of academic freedom, and is essential for the maintenance of intellectual liberty and high standards in post-secondary education and in scholarship. It is the means by which academic staff are protected against personal malice or political coercion. Tenure, following rigorous evaluation by peers, ensures secure continued academic employment. Once academic staff receive tenure, they retain that status should they move from one position to another, or from one rank to another, within the institution (CAUT, [1959-60] 2005b).

During this time, CAUT established investigating committees to review the Crowe case and others where they deemed violations of the principles of tenure and academic freedom had occurred. This involvement helped to quickly establish the association’s reputation “as a defender of academic freedom and tenure in the Canadian university” (Monahan, 1970, p. 83).

In the following years, CAUT set out to look at institutional practices across Canada and worked to encourage institutions to adopt the CAUT understanding of tenure and to formalize it in their own official documentation (Horn, 1999a). Several years later, in 1965, CAUT devoted an entire edition of its Bulletin to the issue of tenure, with an editorial by Soberman (pp. 5-36) which defined CAUT’s position in relation to tenure and outlined what, in its view, was significant about tenure for Canadian faculty.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{52} The AAUP first drafted a definition of tenure in 1915. Their Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure was developed in 1940 and remains relatively unchanged today. It shares much in common with the CAUT statement. Another AAUP policy document Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure provides suggestions for best practices at the institutional level which were “designed to enable the [named institution] to protect academic freedom and tenure and to ensure academic due process.” The document addresses practices relating to faculty appointments, terminations and dismissals along with issues relating to academic freedom. Over the years, these guidelines have helped to shape discussions on campuses across North America and in some cases have directly impacted the redrafting of tenure and promotion policies. A more recent ACE document, Good Practices in Tenure Evaluation (2000), provides advice for university administrators on developing and applying fair and consistent tenure policies and practices.

A revised understanding of tenure was beginning to find its way into institutional documents, as in the University of British Columbia’s 1962 *Faculty Handbook* which included a new clause on tenure

which was said to have been approved ‘in principle’ by the faculty association. The probationary period was to be seven years. Starting in year eight, it stated, those who had gained promotion to the rank of assistant professor or senior instructor ‘shall have tenure in the sense that [their] services shall be terminated thereafter only for adequate case, except in the case of retirement for age, total disability or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies (Horn, 1999a, pp. 292-293).

However, in spite of this, the 1963 Universities Act empowered the boards of the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University, and the University of Victoria to appoint all employees, “to fix their salaries or remuneration, and to define their duties and their tenure of office or employment, which, unless otherwise provided, shall be ‘during the pleasure of the Board’” [my emphasis] (Horn, 1999a, p. 293) suggesting that institutions were not yet fully adapting their academic appointment policies to reflect the evolving definition of tenure, or perhaps that there was a difference of opinion between labour and management.

Changes were more apparent at the University of Toronto where in 1964 President Claude Bissell established a committee, chaired by R.E. Haist of the Department of Philosophy, which recommended that the institution formally recognize tenure in policy. The committee subsequently drafted appointment, tenure and promotion procedures to clarify institutional expectations. These procedures, known as the “Haist rules” were approved and adopted by the Board of Governors in 1967 (Friedland, 2002; Horn, 1999b). Here, tenure was defined as “a continuing full-time appointment which the University has relinquished the freedom to
terminate before the normal age of retirement except for cause” (quoted in Friedland, 2002, p. 565).

While the common understanding of tenure had shifted – from tenure at the pleasure of the board to tenure as an employment contract – thorough and clear evaluation policies and procedures had not yet been fully realized. Significant changes to tenure policies were not always immediate nor were they apparent at all Canadian universities.\(^{54}\) CAUT’s concerns regarding institutional evaluation practices led to the drafting of guidelines on academic appointments and tenure in the mid-1960s (Monahan, 1970)\(^{55}\) and were echoed several years later in the Duff-Berdahl report (1966) on university governance. This report addressed issues of imbalance in university decision-making and called on institutions to engage faculty in such processes more thoroughly, in part through elected membership. By the mid-1960s Canadian institutions had still not yet fully refined evaluation procedures in relation to emerging understandings of tenure, a fact that was not lost on the writers of the Duff-Berdahl report (1966) which found that there existed uneven recognition among Canadian universities and faculties of the fact that the tenure decision is probably the most important one taken in regard to

\(^{54}\) These sorts of practices were already appearing in the American system as evidenced by published studies from the mid-1970s which discussed the impact of more formalized tenure policies. As Crase and Crase (1976) note, “the old system had been scuttled and the new one is characterized by strict adherence to well-delineated guidelines and procedures developed by faculty members and administrators. For a faculty member to receive consideration for tenure or promotion, his credentials must usually be scrutinized by a departmental peer committee, departmental chairperson, a college committee, college dean, and vice president for instruction before final recommendation to the president at the university level. At each step along the way the candidate may receive either a negative vote or a positive one with the president having the last vote before final approval by appropriate state authority. Should the candidate fail to receive tenure and/or promotion he may appeal that decision before a university appeals committee. The process has been systematized; it has become an inevitability in the growing-up of colleges and universities; it is also one requiring deep soul searching and professional commitment among the decision makers” (p. 56). Crase & Crase argue that under the system and in the current 1970s climate “untenured faculty, along with many tenured, are being forced either to get out or to play the new game and play it well” (p. 57).

\(^{55}\) See the current CAUT Policy Statement on Academic Appointments (2005a).
personnel. Mistakes made in appointments and promotions can hurt an institution, but a wrong tenure decision may have more lasting ill effects. Faculty thinking on tenure seemed to us to centre, not unnaturally, more on safeguarding it after it had been granted than on creating standards for awarding it which would be neither too severe nor too permissive. But we consider it urgent, if faculty are to seek careful safeguards for tenure rights and be ready to do battle to defend them, that they should be equally concerned to see that substandard teachers are not granted this precious protection. The shortage of qualified faculty over the next decade will undoubtedly result in a pool of marginally prepared teachers, and these will require careful evaluation. While we are not prepared to specify a given time by which the tenure decision should be made, we do not see how this crucial judgment can be made with care in less than four years. Some institutions wait seven (p. 36).  

Furthermore, Duff and Berdahl also discussed specific ways in which universities could improve their existing evaluation processes in relation to governance structures, suggesting that the  

\[r\]eview of departmental and Faculty tenure recommendations can be undertaken by a standing committee of the Senate (with non-Senate members co-opted to lighten the load on the Senate) or, if the burden becomes too heavy, by ad hoc committees created for this purpose by the Senate. (The former procedure obviously promises a higher probability of maintaining rough institutional equity.) In either case, the committee should operate on a confidential basis and report to the President or Academic Vice-President rather than to the Senate. We would expect the committee’s advice normally to be followed, but would not rule out the opportunity for the executive to make a contrary decision after a thorough discussion with the committee. If this happened often, however, committee resignations should follow (pp. 36-37).  

As the 1960s drew to a close, concerns about tenure and related institutional policies continued to be voiced by individual faculty, national associations and commissions; and since universities

---

56 In their 1973 report on tenure in the American higher education system, Keast and Macy note that at that time, only some institutions possessed formal tenure policies and procedures (many did not), and that only some provided “explicit statements concerning qualifications and criteria for reappointment and award of tenure” (most did not) (p. 3). They also report that the communication of tenure standards and processes were inconsistently handled across American institutions, with some addressing this quite thoroughly while at other institutions faculty and administrators were either ignorant of policies or confused.
are often slow to change, this opened the door for more organized efforts such as unionization and collective bargaining.

**Collective Bargaining, Unionization and Faculty Associations**

As Horn notes, “[b]y 1970 the dominant view in Canadian universities was that tenure should be a permanent appointment terminable only for cause and should be enjoyed by all professors who had passed a period of probation” (Horn, 1999b, p. 271). Emerging policies addressed the issue of dismissal and clarified, to a certain degree, how they defined or understood “cause”. Institutions were moving away from discretionary tenure toward performance-based tenure. Tenure was becoming, in essence, an important component of the employment contract. Tenure was no longer an informal appointment type; rather, it was becoming increasingly formalized through the development of evaluation frameworks. It was being codified in institutional policies and would soon find its way into newly drafted collective agreements and memoranda of agreement across the country.

Over the course of the 1970s at an increasing number of universities “the terms under which tenure was granted and retained, and the reasons for which it might be ended, were embodied in collective agreements” (Horn, 1999b, p. 272). However, bargaining was not always seen as the answer to the woes of university governance. In the late 1950s, CAUT and others had hoped to create a more constitutional form of governance through reform of the senate and the board of governors...Their hope for the professoriate was the creation of a self-governing guild along the lines of the medical and legal professions...In this context, the leadership of CAUT saw no reason for collective bargaining. Many of
them, such as Bora Laskin, were quite hostile to the possibility and remained so for a long period (Savage, 1994a, p. 56).\(^{57}\)

During the 60s and early 70s CAUT censured universities, an approach modeled on the one used by the AAUP, that they felt were engaged in unfair employment practices (Monahan, 1970; Savage, 1994a; Tudiver, 1999). In the 1970s, CAUT began to engage in cases relating to tenure denials and faculty dismissals but they lacked significant powers to effect change or reverse institutional decisions (Tudiver, 1999). None of these efforts were particularly effective as long term strategies; the reform of employee conditions was, for many institutions, only to be a possibility through collective bargaining. Although reluctant to adopt it at first, this approach enabled CAUT to “create a regime on each campus where grievances could be handled effectively and fairly through independent arbitration or the equivalent” (Savage, 1994a, p. 57).

In Canada, like the United States, the move to faculty unionization was a result of several key factors, among them: a restrained financial situation for post-secondary institutions due to reduced government funding, concerns regarding job security, lowered job satisfaction, a decline in university enrolment, and concerns about the increasing bureaucratization of institutions (see Castro, 2000 and McHugh, 1973 for a discussion of the American context\(^{58}\), and Adell & Carter, 1972; Allen & Dale, 1972; Axelrod, 1982; Buchbinder & Newson, 1985; Cameron, 1991; Horn, 1994; Ponak et al., 1992; and, Tudiver, 1999 for the Canadian context).

While acknowledging the various economic, governance, and external political and legal factors

\(^{57}\) Bora Laskin was a University of Toronto faculty member and later a Supreme Court of Canada judge.

\(^{58}\) Castro (2000) discusses not only the historical context that led to the establishment of faculty unions in the United States but also addresses the impact of unionization on higher education and tracks the changing role of unions in this jurisdiction.
that led to unionization, Buchbinder and Newson (1985) also believe the changing nature of academic work and the effects of these changes was a driving force, one which they feel has not been adequately considered in the research. They argue that there was a significant struggle about how academic work was being organized and conducted during this period that influenced the trend toward bargaining. All of this “created greater faculty distrust and declining satisfaction with working conditions” and as a result “collective bargaining became the vehicle for addressing this dissatisfaction” (Castro, 2000, p. 47). In addition, Horn (1994) has argued that unionization efforts appealed to the younger, more radical generation of faculty appearing on university campuses across the nation at this time, further ensuring its success.

Another impetus, of particular interest to CAUT, was decreasing faculty power within university governance structures. CAUT had long believed in and stressed the importance of self-governance (Horn, 1994) and argued that faculty, not lay boards, should govern universities (Whalley, 1964). However, in reality, faculty often had little voice in the governance of their respective institutions: an issue also addressed by the Duff-Berdahl commission report (1966) which called for, among other improvements, increased faculty participation. By the mid to late 1960s, faculty involvement in university governance was changing at most institutions with the replacement of elected senates over those that were fully appointed (Savage, 1994). Moreover, in spite of the calls for governance reform, by the early 1970s many felt enough had not been done (Axelrod, 1982) and that the real power

59 A number of articles published in the CAUT Bulletin in 1959 and 1960 addressed this issue, as did a committee on university government. See also the current CAUT Policy Statement on Governance (2008) and the AAUP’s Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1990).
60 This collection of essays edited by George Whalley outlines CAUT’s position on university governance.
within institutions continued to rest in the hands of university presidents and governing boards (Savage, 1994). The climate on Canadian university campuses had altered quite significantly by the late 1960s due in large part to financial constraints and shifting demographics (student and faculty). This, in turn, impacted the nature of academic work, leading to decreased job satisfaction and increased concerns about job security. Added to this was the perception that faculty continued to have insufficient representation in institutional governance and thus, a limited voice in decision-making. These factors certainly helped to spur on Canadian unionization efforts which were further encouraged by the establishment of CAUT’s first collective bargaining committee in 1971 (Axelrod, 1982) and the subsequent drafting of a policy statement which reads,

It is the democratic right of all employees, regardless of the nature of their appointment, to participate in decisions affecting the terms and conditions of their employment. Collective bargaining is a necessary and effective means of achieving this end. In addition, CAUT affirms the importance of collective bargaining in advancing the standards of the profession, protecting academic freedom and collegial governance, advancing policies and practices which secure equity in employment, promoting the interests of both full-time and contract academic staff, and contributing to the improvement of the quality of post-secondary education in Canada (CAUT, 2008).

A similar scenario was playing out south of the border, where

[m]any postsecondary institutions in the United States had weak traditions of faculty governance prior to the advent of collective bargaining. In a number of cases, faculty senates were established after unionization, perhaps to nurture nascent traditions of faculty participation, or even to limit the influence of faculty unions (Ponak et al., 1992, p. 416).

In 1973, the AAUP developed its *Statement on Collective Bargaining* which asserts similar
concerns raised in the CAUT policy cited above. In both Canada and the United States, with the restoration of “faculty’s governance role, collective bargaining functioned as a countervailing force” (Castro, 2000, p. 48).

Collective bargaining and faculty unionization efforts have now been a part of the Canadian post-secondary landscape for over forty years. While the University of Alberta and the University of British Columbia’s faculty associations had explored the possibility of unionization following World War II (Horn, 1994), unions were not established for several decades. The first were founded in the early 1970s in Quebec, followed shortly thereafter by certification at institutions in British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and Ontario (Horn, 1994). Some Canadian institutions opted for full certification, often translating existing associations into unions; others, like the University of Toronto, maintained their faculty associations and established a memorandum of agreement in 1977 through the process of collective bargaining. In the absence of bargaining units, some campuses established faculty associations which adopted an advocacy role within their institutions (e.g. McGill).

When the first faculty unions emerged in Canada in the early 1970s, there were already 133 bargaining units on American campuses (Tudiver, 1999). By 1978, approximately 50% of Canadian faculty were represented by unions (Axelrod, 1982) and a slow, but steady growth continued across Canada through the 1990s (Savage, 1999). A similar pattern is evident in the United States although here the first unionization efforts began slightly earlier in the late 1960s

---

61 The AAUP statement asserted that collective bargaining is an effective instrument for achieving the Association’s objectives to protect academic freedom, to establish and strengthen institutions of faculty governance, to provide fair procedures for resolving grievances, to promote the economic well-being of faculty and other academic professionals, and to advance the interests of higher education.

62 See Nelson (1993) The Search for Faculty Power, for an historical account of the emergence and early years of the University of Toronto Faculty Association.
(Duryea & Fisk, 1973). By 2004, approximately 79% of Canadian institutions had faculty unions and 21% had organized into faculty associations (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008). In the United States only 40% of faculty are unionized and many institutions are still without collective agreements (Amacher & Meiners, 2004). This discrepancy is in part due to the fact that “[s]hared power through collective bargaining was also easier to achieve in Canada than in the United States because Canadian labour law put many fewer restrictions on certification and on the scope of collective bargaining...In many American states faculty in public universities were legally barred from certification” (Savage, 1994a, p. 58).

In Canada, the impact of faculty unionization could be felt early on. Savage (1994a) wrote, “[c]ollective bargaining meant that faculty could force their economic concerns on the agenda of the university in a way that they could not previously” (p. 58) resulting in greater job security and improved benefits for faculty members including medical coverage, pensions, maternity and paternity leaves, sabbatical terms, research leaves, and retirement plans (Allen & Dale, 1972; Penner, 1994). The establishment of faculty unions and associations also led to increased faculty involvement in institutional governance and the redistribution of decision-making power within universities. Of significance here, is their role in redefining academic appointment policies and practices, and particularly those in relation to tenure. Increased and mandated faculty representation on appointment, tenure and promotion committees meant that they could effectively have a voice in key personnel decisions. As Penner (1994) argues,

---

63 Dobbie & Robinson (2008) note that many non-tenure track faculty (part-time and/or full-time) have also unionized in Canada and the United States.

64 According to Sun & Permuth [2007] the rate of unionized faculty at public institutions is significantly higher at approximately 94%. This statistic is based on 2006 data from the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions (NCSCBHEP) and is quoted in Sun & Permuth (2007, p. 117).
faculty unions have generally, become (at least on major administrative issues relating to terms and conditions of employment) the major power broker on campus, along with the senior administration cohort, leaving (in a de facto though not in a de jure sense) boards of governors and academic senates with relatively less power (p. 50).

Tudiver (1999) notes, “unionization also transforms accountability” (p. 104) and this can be tracked in changes to governance structures and institutional procedures. For example, the University of British Columbia Faculty Association (UBCFA) worked with the institution in 1972 to define the membership and powers of the Senior Appointment Committee, an appointed body which is charged with advising the president on tenure and promotion cases (Bruneau, 1990). Or as at York University, where

[p]rior to the certification of York’s faculty association in 1976, tenure and promotion procedures were governed by a senate document. The status of the document was based on the agreement of the board of governors to be bound by it. The York Act placed the legal responsibility for such matters on the board of governors (i.e. on the administration). However, the first collective agreement specified that future amendments would require the approval of both parties to the agreement, the administration and the faculty union. By virtue of this collective agreement, tenure and promotion procedures were recognized as terms and conditions of employment rather than as academic policy within the terms of reference of the senate (Buchbinder & Newson, 1985, p. 239).

The attention to tenure in collective agreements has increased over the years and when unionized, institutions are more likely to have formal written tenure policies than their non-unionized peers (Baldridge et al., 1981). However, “even at institutions not having union contracts, there is a decided move toward formalization, bureaucratization, and procedural regularity” (Baldridge et al., 1981, p.34), as evidenced by a 1979 study of 275 unionized and 900 non-unionized institutions. Baldridge and colleagues found that 88% of unionized institutions
had a written tenure policy and similar documents could be found in 55% of non-unionized universities.\textsuperscript{65}

As Penner (1994) further points out, a union’s power is not based on their political influence but rather on their ability to manifest change through legal discourse, primarily through collective bargaining negotiations. Through bargaining, unions have successfully “negotiated articles entrenching academic freedom and creating procedures for renewal of contracts, the granting of tenure, and dismissal, as well as providing a grievance and arbitration procedure or the equivalent for all matters dealing with the significant change in the power relationship of faculty and administrators” (Savage, 1994a, p. 58).

Cameron (1991, 1994) has argued and others have agreed (Anderson, 1994) that “unions and collective bargaining have rigidified university decision-making” (Cameron, 1994, p. 385). A survey of unionized Canadian faculty found that almost two-thirds of them “believed that collective bargaining had produced an overemphasis on rules and regulations while decreasing collegiality” (Ponak et al., 1992, p. 419). Others have asserted that unionization has helped to clarify and strengthen certain administrative processes and policies, in particular those relating to academic personnel decisions. Savage (1994b), in response to Cameron’s position, has argued that “[o]ne of the results of collective bargaining is that tenure procedures are both clearer and fairer than they used to be, less subject to patronage pressures, and have a much sounder legal basis” (p. 383). This concern for, and interest in, procedural equity was further codified in newly drafted collective agreements at institutions across North America. As

\textsuperscript{65} The inclusion of tenure guidelines in union contracts rose steadily in the 1970 in the United States: with 50% of institutions reporting this trend in 1971, 55% in 1973 and 72% by 1979 (Baldridge et al, 1981, p. 38).
Horn (1994) notes, “[i]f it has done nothing else, unionization has helped to bring about machinery of due process that sustains higher standards of institutional behaviour than used to prevail in what some still mistakenly think of as ‘the good old days’” (p. 46). As a result, unions “promote more systematic policy, and the ‘established traditional practice’ method is gradually being discarded” (Baldridge et al., 1981, p. 40).

Collective agreements and memoranda of agreement (MOAs) from Canadian institutions reveal that universities and bargaining units (faculty associations/ unions) work together to collectively draft and codify the roles and responsibilities of faculty and administrators and the policies and procedures relating to hiring, tenure and promotion. In most cases, significant changes to these agreements must be agreed upon jointly and cannot be made unilaterally, as in the York scenario cited above.

**Tenure, Unions and Bargaining Today**

Today, tenure-stream appointments continue to be offered at all of the 46 Canadian universities reviewed for this thesis. Statistics Canada data from 2004 through 2009 shows that the numbers of associate and full professors have increased by approximately 9% during this period (see Table 4.1 below). The same is not necessarily true at American institutions. Calls for the abandonment of tenure have been heeded at some institutions whereas others are considering significant changes to tenure policies (see for example, Elkins, 1998; Fogg, 2006a; Gravois, 2006; and Lesk, 1998). Reports from the United States indicate that the number of tenure-stream appointments has decreased by over 25% in the last several decades. A 2005

---

66 Beam (2010) reports that the proportion of tenured professors across the United States fell from 57% in 1975 to 31% in 2007. Moltz (2008) cites AAUP data which showed that 58.4% of all full-time faculty at 1,052 associate
survey conducted by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* suggests that the majority (53%) of university presidents in the United States favour abolishing tenure and believe it should be replaced with long-term contracts (Fogg, 2005).67

| Table 4.1 – Full-time Teaching Staff at Canadian Universities, 2004-2009 |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Full professor            | 14,024     | 14,027    | 14,039    | 14,187    | 14,382    |
| Associate professor       | 12,142     | 12,647    | 13,195    | 13,618    | 14,208    |
| Combined total of Full and Associate Professors | 26,166 | 26,674 | 27,234 | 27,885 | 28,590 |
| Assistant professor       | 10,328     | 10,646    | 10,910    | 10,986    | 10,824    |


Such radical changes to the tenure system have yet to impact Canadian universities. Rather, in Canada tenure-stream faculty continue to undergo a tenure review process, a procedure which emerged following the formalization of tenure in the 1960s. This review occurs following a probationary period, which may range anywhere from 3 to 7 years, and may lead to a permanent appointment (Gravestock & Gregor Greenleaf, 2008). As Monahan (1983/4) notes,

there is no presumption that the probationer has a right to tenure and no obligation on the part of the university as an employer to prove that the probationer should not be awarded tenure. All the probationer has is the right to a careful, comprehensive, and fair evaluation conducted by a duly constituted group of academic peers in accordance with clearly specified academic criteria and with provision for appeal (p. 100).

---

degree granting colleges and 73.6% of full-time faculty at doctoral and research universities were either tenured or on a tenure track in 2005. See the American Federation of Teachers analysis of data from 1997 to 2007 which shows that full-time tenured or tenured track positions in American institutions comprised 33.1% of all positions in 1997 and that by 2007 this had dropped to 27.3%. In public doctoral granting institutions this proportion fell from 34.1% to 28.9% during the same period, and from 51% to 39% in four-year public colleges and universities (American Federation of Teachers, 2009).

67 The article also notes that those presidents with no teaching experience were more likely to oppose tenure.
Details regarding probationary periods and the overall tenure review process are often included in collective agreements negotiated between Canadian universities and representative faculty unions. Faculty unions are present at 75% of Canadian universities and at all 46 universities reviewed for this study, faculty are represented by a union or an association (see Table 4.3 below). All but one of these associations, the Thompson Rivers University Faculty Association, is a member of CAUT.

Most of these Canadian faculty associations engage in bargaining with institutions on behalf of faculty. The resulting negotiations are outlined in collective agreements (or memoranda of agreement). Where present (at 41 of 46 institutions), such agreements either directly address tenure policies and procedures or embed references to separate policy documents that have been mutually sanctioned by both the union and university administration (see Table 4.2 below). In some instances, universities may have associations that represent faculty interests, but that do not engage in collective bargaining or that do not have certified union status: this is the case at McGill. However, in this instance, its tenure and promotion policy, Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic Staff (2009a), addresses the very same issues as those in unionized environments, including appeals processes. This may indicate the impact of unionization on institutions that have not certified as Savage (1994a) notes,

faculty in non-unionized universities could and did press their administration to adopt the protections found in collective agreements; otherwise certification would be the result. Over time many of them created the equivalent of a collective agreement without ever calling it that (p. 58).

Whether included in a collective agreement or a separate document, tenure and promotion policies from Canadian institutions tend to cover much of the same material
including the meaning of tenure, details on academic freedom, information on the eligibility for tenure and the tenure criteria. In addition, such policies outline the range of appointment types and faculty roles and responsibilities, specifically as they pertain to teaching, research and service. Details pertaining to the overall approval process, an indication of which governing body or administrator (e.g. the board or the president) is invested with the authority to grant tenure, and guidelines regarding the make-up of tenure review committees are also commonly located in these documents (Gravestock, Gregor Greenleaf & Jones, 2009). Additionally, processes for deferring tenure and those related to grievances and appeals are also outlined. These elements are recommended in both the CAUT Model Clause for the Evaluation of Teaching Performance (2007b) and in AAUP’s Statement on Teaching Evaluation (1990b).

Regardless of where such information is specifically located, its very presence in university documents has two benefits: one, it provides transparency in the review process for faculty who are being considered for tenure; and two, it highlights and ensures faculty involvement in key personnel decisions. The latter is particularly significant since, as noted, prior to the establishment of formal policies and the rise of faculty unions, appointments at many institutions were made on a rather ad hoc basis, typically by chairs, deans or other administrators, and even the president. Broader faculty involvement ensures that decisions are made more collegially and serves to balance institutional power structures. As Savage (1994a) argues, “[e]ssentially collective bargaining made collegiality real” (p. 58). From the perspective of CAUT and the AAUP, decisions regarding appointments are best decided upon by faculty committees and not institutional administration,

[j]Judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of
their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments... Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail (AAUP, 1990a, p. 139).

This sentiment is reflected in many institutional policies and bargaining documents which state that the tenure review process involves an evaluation of faculty contributions by peers (typically at the departmental or divisional level and sometimes at the institutional level). Recommendations are then transmitted to appropriate individuals (e.g. chairs and/or deans) and then to institutional level committees, boards and the president. For example, at York University, Article 13 of the collective agreement (2009) states that the award of tenure to faculty members, shall be by action of the Board of Governors, only upon recommendation of the President. The President shall, in making his/her recommendations, act in conformity with existing practices with respect to criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure, in so far as they relate to terms and conditions of employment. It is agreed that the existing practices are those as set out in the Tenure and Promotion Policy, Criteria and Procedures document (Article 13.01).

By the mid-20th century the notion of tenure was shifting. Increasingly understood as an employment contract, details regarding faculty appointments were formalized and codified in institutional policies. This formalization of tenure and the increased security of academic appointments necessitated the development of clearer and more thorough evaluation frameworks for hiring, tenure and promotion. In part, these changes were shaped through the influence of the AAUP and CAUT, in particular by their statements of principles and their call for increased faculty involvement in university governance. The processes and criteria for tenure
review were further shaped by bargaining and unionization efforts which led to the drafting of documents that laid out the specifics for tenure track appointments, which now included a probationary period, a formal review of faculty contributions by their peers, the understanding that faculty could only be dismissed for cause, and the establishment of appeal or grievance procedures for those who received negative recommendations. All of this meant that academic appointments were now less tenuous and held a stronger possibility for permanency. The end result was a more rigid set of institutional practices that served to create more clarity and transparency, particularly for those being considered for tenure and for those involved in their assessment.

Summary
Although formal tenure systems emerged in Canada slightly later than those in the United States, they evolved quickly into very similar structures. In both countries, tenure became the safeguard for academic freedom and provided security and assurances for permanent appointments as it took on the characteristics of an employment contract, embedded in policy or bargaining agreements. While in both Canada and the United States faculty unions and associations, as well as national organizations like the AAUP and CAUT, sought to ensure tenure was secured through collective bargaining, these efforts have been sustained more effectively within the Canadian environment. In many American states (including North Carolina, Texas

---

68 At Canadian institutions it is common practice for a faculty member to be hired at the rank of assistant professor for a term of between five and seven years. At the end of this period, s/he is put forward for tenure consideration and undergoes a review by peers. This review may occur at the departmental, divisional or institutional level (or some combination thereof) before being considered by a board of governors or university president. Throughout this review process, individual faculty are evaluated based on the criteria outlined in the institutional policy on academic appointments (which may be embedded in a collective agreement).
and Virginia) unionization has been outlawed or highly regulated, restricting the ability of faculty to form associations that can engage in bargaining with university management (Sun & Permuth, 2007). Additionally, a number of institutions across the United States have either abandoned tenure or modified it to a point that it no longer resembles the structure it once was. In Canada, faculty unions continue to have a strong presence on campuses across the country and continue to engage in bargaining efforts. Some have suggested that tenure has resisted challenges and criticisms in the Canadian environment due to the efforts of faculty associations (Rosenfeld, 2009). It is noteworthy that 41 of the 46 institutions reviewed for this study have codified their tenure policies and teaching evaluation frameworks within collective/faculty agreements or memoranda of agreement.

This review provides a useful historical context for the forthcoming discussion of current tenure policies and also serves as a reminder that, while the Canadian higher education system may have much in common with its American counterpart, there are also significant differences. In the last several decades, tenure has been tested in United States and in some cases it has been abandoned. Although many Canadian scholars and faculty members have questioned and continue to question the value of and need for tenure, and some have called for its abandonment, the discourse has not resulted in similar action in Canada. Tenure continues to be a significant event in the academic life cycle at Canadian universities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Collective Agreement*</th>
<th>Institutional Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland &amp; Labrador</td>
<td>Memorial University of Newfoundland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Acadia University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Breton University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Saint Vincent University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Francis Xavier University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary’s University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>University of Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>Mount Allison University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Thomas University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of New Brunswick</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Bishop’s University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Algoma University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brock University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakehead University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laurentian University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nipissing University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen’s University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryerson University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trent University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ontario Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Windsor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Brandon University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Winnipeg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>University of Regina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Lethbridge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Collective Agreement*</td>
<td>Institutional Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson Rivers University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Northern British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*This may be a collective agreement or a memorandum of agreement.)

**Table 4.3 - Canadian Faculty Associations**

1. Acadia University Faculty Association
2. Algoma University Faculty Association
3. Association of Academic Staff: University of Alberta
4. Association of Professors of Bishop's University
5. Brandon University Faculty Association
6. University of British Columbia Faculty Association
7. Brock University Faculty Association
8. The Faculty Association of University of Calgary
9. Cape Breton University Faculty Association
10. Carleton University Academic Staff Association
11. Concordia University Association
12. Dalhousie Faculty Association
13. University of Guelph Faculty Association
14. Lakehead University Faculty Association
15. Laurentian University Faculty Association
16. University of Lethbridge Faculty Association
17. University of Manitoba Faculty Association
18. McGill Association of University Teachers
19. McMaster University Faculty Association
20. Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association
21. Mount Allison Faculty Association
22. Mount Saint Vincent University Faculty Association
23. Association of University of New Brunswick Teachers
24. Nipissing University Faculty Association
25. University of Northern British Columbia Faculty Association
26. University of Ontario Institute of Technology Faculty Association
27. Association of Professors of the University of Ottawa
28. University of Prince Edward Island Faculty Association
29. Queen's University Faculty Association
30. University of Regina Faculty Association
31. Ryerson Faculty Association
32. St. Francis Xavier Association of University Teachers
33. Saint Mary's University Faculty Union
34. Faculty Association of the University of St. Thomas
35. University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association
36. Simon Fraser University Faculty Association
37. Thompson Rivers University Faculty Association *
38. University of Toronto Faculty Association
39. Trent University Faculty Association
40. University of Victoria Faculty Association
41. Windsor University Faculty Association
42. University of Western Ontario Faculty Association
43. Wilfrid Laurier University Faculty Association
44. Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo
45. University of Winnipeg Faculty Association
46. York University Faculty Association

*Thompson Rivers University Faculty Association is the only one not listed on CAUT’s list of member associations (see http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=128)
CHAPTER 5
THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE: HOW DO CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES MEASURE UP AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE LITERATURE?

This chapter turns its attention toward the institutional policies and related documents that outline how teaching is to be evaluated during the tenure review. This chapter will address my third set of research questions:

What role does the evaluation of teaching play in current tenure policies at Canadian universities?

- Can candidates be considered for tenure on teaching contributions alone?
- Do current policies suggest that research is privileged?
- How are the criteria for teaching defined (e.g. competence vs. excellence)?
- What materials are collected for the evaluation of teaching and how are they reviewed?
- What forms of evidence are tenure candidates required to provide?
- Are the structure, wording and content of current policies the source for faculty beliefs about the value of teaching in higher education?

To frame this discussion, I draw on the scholarship on evaluation frameworks and structure my examination of these policy documents based on the recommendations from this body of literature (see Table 5.1 for an overview of these findings). Specifically, this chapter looks at the following elements of Canadian tenure policies: evaluation goals and purpose; faculty roles and responsibilities; tenure criteria (including categories of evaluation and relative weighting); standards of performance; definitions of teaching effectiveness; mechanisms for evaluation and types of evidence; committee structures and roles. I also consider procedures relating to the training and support for and communication of tenure policies, as they are addressed in these documents. Each of these elements will be discussed and examples will be drawn from current collective agreements and institutional policies and guidelines. Identified patterns will be
highlighted, along with any atypical or exemplary practices all of which will be discussed in greater detail. Subsequent chapters will provide a close examination of institutions that have developed integrated evaluation frameworks that align with identified teaching expectations, will analyze some of the trends highlighted in this section, and will discuss in greater detail the impact and significance of current practices and any implications they might have on teaching cultures and perceptions about teaching.

**Table 5.1 - Components of an Effective Evaluation Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The literature on teaching evaluation recommends that comprehensive, integrated and aligned teaching evaluation frameworks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish evaluation goals and purpose that align with institutional mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide a clear understanding of faculty responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Define teaching effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify criteria for the evaluation of faculty work and articulate the related standards of performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use a range of evaluation mechanisms and seek multiple forms of evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establish clear and transparent governance and decision-making structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide sufficient support and/or training for all involved in the review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ensure effective and consistent communication to all relevant constituents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that this review of policy focuses on institutional level documents and does not drill down to divisional or departmental level policies or guidelines. As noted in the introduction, this study presents a view of teaching from the university-level, with the understanding that divisions and departments may elaborate on or articulate more thoroughly their expectations in terms of teaching contributions and successes. While divisional differences may exist, it is the institution that sets the overall tone and that is the focus for this study.
Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

At all 46 Canadian institutions reviewed for this study, institutional documents indicate that tenure-stream faculty are expected to contribute in three primary areas: teaching, research and service. These expectations are outlined in collective agreements, faculty handbooks, guidelines and/or policies in sections most often titled “Faculty Responsibilities”, “Duties and Responsibilities of Faculty” or “Faculty Roles”; however, they are also often elaborated on in more detail in other sections of these documents (including those addressing tenure criteria). Frequently, some sense of the nature and scope of teaching, research and service responsibilities are provided in articles of the policies or agreements addressing faculty roles (see Appendix E). The term “research” is used in 17 of 46 policies. In some instances, the term “research” is replaced by “scholarly or professional activity” (1 of 46) or “scholarship/scholarly activity” (16 of 46) or may be referenced as “research, creative and/or scholarly activity” (9 of 46). However, regardless of the chosen terminology, the accompanying details reveal that the criteria are referring to the pursuit of scholarly activity and subsequent dissemination of the results of that work (most often in terms of publication or the creation of artistic works). Service may encompass contributions to the discipline, to the department/division, to the university (which may include participation in governance), to the profession, and/or service to the community.

As with research and service, teaching duties are also outlined in policy documents. This typically consists of a list of activities and is fairly homogenous across institutions and includes undergraduate and/or graduate teaching (including labs, practica, field work, seminars, lectures, and so on), the preparation of course materials, the development of assessment
measures and grading, academic consultations and counseling, graduate supervision, and course and curriculum development. (See Appendix E for an overview of the way in which teaching activities are understood at Canadian institutions.) While the specific activities may vary by institution, almost all of the 46 Canadian university policies include a list of teaching-related activities (no specific details are provided in university policies from Bishop's, Regina and Victoria). In all cases, the word “teaching” is used; there are no variations on this term in any of the policies reviewed.

In a number of examples, including Algoma, Dalhousie, Laurentian, Manitoba, New Brunswick, St. Francis Xavier and St. Mary’s, institutional documents note that faculty must “develop and maintain their scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers”. In other instances, as at Memorial, St. Francis Xavier, Saskatchewan and York, teaching is framed as a scholarly activity within the tenure criteria and standards, which will be discussed in more detail below. One example of a more thorough description of “teaching” can be found in the University of Alberta’s General Faculty Council (GFC) Policy Manual (2002). Here, four pages of this document are dedicated to a section on “Teaching and Learning” (Section 111) which outlines a set of principles regarding good teaching and learning and discusses the various roles that a teacher plays, including that of a scholar. (This document from Alberta will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6.) At Saint Francis Xavier, the Collective Agreement (2009) states that

it is recognized, however, that scholarship must be manifested in the teaching function and that a dogmatic attempt to separate “scholarship” and “teaching” is somewhat artificial (Article 2.21:2.2, p. 58).
Overall, institutional expectations regarding faculty roles and responsibilities are quite consistent across all Canadian universities surveyed. Although there may be some differentiation in terms of particular items or tasks required at the local level, in terms of the scope of each responsibility, and in the specific terminology chosen to capture each role (this only applies to research activity), Canadian faculty are, across the board, expected to engage in teaching, research and service regardless of their location.

Tenure Criteria: Categories of Evaluation and Relative Weighting
Echoing the responsibilities for faculty members, all 46 tenure policies consulted indicate that faculty will be reviewed on the basis of their contributions in teaching, research and service (see Appendix E). While service is always listed as one of the criteria or expectations for faculty, tenure is never granted on the basis of contributions in this area. A number of institutional policies make this explicit, as at Brock. Others (including Memorial, Toronto and Western Ontario) note that the primary emphasis will be on teaching and research. In other cases, policies note that exceptional service should be taken into consideration when tenure files are assessed. For example, at Lakehead the policy indicates that exceptional service, when combined with satisfactory teaching, can compensate for lesser research.

Although only one institution lists teaching as the primary criterion for tenure (Bishop’s), all institutions surveyed require evidence of teaching contributions for the granting of tenure. In one case, at Trent, the Collective Agreement (2009) states that “in assessing a candidate for
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69 The vast majority of universities have set these expectations at the institutional level, although some are reasonably vague and delegate the responsibility of establishing specific weighting to departments or divisions (as at Manitoba, Dalhousie, Guelph). In some cases, general institutional expectations are noted but additional standards are articulated at the departmental level (as at Trent).
tenure” the various committees and reviewers “shall pay principal regard to the candidate’s scholarship and scholarly promise” (Article 4.1). However, subsequently within this same clause, the policy indicates that “to qualify for tenure, the candidate must be judged to have demonstrated high quality in both teaching and research”. Perhaps in this case, Trent’s understanding of “scholarship and scholarly promise” includes both teaching and research, although this is not made explicit.

Aside from this one example, no other institutional policies identify research as the primary basis for achieving tenure, nor do any state that research is privileged, or more heavily weighted, in tenure decisions. As Fairweather (2005), Ramsden and Martin (1996) and others have suggested, it is through policies that institutions make explicit their expectations and what they value, and it is here that faculty look for this information. In the Canadian examples, teaching and research appear to be on equal footing within policy documents. Based on this finding, it is evident that teaching is viewed as a fundamental category of faculty work from which no tenure stream faculty are exempt.

**Standards of Performance for Tenure Review**

The standards of expectation for each of the individual criteria – teaching, research and service – vary quite a bit across institutions (see Table 5.2 below). In general, five variations in practice can be identified across Canadian institutions in relation to how these standards are applied:

1) Faculty are expected to perform at the same level in all of three categories of responsibility;
2) Faculty are expected to perform at the same level in teaching and research;
3) Faculty are expected to perform at a higher level in one category over another;
4) Faculty are expected to perform at a higher level in at least two of three categories, or;
5) Each category of responsibility has a different level of expectation.

Table 5.2 – Standards of Performance in Tenure Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure criteria</th>
<th># and % of Institutions</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal level of performance in teaching, research and service</td>
<td>9 (20%)</td>
<td>Alberta, British Columbia, Cape Breton, Concordia, Laurentian, Mount Allison, Thompson Rivers, Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal level of performance in teaching and research only</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>Bishop’s, Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level of performance in at least one category</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>St. Francis Xavier, Toronto, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level of performance in at least two categories</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>McGill, Ryerson, Waterloo, Western, Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different levels of performance for each category</td>
<td>23 (50%)</td>
<td>Acadia, Algoma, Brandon, Brock, Calgary, Carleton, Lakehead, Lethbridge, McMaster, Memorial, Mount Saint Vincent, New Brunswick, Nipissing, Northern British Columbia, Ontario Institute of Technology, Prince Edward Island, Queen’s, St. Mary’s, St. Thomas, Saskatchewan, Simon Fraser, Victoria, Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NB. No data available for: Regina, Dalhousie, Guelph, and Manitoba. At Dalhousie, Guelph and Manitoba institutional policies state that these standards are determined at the divisional/departmental levels.)

Nine institutional policies indicate that faculty contributions in teaching, research and service are expected to be on par with one another. For example, at Thompson Rivers, faculty must demonstrate a “satisfactory record” as a teacher, of scholarship and of service (here, additional criteria are applied when candidates are promoted to associate professor when they attain tenure). Similarly, at Cape Breton the expectation is for “acceptable performance” in teaching, research and service.

In at least one instance, at Ottawa, the details regarding standards are somewhat ambiguous. Ottawa’s Collective Agreement (2008) notes that teaching must “meet expectations”, that “good quality” research/scholarly work is expected and that service must be

---

70 At Manitoba the Collective Agreement (2007) notes that teaching and research are to be the primary criteria for tenure, with service being secondary.
of “satisfactory quality”. It further notes three levels of performance that may be used when making assessments: outstanding, meets expectations, and unsatisfactory. The policy does not clearly articulate whether there is a distinction between the level of performance in the three categories of faculty work.

In two instances, at Trent and Bishop’s, policies refer only to teaching and research expectations in the tenure criteria, and there is no explicit reference to service. At Bishop’s, candidates are required to demonstrate “satisfactory performance” in both teaching and research and at Trent the expectation is for “high quality performance” in each of these two areas. In two cases, there are equal expectations for both teaching and research and slightly lower levels of contributions required in relation to service. At Western the criteria call for a “sufficiently strong record of performance” in both teaching and research and a “satisfactory record of performance” in service. A similar scenario is in play at Mount Allison, where faculty must show “high quality” teaching and research/creative activity and a “willingness to engage” in service.

Teaching and research tend to be the primary focus during the tenure review, with service being taken into consideration, but never forming the basis of any tenure decisions. In seven instances, universities look for evidence of a higher level of performance in at least one, and possibly two categories. This is the case at Toronto and St. Francis Xavier where faculty must demonstrate “excellence” in either teaching or research and “competence” in the other but could demonstrate excellence in both. Similarly, at York, demonstrated superiority (or excellence) is required in one of the three categories with at least competence demonstrated in teaching and research. At McGill and Cape Breton, review committees are looking for “superior
performance” in two of teaching, research and service and “reasonable performance” in the third. In a handful of cases, “superior contributions” in either teaching or research can substitute for lesser performance in the other category (as at Lakehead and Waterloo). In some institutional policies the weighting is more nuanced, as is the case at Prince Edward Island, where candidates must demonstrate “satisfactory performance” as a teacher, and provide evidence of an “established foundation of enduring and productive involvement in scholarly endeavours”.

In the majority of the policies reviewed, the standards for research and teaching can be read as parallel to one another, in that it is difficult to suggest that one is emphasized over the other. In slightly more than half (24) of the institutional policies reviewed different terminology is used to describe the expectations for each area of faculty responsibility (see Appendix E for an overview of these standards and Table 5.3 below for the variation used for teaching contributions alone). For example, many institutions use the same qualifiers for both (satisfactory performance in both teaching and research) which could suggest that these two categories are both valued and assessed with the same level of rigour. Other policies use terms that suggest similar weighting: quality and effectiveness as a teaching/quality and significance of scholarship (St. Mary’s), evidence of good quality teaching/evidence of continual and consistent scholarly contributions (St. Thomas), sustained commitment to undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and supervision/continued growth as an established scholar as evidenced by the development of a significant program of research and scholarship (Simon Fraser). At one institution, Algoma, the weighting appears to privilege teaching: high degree of effectiveness in teaching/satisfactory performance in research/scholarship.
### Table 5.3 – Terminology Used in Tenure Policies to Describe Teaching Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards of Performance for Teaching Contributions</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness/effective</td>
<td>British Columbia, Calgary, Carleton, Dalhousie, Laurentian, Manitoba, McMaster, Nipissing, Northern British Columbia, Ryerson, Saskatchewan, Simon Fraser, Toronto, Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated effectiveness</td>
<td>Ontario Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented effectiveness</td>
<td>Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established effectiveness</td>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of effectiveness</td>
<td>Algoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and effectiveness</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island, St. Mary’s, St. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained satisfactory and effective</td>
<td>Brock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of performance</td>
<td>Guelph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>Acadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable performance</td>
<td>Cape Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable performance</td>
<td>McGill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory performance</td>
<td>Bishop’s, Lakehead, Laurentian, Mount Saint Vincent, Prince Edward Island, Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong performance</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High standard of performance</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior performance</td>
<td>McGill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching excellence</td>
<td>St. Francis Xavier, Toronto, Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory quality</td>
<td>Lakehead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good quality</td>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality</td>
<td>Mount Allison, Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional quality</td>
<td>Lakehead, Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated superiority</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory record</td>
<td>Northern British Columbia, Thompson Rivers, Wilfrid Laurier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong record of achievement</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently strong record</td>
<td>Western Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>New Brunswick, Ryerson, Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of competence</td>
<td>Concordia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated competence and responsibility</td>
<td>Northern British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly competence</td>
<td>Laurentian, Manitoba, Memorial, Nipissing, Ryerson, Wilfrid Laurier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good teacher committed to academic and pedagogical excellence</td>
<td>Queen’s, Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Brandon, Prince Edward Island, St. Mary’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise</td>
<td>Nipissing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained commitment</td>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the standards of performance for teaching expectations were articulated in 33 different ways across the 46 Canadian institutional tenure policies (as noted in Table 5.3). Frequently more than one type of phrase is used within and across different documents (see Appendix E). In many cases there were similarities in the adopted phrasing, where terms like “effective”, “excellence” or “quality” were identified in multiple locations. There were, however variations in the qualifiers used for these terms, with examples ranging from “good quality”, to “satisfactory quality” to “high quality”. In at least one instance the term “promise” was used to describe teaching contributions, a term often used to describe an institution’s overall expectations for faculty, and frequently associated with research productivity. Another term more often linked to research – “scholarly competence” – appeared in several policies. And, the phrase “sustained commitment” also appeared in relation to teaching in one policy document. This array of terms used to set the standards of performance for teaching activities clearly indicates that there is no established norm across Canada in this regard. Moreover, no clear jurisdicational patterns or those relating to institutional type could be identified.

Disciplinary Contexts
As noted in Chapter 2, much of the research calls on institutions to recognize differences in disciplinary contexts when setting standards of performance for the tenure review. When addressed in Canadian institutional policies, one of two approaches is taken (see Table 5.4 below). In 11 policies (Concordia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Simon Fraser, Acadia, St. Mary’s, Bishop’s, Brock, Wilfrid Laurier, British Columbia and Nipissing) it is advised that disciplinary differences be considered during the tenure review and that assessments take into
account these varied teaching contexts. At 16 institutions (Toronto, Guelph, Ryerson, Regina, Memorial, St. Francis Xavier, Simon Fraser, Dalhousie, McGill, Victoria, Calgary, York, Manitoba, Trent, Alberta, and Saskatchewan) tenure policies require or recommend the establishment of supplementary divisional/departmental guidelines that further enable this recognition of contextual differences in relation to pedagogical (and research) approaches.

**Table 5.4 –Disciplinary Contexts in Tenure Processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition of disciplinary differences/contexts</th>
<th>Noted in policies from the following 11 institutions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nipissing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment of disciplinary/divisional/departmental standards</th>
<th>Supplementary standards are required (REQ) or recommended (REC) in the following 16 institutional policies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberta (REQ)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calgary (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalhousie (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guelph (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGill (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regina (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryerson (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Francis Xavier (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saskatchewan (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Fraser (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trent (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York (REQ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*REQ: required; REC: recommended]*

**Defining Teaching Effectiveness**

Canadian institutional policies do a reasonably good job of identifying their expectations in relation to the scope and nature of activities related to teaching (see Appendix E). Further,
tenure policies also articulate expected standards of performance for teaching, along with research and service. These standards fall into five broad categories, but vary widely in terms of the vocabulary used in relation to expectations for performance (e.g. high quality, competence, excellence, effectiveness, and so on). In 67% of the institutions surveyed (31 of 46), these terms are not clearly defined; in others, brief descriptions are provided. For example, at Toronto the *Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness in Teaching* (2003b) outline expectations for both competence and excellence, the two standards of performance (see Appendix E). As such, tenure candidates, academic administrators (e.g. chairs and or deans), and members of tenure review committees are provided with a fairly reasonable understanding of the institutional expectations in relation to teaching. It should be noted, that at the University of Toronto, the *Provostial Guidelines* (2003b) are a university-level document and therefore the understanding of competence and excellence reflect broader institutional expectations regarding teaching. Individual divisions each have supplementary guidelines that reflect disciplinary-based understandings of and expectations regarding teaching.

In addition to Toronto, 13 other institutional policies attempt to clarify their expectations in relation to the standards of performance for teaching, these include Lethbridge, Simon Fraser, Victoria, Nipissing, Ontario Institute of Technology, McMaster, Waterloo, Windsor, York, Prince Edward Island, St. Francis Xavier, Carleton and Saskatchewan (as detailed in Appendix E). In many cases, this is done through an effort to define what it means to be an “effective” teacher. Among these examples there is significant variation, with some institutions providing a basic understanding of what “effective” means and others working to establish clear principles. The following examples from five institutions, Lethbridge, Thompson Rivers,
McMaster, St. Francis Xavier and Queen’s, demonstrate the range of approaches in defining effective teaching.

Two concise, but useful, definitions of teaching and teaching effectiveness are provided in policies at Thompson Rivers and Lethbridge. At Thompson Rivers, teaching is understood as a scholarly and dynamic endeavour that covers a broad range of activities with a commitment to creating the best possible learning situation for students. Teaching involves attention to course work, course design, methods of teaching, curriculum development and other instructional related activities (Collective Agreement, 2004, Article 6.10.5.1, p. 59).

The Faculty Handbook (2007) at Lethbridge also focuses on learning but links this to particular teaching approaches and possible means of evaluation in the following description:

Effectiveness as a teacher implies a concentrated and successful effort to create the best possible learning situation for students. It involves continuing attention to course work, course design, and related activities; and to the supervision of students in alternative modes of learning. It may involve participation in seminars and colloquia, the design of innovative methods of teaching, or other contributions to the teaching activities of the university. Effectiveness as a teacher may be assessed by a variety of means including evaluation by fellow faculty members and through student appraisals though no assessment will be based mainly on student appraisals (Article 12.01.1).

As detailed in its Policy and Regulations with Respect to Academic Appointment, Tenure and Promotion (2009a), McMaster understands teaching to include the following activities: the selection and arrangement of course topics and materials, lecturing, leading class and seminar discussions, assisting students during office hours, lab and studio teaching, grading, setting exams, and supervision of undergraduate and graduate students (Section III.7, p. 14). This policy further notes that “A candidate for re-appointment, tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher. Committees, in judging teaching effectiveness, shall seek assurance that the candidate has a scholarly command of his or her
subject, is both willing and able regularly to assist students in understanding the subject, and is able to assess students’ performance in an equitable and effective manner” (p. 13).

Documents from St. Francis Xavier provide a concise but reasonably thorough definition of how teaching is understood and how effectiveness should be demonstrated. This aligned system also incorporates multiple means of assessment. As Article 2.2: Evaluation, Section 2.0: Teaching Ability in the St. Francis Xavier Collective Agreement (2009) states:

2.1 Teaching, at all levels, is the primary activity of a University. It is not confined to a commitment to formal instruction, but includes every way in which a teacher has influence upon students -- by lecturing, by inspiring, by encouraging, and by guiding and directing. Also, it may involve day-to-day participation in the intellectual, social, and recreational environment of the campus.
2.2 Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated in lectures, seminars, laboratories, and tutorials as well as in more informal teaching situations. It is recognized, however, that scholarship must be manifested in the teaching function and that a dogmatic attempt to separate “scholarship” and “teaching” is somewhat artificial.

This article further indicates that,

2.3 Three major elements should be considered in assessing teaching effectiveness:
   a) The degree to which the Faculty member is able to stimulate and challenge the intellectual capacity of students;
   b) The degree to which the Faculty member is able to communicate well; and,
   c) The degree to which the Faculty member has a mastery of his or her subject area. (Article 2.2: Evaluation, 2.2.1 Evaluation Criteria, Section 2.0 Teaching Ability, p. 58)

The ability to communicate institutional expectations in relation to effective teaching is perhaps best captured in Queen’s Statement on Effective Teaching (1995). This lengthy and detailed document which identifies a number of key characteristics of effective teaching is unlike anything found at the other institutions surveyed. At Queen’s, effective teaching is a scholarly activity; it requires excellent communication skills, attention to curriculum design and
development, a recognition of diverse learning styles and approaches, equitable approaches to students, and self-reflection and flexibility (see a copy of the full statement in Appendix G). Such a statement provides the Queen’s community with a very clear and thorough understanding of institutional expectations in relation to teaching, even though this document is not a formal policy.

These five examples reveal variations in approaches from two different institutional types (primarily undergraduate and medical/doctoral). Overall, as indicated in Appendix E, there are no identifiable patterns in terms of institutional type; rather, in the handful of institutions that have taken the steps to formalize their understanding of effective teaching, we see medical/doctoral, comprehensive and primarily undergraduate all represented.

**Mechanisms for Evaluation and Types of Evidence for the Evaluation of Teaching**

An examination of the mechanisms by which teaching is evaluated and the types of evidence requested in tenure dossiers may provide some sense of what institutions are looking for in relation to teaching effectiveness. In addition, this information will reveal whether or not universities are adhering to the practices outlined in current research on teaching evaluation frameworks which strongly urge institutions to utilize a range of evidence to most effectively evaluate teaching performance.

The literature suggests that comprehensive teaching evaluation frameworks rely on multiple sources to assess teaching, both in terms of the means by which the evidence is gathered and what is actually collected. The general rule of thumb is that teaching should be evaluated on the basis of more than one indicator (e.g. course evaluations, instructional
materials, in-class visits) and that it should involve assessments from various parties (self, peers and students). Indeed, this is the case at most Canadian institutions as demonstrated by policy documents, collective agreements and institutional guidelines (see Table 5.6 and Appendix F for an overview of these practices).

As Table 5.5 indicates, most institutions draw on data for the evaluation of teaching from a combination of sources: the tenure candidate, colleagues/peers and students. In all 46 cases, the tenure candidate tends to be the primary source for teaching-related information, with student feedback being used at 42 of 46 institutions. Less common is data collected from peers/colleagues, and we see this forming a part of the collected evidence in 37 of 46 institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th># and % of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor (self)</td>
<td>46 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal colleagues/peers</td>
<td>37 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External colleagues/peers</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>42 (91%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of course evaluations the majority of evidence is supplied by the tenure candidate. In 39% (18 of 46) of the institutions surveyed, this information is provided through the submission of a required teaching dossier compiled by the candidate (Northern British Columbia requires an annual performance review report, which very much resembles a dossier in scope and content; however, this is not included in the tally here). In seven institutions (Simon Fraser, British Columbia, Algoma, York, Winnipeg, Saskatchewan and Waterloo), the dossier is recommended. (See Table 5.6 for an overview of the types of evidence used at Canadian universities.)
Table 5.6 – Most Common Forms of Evidence Requested for Teaching Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Evidence</th>
<th># and % of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course evaluation data</td>
<td>29 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching dossier</td>
<td>18 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class observations by peers</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/testimonials/opinions from students</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/testimonials/opinions from colleagues</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample student work</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with students</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dossier has clearly become a dominant source of information for the evaluation of teaching at Canadian institutions, and in some cases it is identified as the primary means of evidence (e.g. Concordia). At each of the 18 institutions requiring teaching dossiers, and the seven recommending their use, tenure policies or collective agreements include a suggested/required list of items to be included in the candidate’s teaching dossier. The most common elements requested in dossiers include: lists of courses taught, copies of course materials (including syllabi, assessment measures, assignments/tests/exams), statements from the candidate outlining their teaching philosophy, teaching goals and objectives and or pedagogical strategies, course and curriculum development efforts, and evidence pertaining to supervisory activities. Faculty may also be asked to include information on efforts to improve their own teaching (including professional development activities), presentations and/or publications on teaching and learning, innovative teaching methods, teaching awards or instructional grants received. On occasion, samples of student work may also be included in dossiers. An atypical example of an item requested for a dossier appears in the Prince Edward Island policy, which notes that the dossier must include (where applicable) “a summary of special efforts to accommodate students with disabilities” (Collective Agreement, 2010, Article
E.3.1.2, p. 80). All of these forms of self-reported evidence mirror the recommendations of Seldin (2004), Knapper and Wright (2001) and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (2007a, b) (see Appendix A for a list of the contents recommended by CAUT and Table 2.4 in Chapter 2) and others.

In some cases, faculty are directed to on-campus resources and/or teaching and learning support offices (e.g. at Memorial, Waterloo, Queen’s, McGill) for additional support and guidance in compiling a dossier. A number of institutional policies incorporate detailed guidelines for the development of dossiers. (See for example, McGill’s Guidelines for Developing a Teaching Portfolio, 2009b.71) In other instances, the community is directed to institutional guides, as at Queen’s, or to the CAUT guide, which is appended to the Memorial tenure guidelines. At Windsor, where teaching dossiers are optional, a guide produced by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (University of Windsor, 2010) outlines the relevant procedures and policies for tenure and promotion and includes a section describing the purpose and format of a teaching dossier. Increasingly institutions, either centrally or at the divisional or departmental level, run sessions on dossiers for instructors.72

In the 17 policies where teaching dossiers are not explicitly mentioned the same types of materials, as would normally be included in a dossier, are typically requested for review. Again, the candidate for tenure is asked to provide this evidence, which most often includes: a list of courses taught, sample course outlines and course materials, information regarding a faculty’s involvement with course, curriculum or program development, and, if applicable,

---

71 This document forms Appendix A of the Regulations Relation to the Employment of Academic Staff (2009).
72 As evidenced by events advertised on university web sites and through teaching and learning centres. For example, Windsor runs a week-long teaching dossier institute each year and the University of Toronto offers a two-part workshop series on dossiers.
In most cases, tenure candidates have a limited role to play in the review process beyond compiling materials for the tenure dossier (including the teaching dossier) as noted above. Once this material is prepared it is passed along to the tenure committee whose members review and interpret in on their own. Some institutional policies provide an opportunity for tenure candidates to meet with the review committees before they finish their assessment (as at Mount Allison, Mount St. Vincent, St. Mary’s, Cape Breton, Concordia, Memorial and Wilfrid Laurier). At Mount Allison, the faculty member is invited to meet with the committee once; whereas at Concordia his/her appearance before the departmental level committee is a required part of the process. Such practices, as defined in official documents, appears to be relatively uncommon. Candidates are more likely to appear before a tenure committee in the event of a negative recommendation as outlined in appeals and grievance procedures.

The very fact that universities are looking for the range of information included in a typical teaching dossier suggests that they are also adhering to the recommendations in the literature that evaluations of teaching be based on more than one form of evidence (see Arreola, 2000; Cashin, 1996; Centra, 1977 and 1979; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Paulsen, 2002; Pratt, 1997; Seldin, 1980, 1984). Such a long list of materials suggests that a more comprehensive review of a candidate’s teaching may be taking place. But while the teaching dossier is certainly a valid form of evidence, it is primarily based on self-reflection and materials
selected by the candidate. Aside from the inclusion of course evaluation data, and occasionally unsolicited letters and testimonials which instructors may have received from colleagues and/students, it generally consists of little or no external assessment of an individual’s teaching performance or contributions. As Seldin (2004), Diamond (1999) and others have argued, the most effective assessment involves not only multiple forms of evidence but also requires a range of mechanisms through which to acquire such evidence. Thus, a combination of self, student and peer assessments together will provide the most accurate and thorough evaluation.

As indicated in Tables 5.5 and 5.6 and Appendix F, most Canadian universities do not, at the institutional level, call for this triangulation of data and instead typically rely primarily on two of these three; most often derived from the tenure candidate and his/her students. The evidence provided by the candidate, as discussed above, typically takes the shape of a teaching dossier encompassing a range of materials and forms of evidence. Evidence from students most commonly comes from the data collected through course evaluations.

Student evaluation of teaching is the single most common form of assessment used in Canadian tenure review processes. At 29 of the 46 institutions reviewed data from student course evaluations are a mandatory source of evidence for tenure files (six institutions recommend this information be included, 5 note that it is optional, while 6 make no mention of it in tenure policy documents). A number of universities have developed guidelines relating to the collection of this data (as at St. Francis Xavier, Prince Edward Island, Mount Allison, Alberta, 73

---

73 Teaching dossiers often contain comments or feedback from students or colleagues that was not solicited by the faculty member. This is typically included as evidence for claims made by the faculty member (e.g. evidence of impact on student learning, notification from a colleague that they have incorporated the instructor’s educational materials in their own teaching, comments on mentorship experiences with the faculty member).
Calgary, British Columbia, Northern British Columbia) and at least one institution (Laurentian) has developed a guide specifically for the tenure review committee to use when assessing course evaluation data. In those cases where course evaluations are used during the tenure review process, it is generally noted that this form of evidence alone cannot form the basis of a committee’s recommendations or decisions (as at Acadia, Prince Edward Island, Lethbridge, Calgary and Mount Allison).

Mount Allison University’s institutional policy on the Evaluation of Teaching (Policy #5310, dated 22 September 2009) serves as an interesting example of how this practice is linked to overall assessment purposes, goals and needs. While the primary focus of this document is to set parameters and outline practice for the use of course evaluations (completed by students), it also provides a framework for the overall evaluation of teaching at Mount Allison and demonstrates a more holistic approach to evaluation, as evidenced by the following sections:

1. INTRODUCTION
Just as scholarship in one’s discipline requires reading, research, experimentation, presentation of persuasive evidence, and response to critique, so does scholarly teaching require reflection, research, innovation, on-going assessment, and evidence of accomplishment. Mount Allison University is committed to excellence in undergraduate teaching and learning and recognizes that a fair and robust system of evaluation is essential to maintain the high quality of teaching and curricula at the university.

The university remains committed to developing and implementing a system of teaching evaluation that
   a) reflects and supports both individual styles and disciplinary norms or standards; and
   b) combines complementary evidence from a variety of sources: student ratings of courses and instruction, peer review, and continuous self-assessment.

2. GOALS
Evaluation has several goals relating to the achievement, maintenance, and demonstration of the highest quality of teaching at the university. Specifically, the goals of this policy are the following:
a) To articulate the underlying principles of course and teaching evaluation as a means of
   i. encouraging reflective teaching and continual improvement at Mount Allison,
   ii. demonstrating that good teaching is valued and supported at the university, and
   iii. encouraging a culture of transparency and accountability with respect to the evaluation of teaching quality at the university;

b) To recommend a teaching evaluation form for Mount Allison University that includes both standardized questions and optional additions;

c) To recommend procedures to be used in administering that form to acquire student evaluation of courses and teaching; and

d) To outline and describe the accountabilities of the various stakeholders responsible for the conduct and administration of this policy. These include the following internal stakeholders: current and prospective students, professors, university administration. External stakeholders include alumni, donors, funding agencies, MPHEC, and government (Policy # 5310, 2009, pp. 1-2).

The pros and cons of collecting and using course evaluation data to assess teaching has long been a matter of debate in the literature, popular media, and on university campuses in Canada and abroad. While some have argued that students cannot effectively evaluate teaching, there is a great deal of evidence to suggest that students, as direct participants in classrooms, are best situated to judge whether or not an individual is an effective teacher. There are of course some elements that students are not well suited to evaluate, such as the instructor’s knowledge of a particular subject area. However, ample evidence and research has shown that students are able to assess such things as the relationship between course materials and assignments and their ability to learn, or an instructor’s ability to effectively communicate course content and concepts. Course evaluations are a common method for evaluating teaching across university campuses; and while the literature strongly suggests that this is a valid form of assessment that can be used effectively for both formative and summative evaluation, there is general agreement that such data should never form the sole
basis for personnel decisions, such as those relating to tenure (Cashin, 1990, 1995, 1999; Theall & Franklin, 2001; also see Gravestock & Gregor Greenleaf, 2008b for a review of the scholarship in this area).

Another less common means of collecting information from students is through the conducting of interviews. At McMaster, the policy documents note that while course evaluations are an acceptable means for assessing both undergraduate and graduate teaching, interviews are the preferred method for assessing graduate instruction and supervision. At Ottawa, a team of teaching evaluators review a range of materials, including course evaluations and the instructor’s materials but it is also recommended that they interview students before writing their final assessment report. The interviewing of students is also listed as a “normal” practice at St. Francis Xavier. Additionally, feedback from students may also be obtained through requests for written feedback. While not as common as the use of course evaluations, 20 institutional policies refer to this practice, 14 of which note that it is optional and six require that this method be used. At Trent and Manitoba written assessments from students are required. At the former, requests are sent out to a sample (between 40 and 60) of the candidate’s current and former students.

Colleagues are also seen to be a valuable source of information when assessing teaching and there is sufficient evidence (see Arreola, 2000; DeZure, 1999; Hutchings, 1995, 1996a, 1996b) to indicate that on-site observations by peers can be particularly useful. At Ryerson, York and the Ontario Institute of Technology, on-site observation of a candidate’s teaching is required, at nine others it is a recommended practice (Acadia, British Columbia, McMaster, Northern British Columbia, St. Francis Xavier, Simon Fraser, Thompson Rivers, Toronto, and
Waterloo), and 10 indicate that this is an optional form of evidence that can be gathered (see Appendix F). Acadia is one of the institutions that recommends on-site observations, and in fact, its policy states that any evidence in a tenure file presented in relation to classroom performance should be based on observation by peers, and/or academic administrators or by students’ comments on course evaluations. At Northern British Columbia and Carleton, institutional policies indicate that peer evaluation of teaching may be undertaken by review committees (at Northern British Columbia, this is part of the overall evaluation of faculty and is not restricted to the tenure process). The Carleton Collective Agreement (2009) provides brief guidelines regarding how and when such peer review should be conducted (see Article 26.4) for the evaluation of teaching. For example, the agreement states that they must be in writing, signed and must indicate the types of evidence upon which the assessment was based.

One of the most comprehensive treatments of the role of peer review is found in McMaster’s Policy on the Encouragement of Teaching Excellence (SPS10, 7 May 2009b) which states that, in addition to a teaching dossier submitted by the candidate, teaching is also to be evaluated on the basis of student and peer assessments. Peer evaluation may include a range of activities, including in-class observations of teaching and the review of a candidate’s dossier, his/her course evaluation data, and/or a discussion with the candidate about these forms of evidence. To ensure consistency in the format of teaching dossiers, McMaster’s policy outlines six required sections for the teaching dossier, which include: a description of responsibilities drawn from the letter of appointment; a statement of teaching philosophy/approach; a description of teaching practice; evidence of the effectiveness of teaching practice; a description of contributions to teaching; and a summary of summative course evaluation data.
Moreover, since peer evaluation is an essential component of the tenure review process at McMaster, the policy notes that the structure of the dossier, described above, enables “peers to evaluate the appropriateness of the individual’s teaching approach, effectiveness of his or her teaching practice, the robustness of the evidence adduced in support of the instructor’s effectiveness and the importance of the individual’s teaching contributions” (SPS 10, Section IV, p. 2).

McMaster’s policy (2009b) also requires that peer evaluation at the departmental level take into account the following: a review of and discussion with the candidate about their teaching dossier; classroom visits by colleagues and follow-up discussions; significant contributions to the curriculum; significant contributions to the development of course materials; significant participation in pedagogical discussions with peers, students, teaching assistants, in the department and elsewhere; evidence of the incorporation of some form of formative evaluation (Section IV, p. 3).

Several institutions allow academic colleagues to provide their own assessment of a candidate: at Prince Edward Island, departmental colleagues may submit signed letters (if they wish to provide feedback); at Mount Allison, institutional guidelines state that departmental colleagues shall submit to the tenure committee his/her own signed and written evaluation of the candidate’s performance, and at Manitoba, opinions from departmental colleagues are solicited. Similar practices exist at a number of Ontario institutions where feedback from faculty colleagues may be invited, including: Algoma, Brock, Carleton, Lakehead, Laurentian, Queen’s, Trent, Ontario Institute of Technology, Western Ontario, Windsor and York, and at one eastern Canadian institution, St. Francis Xavier. At Calgary the APT Manual, Procedures Pertaining to
Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff (2008) states that the “general reputation of faculty among faculty colleagues and students is considered, as evidenced by signed documentation or collected through formal evaluation processes” (Section 3.2.4, p. 8).

Canadian universities, by and large, rely on a range of indicators from at least two sources: the instructor and his/her students. There is less emphasis in the policies on the use of peer review, and when this is mentioned it tends to be optional (e.g. in the form of on-site observation). It should of course be acknowledged that the membership of tenure committees is composed of faculty colleagues, thus constituting a form of peer review.

Tenure Committee Structures and Roles
Tenure files typically pass through several levels of review before a candidate is granted tenure. Given the collegial nature of governance structures in Canada (Jones, 1997, 2006), reviews are conducted by committees made up of academics and normally begin at the disciplinary or department/unit level before moving through a divisional or college level review process and possibly a university-level committee.

Tenure files at 23 (50%) of the 46 Canadian institutions surveyed for this study are reviewed by at least two committees. A smaller percentage (39%) of universities employ one committee and 11% have three levels of review committees. In 26 of 46 (57%) universities, reviews begin at the departmental/unit level where tenure files are assessed by disciplinary academic peers; while 41% of institutions surveyed have committees at the divisional level and 65% at the university level. In four instances, reviews begin at either the department or
divisional level depending on the organizational structure of the institution (e.g. single-department vs. multi-department divisions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.7 – Types of Tenure Review Committees (by level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Committee by Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department or Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.8 – Number of Tenure Review Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Committees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most cases, administrative level reviews occur at multiple levels. This may include a review by unit heads, Deans or a senior level office such as the Office of the Vice-Provost or Provost. The President (or Principal) is involved in either granting tenure or making a recommendation to the Board of Governors in all but 10 of the institutions reviewed here. (See below for an overview of the review processes.)

These processes suggest a fair amount of rigour in the tenure review process at Canadian universities, whereby candidate’s files are assessed at multiple levels. In all cases, the various committees are composed of tenured faculty, with representation from within a candidate’s department/division. Overall, these committees are charged with reviewing the entire tenure dossier, including teaching, research and service contributions. However, in four instances, policies require or recommend the establishment of a separate teaching review committee, tasked explicitly with assessing teaching materials and contributions, for the tenure review process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Departmental Level Review</th>
<th>Divisional Level Review</th>
<th>Institutional Level Review</th>
<th>Tenure Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Faculty Evaluation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Vice-President &amp; Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Vice-President Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount St. Vincent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Vice-President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department OR Division</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dean &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Vice-Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Xavier</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Presidents &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department OR Division</td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department OR Division</td>
<td></td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department OR Division</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President &gt;&gt; Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the University of Ottawa a team of no less than 15 Teaching Evaluators (TEs) are used for the direct peer review of teaching (Collective Agreement, 2008, Article. 24.2.2). Article 24.2.3.1 of the university’s collective agreement outlines the role and duties of this group,

The general role of the TEs is to provide those charged with making recommendations in personnel matters with an objective assessment of a member’s preparation and pedagogy. Their duty is to ensure that, both in their investigation and subsequent reports, they consider all relevant information, such as the type and nature of courses taught, the nature of the subject matter, the opinions of students, the quality and utility of pedagogical materials prepared by the member, and the usefulness of the member’s contributions in the areas of pedagogical development and innovation (p. 178).

When a faculty member is going forward for tenure at Ottawa, three Teaching Evaluators are selected to participate in the assessment of the candidate’s teaching. These three individuals meet first as a group to discuss their roles, to gather the full range of evidence they will need to assess a candidate’s teaching, and to meet with the candidate. In reviewing a candidate’s teaching, they may interview current or former students, review or solicit written assessments from former students, examine teaching materials, and/or observe the candidate teaching. Following their review, they each prepare an individual assessment of the candidate which is forwarded to the Dean. (These individuals do not constitute a formal committee but provide feedback to the Dean.)

Similarly, the tenure policy at the Ontario Institute of Technology describes the role of a decanally-appointed Teaching Evaluation Committee. This committee, established alongside an Internal Reading Committee to assess a candidate’s scholarly work, is tasked with preparing “written evaluations of the candidate’s accomplishments in learning facilitation” (Award of Tenure Procedures Policy, n.d., Section 7). The policy also notes that the report should address
“whether, in addition to her/his demonstrated effectiveness and creativity as a teaching, the candidate has:

a. Carried out her/his responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students;
b. Demonstrated competence and effectiveness in the use of new information technologies;
c. Taken care to make herself or himself accessible to students for academic consultation, in person and on-line;
d. Informed students adequately of course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation;
e. Maintained teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances;
f. Informed students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructors;
g. Complied with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of her/his students; and
h. Made an impact or contribution to the teaching practices of the discipline”
(Section 7).

The University of Ontario Institute of Technology policy further notes that

[n]ormally, members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee will spend some time in the classroom of the faculty member whose teaching is being assessed as well as visiting the person’s website and reviewing her/his electronic communications. The committee will review course evaluations of all courses taught by the candidate and shall attempt to obtain evaluations of her/his teaching from current and former students, undergraduate, and, where appropriate, graduate (Section 7).

Policies from several other institutions, such as St. Francis Xavier and Toronto, reveal a variation of this practice. At St. Francis Xavier, a departmental evaluation committee is charged with reviewing teaching; however, this is not a required process but a recommended one. Article 2.2.2.1 of the Collective Agreement (2009) details the specific means by which this committee should assess a candidate’s teaching contributions (check to see how this impacts the overall review process). The University of Toronto’s policy states that divisions will
determine processes for the peer review of teaching. However, directions regarding tenure review procedures in the *Academic Administrative Procedures Manual* (n.d.) states that

> A separate Teaching Evaluation Committee should be struck to prepare a written evaluation of teaching accomplishments. This committee should not make a recommendation either for or against tenure but should assess whether competence or excellence in teaching is met. The committee should normally have a minimum of two tenured faculty members (Section A, Step 6).

At Ryerson, additional processes are also incorporated into the tenure review to assess teaching. Here, a sub-committee of the Faculty Promotions Committee is struck for tenure review and two members of this group are required to conduct an in-class observation of the candidate’s teaching. At York, the *Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures* (2007), a File Preparation Committee is struck to prepare materials for a candidate’s tenure review. Several members of this committee are charged with preparing the teaching file and with conducting in-class visits, when possible (see Section F.3.1.2, p. 10).

Once all appropriate committees have reviewed a tenure candidate’s file, their recommendations are passed along for the final step in the process. Across Canada, the authority to grant tenure rests with either an individual, one of the President, the Vice-President, or the Provost or a governing board, senate or institution-level committee. In 59% of cases (27of 46) the President/Principal/Vice-President/Provost confers tenure. In most other cases, he/she makes a recommendation to the governing board or senate which is vested with the ability to deny or grant tenure. In several cases, an institutional committee or board is the decision-making body. (See Tables 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 above for an overview of the review processes.)
Comprehensive, Aligned and Integrated Systems of Evaluation

The literature on the evaluation of teaching recommends that institutions develop systems that are comprehensive, aligned and integrated. Systems that are comprehensive establish evaluation goals and purpose, define faculty roles and responsibilities, define teaching effectiveness, establish clear criteria and standards of performance in relation to teaching contributions, gather data through a range of mechanisms and evidence from multiple sources, and implement clear and transparent governance structures and processes. This review of policies from 46 Canadian universities reveals that on some levels there are a fair number of commonalities across the sector, for example, teaching is always one of the main categories of evaluation during the tenure review and in general, most institutions understand teaching as a set of particular activities. However, there is also a great deal of variation across these policies. There is no common definition of effective teaching (and in fact, this is absent in most cases) and there is no consistent or common standard of performance for contributions in relation to teaching. While many institutions rely on common types of indicators to evaluate teaching (dossiers, course evaluations, peer observations), there is a high degree of variability in terms of the requirements for these forms of evidence. Overall, whether included in a dossier or not, a list of courses taught by the candidate along with representative course materials, are mandatory requirements for tenure files across all Canadian institutions reviewed (see Appendix F). In all cases, these materials are requested for review. Therefore, the elements of a “comprehensive” teaching evaluation framework are reflected inconsistently across Canada and are not present in all institutional policies.
The literature also recommends that evaluation frameworks should reflect institutional cultures and be aligned with disciplinary cultures and contexts. While all universities have established faculty responsibilities and tenure criteria at the institutional level, some (see Appendix E) have delegated the responsibility of establishing the specific weighting of teaching contributions to departments or divisions (as at Manitoba, Dalhousie, Guelph). In some cases, general institutional expectations are noted but additional standards are articulated at the departmental level (as at Trent).

A further recommendation calls on institutions to integrate their evaluation policies and practices with campus supports and resources and this includes a provision for training and support of tenure candidates and review committee members. As already noted, a number of institutions have developed programs or resources to support faculty through the tenure process. These may be provided by teaching support offices, provostial office staff, or by faculty unions. These materials tend to offer guidance as faculty prepare for tenure and may focus on the review process, or the preparation of a teaching dossier. For example, McMaster has a number of resources for faculty, including Teaching at McMaster (2010), a handbook for new faculty produced by the Centre for Leadership in Learning. Additionally, a short document titled Advice to New Faculty Members to Increase Your Chances of Getting Tenure (2009) was developed by the McMaster University Faculty Association. A policy document titled, Preparation of Dossiers for Tenure and/or Promotion (SPS 15B, 2009c) provides information for candidates on preparing dossiers for tenure and promotion.

The literature also recommends that faculty development resources be integrated into the evaluation process. A scan of institutional web sites revealed that all but one of the 46
Canadian universities reviewed (Nipissing is the exception) possess teaching and learning centres, suggesting a culture that supports and values teaching or efforts to address existing deficits or problems. Although, only 4 of 46 (Alberta, York, Toronto and British Columbia) institutions reference these units directly in tenure policies and related documents, suggesting that fully integrated systems, as defined by the literature, are not the norm.

The need for training and support for all those engaged in the evaluation of teaching, including academic administrators and members of tenure committees is also emphasized in the literature. In at least one instance, at Prince Edward Island, direct reference was made in the policy to training that would be provided for tenure committees regarding the review process. Overall, my review of policy documents uncovered no direct references to evaluation rubrics, often recommended in the literature, to guide committee members or peer assessors. This of course does not mean that they do not exist, but just that policy documents make no direct reference to them. At York, several guides produced by the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning provide detailed information on the process of evaluation. While these documents are not part of any formal policy, they aim to offer guidance to those involved in the evaluation of teaching during the tenure process and other types of reviews. At Windsor, a resource guide (2010) offered through the Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic brings together information for academic administrators and includes references to relevant policies, timelines, sample forms and so on. Similar materials are made available at other institutions, including Toronto; however, these are not typically referenced in official policies.

A final recommendation from the literature, as reviewed in Chapter 2, focuses on the need to ensure expectations for teaching and the related evaluation processes are
communicated to faculty. The success of this is somewhat difficult to assess. In only two instances did I locate a direct reference to a recommended practice regarding communication of institutional policies to faculty, at Calgary and Dalhousie. Section 3.5 of Calgary’s APT Manual (2008) states that Deans are required to provide copies of the Faculty guidelines outlining the criteria for tenure to each faculty member. This must also include a statement about the relative importance the division attaches to teaching, research and service, a description of how the Faculty interprets each of these activities, and a clear indication of how accomplishments in each of these areas are translated into recommendations for tenure.

All other institutions reviewed, including Calgary, have made the relevant policy documents available on their web sites, making them accessible to the community. However, it is not entirely clear how faculty are informed about the existence of these sites. In some cases, copies of institutional memos were located on web sites aimed at faculty, as at the University of Toronto. A search of institutional web sites found that such memos were often re-posted, or cited (with web links) in other locations and web pages. A number of institutions offer orientation sessions for new faculty, sessions on the tenure process (these may be offered by academic administrators, faculty associations or teaching and learning offices) or have developed kits or guides that distribute relevant information about tenure expectations (as at McMaster). While many institutions have developed resources it is difficult to determine the precise channels of communication, let alone their effectiveness in reaching relevant individuals. However, the fact that they are openly available and accessible through institutional web sites is significant.
Summary

On the one hand, given jurisdictional differences, diverse institutional cultures, histories, mandates and governance structures, one might expect to encounter a broad range of approaches to tenure across Canadian universities. On the other, since faculty at Canadian universities are typically expected to engage in both teaching and research activities and collegial governance or service, one might anticipate that the tenure structure and the evaluation criteria would be very similar across institutions – so, excellence in research would be demonstrated by X and excellence in teaching by Y. However, current practice reveals a scenario that falls somewhere in the middle of these two possibilities.

To a certain degree, one could conclude that there is surprisingly little consistency in the tenure policies and processes at Canadian institutions as no two policies are identical and no two review processes follow an identical path. At a granular level, the language and terminology in institutional documentation, the committee structures and approval processes can vary widely. In spite of this fact, there are also many common elements in the Canadian processes and policies and this is particularly true with regard to the evaluation of teaching contributions at the point of tenure. This review has demonstrated that tenure candidates are expected, at all institutions, to provide a significant portion of the materials used in the review process. This evidence is required or recommended in more than half of the institutional policies. A reliance on course evaluation data is even more prominent with 35 institutions requiring or recommending this type of evidence (and an additional five stating that it is optional). Additionally, the tenure committees at all institutions reviewed engage academic peers in the process of assessment and in decision-making.
As this review suggests, there is nothing explicit in tenure criteria that suggests Canadian universities privilege research over teaching contributions. On the contrary, as we have seen, overall these policies appear relatively neutral in their positioning of these two fundamental academic activities. Faculty are either expected to perform at the same level for both or demonstrate higher level contributions in at least one of the two areas. In only one case, is there an overt statement indicating that one activity will be privileged over the other – and in this case, it is teaching – which Bishop’s notes will be the priority for tenure evaluations.

Although defined tenure criteria and standards of performance do not reveal inequities in the expectations for teaching and research, Canadian tenure policies and other institutional documents do not consistently address all of the recommendations from the literature. This review revealed that the majority of institutions successfully identify the range of activities that teaching encompasses. Sometimes this was understood as a very limited set of activities; at others it was rather extensive (see Appendix E). Only a small number of institutions adopted a more holistic or substantive view of teaching as defined by Colbeck (2002), Pratt (1997) and others. Regardless of how teaching was understood, in defining teaching effectiveness (and standards of performance, such as satisfactory, high quality, and reasonable) official university documents fared poorly. One recommendation that appears to have had rather extensive implementation is that which calls on institutions to use multiple forms of evidence when evaluating teaching. It was evident that a significant number of institutions do indeed require (or recommend) this when seeking data on teaching contributions, although these are not always gathered from different perspectives or through different mechanisms.
Overall, there appears to be little within Canadian university tenure policies to suggest that they are the sole source or cause for persistent beliefs that teaching is undervalued. Rather, in most cases, these documents establish that teaching is a fundamental responsibility of all faculty and that it is to be reviewed during the tenure process, alongside research (and service). Moreover, all of these institutions require a minimum level of performance in relation to teaching in order for tenure to be granted. While all of this is true, one could point to the absence of a clear definition of “teaching effectiveness” within the majority (72%) of institutional policies as a source for the belief that teaching is not valued. As the literature suggests, without a clear and transparent definition of effectiveness, individuals will apply their own and these will infiltrate assessments of teaching that are made during the tenure review process. A commonly agreed upon definition that is communicated to the broader community will help to avoid this problem.

In sum, the majority of institutions surveyed failed to incorporate all of the recommendations on teaching evaluation. This review demonstrates, however, that many of the elements identified in the literature as necessary for effective evaluation frameworks have been incorporated across Canadian institutional policies – albeit, not necessarily within any one institution. In spite of this fact, there are a handful of unique examples that stand out and reveal approaches that align much closer with the recommendations from the research. These examples, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nipissing, UBC and York, will be explored in greater detail in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 6
COMPREHENSIVE AND INTEGRATED EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS:
EXAMPLES FROM CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

A review of the tenure policies from 46 Canadian universities revealed a number of commonalities in the approaches to the evaluation of teaching. In each of these post-secondary institutions, faculty are expected to demonstrate a certain level of competency in this aspect of academic work, and in no cases are they exempt from demonstrating contributions in this area. And while at this level, expectations regarding the scope of faculty work are the same across all 46 institutions, a few institutions have developed richer, more thorough documentation and processes for the evaluation of teaching. The tenure policies from these universities come much closer to integrating the full set of recommendations from the literature and in doing so have implemented evaluation frameworks that are comprehensive, integrated and aligned. In this chapter, I will look more closely at the tenure policies of a sub-set of universities which includes Alberta, British Columbia, Nipissing, Saskatchewan and York.

Drawing on the extensive body of research reviewed in Chapter 2, there are a number of elements that, when combined, form a comprehensive, integrated and aligned evaluation framework. In sum, these recommendations call for evaluation systems that:

1. Establish evaluation goals and purpose that align with institutional mandates.
2. Provide a clear understanding of faculty responsibilities.
3. Define teaching effectiveness.
4. Identify criteria for the evaluation of faculty work and articulate the related standards of performance.
5. Use a range of evaluation mechanisms and seek multiple forms of evidence.
6. Establish clear and transparent governance and decision-making structures.
7. Provide sufficient support and/or training for all involved in the review process.
8. Ensure effective and consistent communication to all relevant constituents.
While some similarities in the approaches to the evaluation of teaching for tenure review at Canadian institutions are evident, my review of the current Canadian landscape revealed that institutional policies reflect the recommendations from the literature unevenly. Perhaps not surprisingly, all of the universities articulated expectations in relation to teaching responsibilities (some more extensively than others). All university policies identified multiple means for assessing effective teaching with most institutions looking to the same or similar types of evidence, gathering data from some combination of the instructor, peers and students. However, this range of evidence was not always required for the tenure file (see Appendix F).

The only mandatory materials, requested at all institutions, came from the tenure candidate (including a list of teaching responsibilities and sample course materials). There are of course a few exceptions, whereby some universities rely on less common indicators such as interviews with students, or the candidate themselves, or the use of special committees or individuals tasked solely with undertaking a thorough review of an individual’s teaching.

One recommendation from the literature, the call to adopt dossiers to document teaching contributions, has been heeded by 39% of institutions (18 of 46). And even where the term dossier or portfolio is not used in institutional documents, the types of evidence requested mirror the typical contents of a dossier. However, a much smaller number of universities (14 of 46) had clear definitions of teaching effectiveness, generally considered within the literature to be mandatory for effective evaluation.

While these elements are considered necessary to evaluate teaching, the current literature suggests that universities must take their policies and practices further in order to successfully establish integrated, comprehensive and aligned evaluation frameworks for
teaching. As the work of Boyer (1990), Colbeck (2002) and Pratt (1997) demonstrates, a holistic approach to academic work that sees teaching, research and service as integrated, rather than as separate and independent contributions, reflects the manner in which most faculty view their work. In addition, a broader understanding of teaching that moves beyond simple actions (the “what”) and considers the “how” and “why” better mirrors the way faculty approach their teaching and allows for such contributions to be more effectively evaluated – for tenure, promotion and merit.

Aligning teaching priorities and evaluation processes and policies with institutional mandates ensures that teaching is considered in more meaningful ways and that it is read as an institutional priority that is connected to these broader goals. An even more powerful way to achieve this is through the articulation of institutional teaching priorities, further fostering a culture of and appreciation for teaching. And while, an institution can set the tone and establish a positive culture in relation to teaching, evaluation frameworks should also reflect disciplinary contexts, as it is in the departments and divisions that teaching occurs. As such, Paulsen (2002), Biggs (2001) and Cannon (2001) recommend that institutional evaluation policies be contextually aligned with divisional policies to reflect disciplinary standards and cultures. Further, evaluation frameworks should also be aligned with other resources to support teaching, such as faculty development initiatives or teaching and learning centres. As McAlpine and Harris (2001), Seldin (2006), and others have argued, the presence of these centres can signal an institutional culture that values and recognizes teaching. Better yet, when policies refer to and acknowledge the role of such centres, it demonstrates that institutions have, or are
working toward, aligning these resources with institutional goals, mandates and personnel policies.

While a number of the 46 institutions reviewed for this study have developed reasonably thorough policies that reflect many of the recommended elements (e.g. McMaster, Waterloo, Mount Allison, St. Francis Xavier), only a handful emerged that more fully reflect these characteristics, revealing the deeper impact that the scholarship has had in shaping policy. This sub-set of institutions includes: Alberta, York, British Columbia, Nipissing, and Saskatchewan. This chapter will explore in greater detail the policies, related documents and institutional supports and resources at these five universities.

Table 6.1 – Items Addressed in Institutional Documents at Alberta, Nipissing, Saskatchewan, UBC & York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Nipissing</th>
<th>Saskatchewan</th>
<th>UBC</th>
<th>York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles &amp; Responsibilities Articulated</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Performance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Effectiveness Defined</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Forms of Evidence</td>
<td>Y - S, P, St</td>
<td>Y - S, P, St</td>
<td>Y - S, P, St</td>
<td>Y - S, P, St</td>
<td>Y - S, P, St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making processes/committees</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Centres</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 – Tenure Review Processes at Alberta, Nipissing, Saskatchewan, UBC & York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Tenure Review Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>1. Recommendation from the Department/Unit Chair to the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The FEC reviews the recommendation and grants tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Files are subsequently reviewed by the President’s Review Committee to ensure procedures were followed and standards were met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>1. Recommendation from the Department Head to Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dean sends recommendation to the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. SAC makes recommendation to the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. President grants tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Tenure Review Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td>1. Faculty Review Committee (FRC) makes a recommendation to the University Review Committee (URC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The URC makes a recommendation to the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The President makes a decision on behalf of the Board of Governors and reports that decision to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>1. Tenure files are reviewed by the following committees: Department Renewals and Tenure Committee, the College Review Committee and the University Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recommendations are sent to the President for transmission to the Board of Governors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Board of Governors grants tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1. Reviews begin in the department/division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Tenure files are prepared by the File Preparation Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Files are first assessed by the Adjudicating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Files are then reviewed by the Review Committee involving the Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Files are sent to the President who makes a recommendation to the Board of Governors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Alberta

The University of Alberta, Canada’s fourth largest university is located in Edmonton, Alberta. In 2009, there were 28,370 full-time and 880 part-time undergraduate students and 5,700 full-time and 1,230 part-time graduate students enrolled at the University of Alberta.\(^74\) The mission and vision of the University of Alberta are laid out on its web site:

**Mission**

Within a vibrant and supportive learning environment, the University of Alberta discovers, disseminates, and applies new knowledge through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, community involvement, and partnerships. The University of Alberta gives a national and international voice to innovation in our province, taking a lead role in placing Canada at the global forefront.

**Vision**

To inspire the human spirit through outstanding achievements in learning, discovery, and citizenship in a creative community, building one of the world’s great universities for the public good (Retrieved from the University of Alberta web site at: [http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/facts/](http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/facts/))

\(^74\) Source: Data for 2009, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada website (www.aucc.ca)
Mirroring the mission statement, the University of Alberta’s *Faculty Agreement* (2008) outlines the nature of faculty responsibilities: teaching, research and service (Article 7: University Responsibilities). It also provides details relating to the types of decisions that are made for probation and tenure reviews (Article 12). Tenure-stream faculty at Alberta may go through one or more probationary periods, each lasting about four years. At the conclusion of the first, faculty may have the probationary period extended or may be reviewed for tenure. At the end of the second period, faculty undergo a tenure review, a one-year extension or are dismissed.

There are three levels of review in the Alberta system, involving the department, a Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and a President’s Review Committee (PRC). Tenure candidates are first reviewed at the departmental level with recommendations for tenure, dismissal or the extension of the probationary period being made by the Chair to the Dean. Positive recommendations are referred to the FEC which reviews the recommendation and decides whether to grant tenure to the candidate. Files are then transmitted to the PRC which ensures that the review was handled appropriately and that the standards were met (see Article 13).

The FEC, whose membership includes the Dean and at least three tenured faculty from the division and another from outside the Faculty, is also tasked with drafting standards of performance which are used to evaluate faculty annually and for tenure and promotion (Article 13: Faculty Evaluation). For tenure, faculty “must demonstrate a strong record of achievement in teaching and research” (Article 13.05(c), p. 17). The *Faculty Agreement* (2008) further notes that

The standards for evaluation of teaching performance shall be broadly based, including course content, course design and performance in the classroom. Such
evaluation may take into account information such as statistical summaries of responses to student questionnaires, comprehensive reviews of student commentary; reviews by peers, reviews by administrative officials and reviews of teaching dossiers and other materials provided by the staff member (Article 13.06, p. 17).

The Faculty Agreement (2008) also notes that the FEC is responsible for determining how information about tenure criteria and procedures should be shared with tenure candidates.

While the Faculty Agreement (2008) outlines the expectations in relation to tenure, the General Faculty Council (GFC) Policy Manual (2002a) provides more detailed information regarding the teaching context and the institutional principles relating to teaching at the University of Alberta. The GFC Policy Manual (2002a) states that Alberta is a large research intensive university, which recognizes a bond between teaching and research, and one that is central to its mission. Here, as at Nipissing, faculty are viewed as researcher-teachers or scholar-teachers. Alberta’s policy manual notes that all of its institutional documents acknowledge its dedication to teaching excellence:

Most major University of Alberta documents of recent years discuss teaching from two points of view: strong affirmation of the University’s commitment to the importance and centrality of good teaching, and varying approaches to quality assurance in teaching. These two themes are consistent throughout the corpus of the staff agreement, strategic planning documents, reports of student and faculty surveys, and official documents of various faculties. Interestingly enough, between these two poles of, on the one hand, asserting the importance of excellent teaching in the University and, on the other, explicating a range of questions, opinions and policies about how to ensure teaching excellence, there is a large and evident gap which only becomes clearly visible when the documents are scanned as a group: nowhere, in any document, is there a clear and complete statement of what constitutes excellent teaching. It is taken for granted that we all know (GFC Policy Manual, 2002a, Section 111.1)

While Alberta’s policy may not explicitly define “teaching excellence”, it does identify four principles of good teaching/learning that suggest how they understand excellence:
1. The teacher is a scholar who has, and can share with the student, a rich knowledge of the discipline and its place in the larger intellectual community.
2. The teacher engages the mind of the student.
3. The teacher respects the student and the student respects the teacher.
4. The teacher ensures a good climate for learning (Section 111.1).

In the first principle, Boyer’s four categories of scholarship are referenced and a description for each is provided. Additionally, the value of this approach is highlighted and acknowledged as essential for good university teaching and for active learning.\textsuperscript{75}

Following the articulation of these principles, the policy further identifies the expectations for students, in a section titled, “What must students bring to the University teaching and learning environment”. Here, a range of attributes and skills are outlined (including motivation to participate in an active learning community, willingness to participate in one’s own learning, curiosity about the discipline, and tolerance and appreciation for diversity and multiple viewpoints) along with a series of general and specialized outcomes for students.

In a section titled “Teaching Evaluation” the \textit{GFC Policy Manual} (2002a) identifies two purposes for the evaluation of teaching: summative and formative:

a. \textbf{Summative} - Evaluation provides a review and overview of an instructor's teaching that is an essential element in promotion and tenure decisions. In its summative form, teaching evaluation forms a basis for rewarding excellence, as well as the basis for withholding reward.

b. \textbf{Formative} - Evaluation provides helpful feedback to teachers by identifying teaching strengths and weaknesses and, in so doing, giving guidance for the improvement or refinement of teaching skills (Section 111.2).

Further, this section also reinforces the need for evaluation to be “multifaceted” using

\textsuperscript{75} A number of American institutions have also adopted Boyer’s definition of scholarship, including Western Carolina University which uses this model for hiring, merit reviews and tenure considerations.
assessments that will include input from “administrators, peers, self, undergraduate and graduate students, and alumni” and that “teaching performance must be based on more than one indicator of the adequacy of teaching”. The *GFC Policy Manual* (2002a) addresses in Section 111.3: Universal Student Ratings of Instruction, one of the means for collecting data on teaching from students. This portion of the policy lays out how course evaluations will be conducted, includes the questions that appear on all surveys, and contains details regarding how the data will be interpreted.

As with the other institutions profiled in this chapter, Alberta’s policies effectively reflect a range of recommendations from the literature; however, the *GFC Policy Manual* also reveals a rich and thoughtful approach to teaching and its evaluation. Teaching activities at Alberta are contextualized in relation to the institution’s mission and mandate, they provide a broader understanding of the teacher – as teacher-scholar, and they link the teaching activities and contributions of faculty to students’ learning and to the institutional expectations of students in relation to their own learning. The responsibilities of students are also a part of this framework, recognizing the significant role that they play in teaching and learning at the University of Alberta. The *GFC Policy Manual* (2002a) also mentions the university’s teaching support centre (University Teaching Services) by name, acknowledging the institutional support for this unit to develop programming to enhance and improve teaching across the institution. Although a definition of “teaching excellence” is not provided in institutional documents, it is quite clear what Alberta values in this regard and what is expected of faculty.
York University

With 40,100 full-time and 7,100 part-time undergraduates and 3,900 full-time and 2,100 part-time graduate students York University, located in Toronto, Ontario, is Canada’s third-largest university. Its mission is

…the pursuit, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge. We promise excellence in research and teaching in pure, applied and professional fields. We test the boundaries and structures of knowledge. We cultivate the critical intellect. York University is part of Toronto: we are dynamic, metropolitan and multi-cultural. York University is part of Canada: we encourage bilingual study, we value tolerance and diversity. York University is open to the world: we explore global concerns. A community of faculty, students and staff committed to academic freedom, social justice, accessible education, and collegial self-governance, York University makes innovation its tradition.

(Retrieved from the York University web site at: http://www.yorku.ca/web/about_yorku/mission/).

Although the mission statement promises excellence in both teaching and research, at York, tenure candidates are only expected to demonstrate superiority (excellence) in at least one of teaching, research or service with at least competence demonstrated in teaching and research or at least high competence in all three areas.

A number of documents articulate York’s tenure policies and procedures. The Collective Agreement (2009) includes several relevant articles: faculty roles and responsibilities are outlined in Article 11: Professional Responsibilities; the types of faculty appointments are addressed in Article 12: Appointments Categories; and Article 9 lays out processes for faculty grievances. While Article 13 is titled Tenure and Promotion, the criteria are not fully articulated here; rather, these are found in the Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures

---

76 Source: Data for 2009, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada website (www.aucc.ca)
77 A Senate policy, the Statement on the Responsibilities of Faculty Members (1984) also outlines the three areas of responsibilities: teaching, research and service. For teaching, it indicates faculty are responsible for keeping up-to-date on the relevant literature in their field, for preparing lectures and course materials, for being accessible to students, and for informing students of course format, assignments and evaluation methods.
(2007). This lengthy document includes a preamble that states the goals and purpose of tenure, a description of the criteria for tenure and promotion, the details pertaining to tenure and promotion procedures (file preparation, adjudication, the review of files by the Senior Review Committee, and the Senate’s report), and the role of the President in decisions. The Tenure and Promotions Policy (2007) document is included in an on-line toolkit for tenure and promotions committees, along with forms, frequently asked questions, templates and timeline documents.

At York, faculty move through two stages of appointments towards tenure. The first is a “pre-candidacy” stage which is the status conferred upon initial appointment; it is followed by “candidacy,” a pre-tenure stage that lasts up to an additional three years. Together these two periods last no more than six years at which time the tenure review is undertaken. For this review, a tenure file is prepared by a File Preparation Committee which is submitted to the Adjudicating Committee. These two committees are struck at the departmental or divisional level. The file is subsequently reviewed by the Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions and forwarded to the President for a final decision on the granting of tenure.

In outlining the criteria for tenure, York’s Tenure and Promotions Policy (2007) includes a lengthy passage on teaching that sheds light on the value placed on teaching here and echoes Boyer’s approach that conceives of teaching as a form of scholarship:

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 specialisation generating an information explosion, the scholar who can take information and synthesise 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. Today disciplines interpenetrate to such a degree that the researcher cannot rest tranquilly secure in his or her area of expertise,
and the teacher cannot rest secure that a gentle summer’s preparation will be sufficient scholarship for a good introductory course.

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. Without a concrete, highly specific and well-supported evaluation of a teacher’s performance, the Senate Review Committee will return a dossier with a request for more information (Section B.1. Teaching, p. 2).

At York, teaching is assessed through multiple means, including self, peer and student evaluation. The Tenure and Promotions Policy (2007) indicates that two internal referees are selected to review course materials and a dossier, if provided by the candidate. The policy suggests that the tenure candidate may wish to submit a teaching dossier but does not require such a document. It does, however, refer candidates to the Centre for the Support of Teaching and the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning’s Guide to Teaching Assessment and Evaluation (2002) and their Teaching Documentation Guide (n.d.) if they choose to prepare a teaching dossier. In addition to course materials, the referees are also encouraged to visit classes taught by the candidate to observe their teaching.

The File Preparation Committee, which compiles the tenure dossier, is also charged with soliciting letters of reference from colleagues or teaching assistants with whom the candidate has taught. Data from students include feedback provided through course evaluations, letters
solicited from undergraduate and graduate students taught by the candidate and from former
graduate students taught or supervised by the candidate. York has a separate policy on the
*Student Evaluation of Teaching* (1996) which addresses the administration of course
evaluations and the manner in which results are shared and made available.

At York, departments are asked to prepare disciplinary standards for tenure and
promotion – in line with the recommendations from the literature that calls for this to be taken
into consideration. A short document, *Questions to guide the development of home unit tenure
and promotion standards* (2003), asks departments to align their standards with the university’s
tenure and promotion criteria. With regard to teaching standards, the document suggests the
following be considered:

- the range of teaching situations and formats in which candidates are required to
  perform;
- whether graduate teaching is required and what its importance is within the
department;
- the kind of graduate supervision that is expected;
- the weight given to course evaluations, internal and external teaching awards;
  whether the candidate’s performance will be compared to that of other colleagues
  (within the unit or beyond); and,
- the level of importance attached to significant activities beyond instruction (such as
  pedagogical innovations or curriculum development).

York’s Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning has produced a number of
companion documents for faculty and administrators, including: the *Guide to Teaching
Teaching Assessment & Evaluation* includes a section dedicated to defining quality teaching at
York. In addition, the document addresses the need for both formative and summative
assessment and offers strategies for assessing and evaluating quality teaching and student
learning, which include: teaching dossiers, student evaluations, peer observations, letters and individual interviews, course portfolios, and classroom assessments. For each of these strategies, the guide highlights the purposes for which they would be used, along with the benefits and limitation of each approach.

The *Guide to Teaching Assessment & Evaluation* (2002) is not prepared specifically for the context of the tenure review; rather it aims to provide “instructors with starting-points for reflecting on their teaching, and with advice on how to gather feedback on their teaching practices as part of a systematic program of teaching development” (Introduction, p. 1). The Senate Committee also recognizes its value in summative evaluation, “the *Guide* provides guidance on how teaching might be fairly and effectively evaluated, which characteristics of teaching might be considered, and which evaluation techniques are best suited for different purposes” (p. 1).

The *Teaching Documentation Guide* (n.d.) is directed at individuals involved in the tenure and promotion process (although the document states that it has no official status) and provides advice on how to compile a teaching dossier and the teaching portion of the curriculum vitae. It also references York’s tenure policy quoting directly from the sections that outline the responsibilities of the candidate, the file preparation committees, and the collegial references.

Together, these two documents, along with the material provided in the tenure policy and collective agreement, clearly define how teaching is understood and valued at York. The guides produced by the Senate committee offer one of the most comprehensive approaches to teaching and the evaluation of teaching found at all 46 institutions surveyed. As such, these
documents send a clear message that teaching is valued at York as evidenced by the institutional mission statement through to the tenure criteria and related processes. York’s policy indicates that teaching contributions at the point of tenure are reviewed rigorously by peers and students. Internal reviewers are identified and are given specific directions regarding what and how to review a candidate’s teaching. The policy is flexible enough to allow for diverse teaching approaches and strengths but still rigorous enough to ensure that candidates meet institutional expectations. The Senate Committee documents are also a useful resource for those involved in the tenure review process, including candidates and committee members, providing a framework for effective evaluation while working to ensure consistency in the application of criteria and standards and the decision-making process.

The University of Saskatchewan

Founded in 1907 in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, the University of Saskatchewan is a mid-sized, primarily undergraduate institution. In 2009, Saskatchewan had 12,700 full-time and 3,530 part-time undergraduate students along with 2,230 full-time and 350 part-time graduate students. Its mission statement reads:

The University of Saskatchewan belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. As an academic community, our mission is to achieve excellence in the scholarly activities of teaching, discovering, preserving and applying knowledge.

(Retrieved from the University of Saskatchewan web site at: http://www.usask.ca/university_secretary/policies/contents/uofs_missionstat.php?heading=menuPolicies)

And its vision statement includes the following item:
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The University of Saskatchewan will be a model of scholarly inquiry, a place where all who contribute to its achievements - students, faculty, and staff - can take pride in their commitment to this centre of excellence dedicated to the service of the people of Saskatchewan and Canada. (Retrieved from the University of Saskatchewan web site at: http://www.usask.ca/university_secretary/policies/contents/uofs_missionstatement.php?heading=menuPolicies).

Three primary documents from the University of Saskatchewan lay out the tenure process and the policies relating to the evaluation of teaching: the **Collective Agreement** (2007), the **Standards for Promotion and Tenure** (2002) and the **Guidelines for Preparation of Case Files for Renewal of Probation, Tenure and Promotion** (2009). The **Collective Agreement** addresses a number of critical elements relating to the tenure process. It defines tenure and outlines its purpose, provides details on the structure, roles and responsibilities of the various review committees (departmental, college level and university level committees), and identifies that the authority to grant tenure rests with the Board. The **Collective Agreement** also addresses tenure timelines, appeals procedures and the manner in which tenure candidates are informed of decisions (see Article 15: Tenure).

Tenure candidates are reviewed at three levels at Saskatchewan, by a Department Renewals and Tenure Committee, a College Review Committee and a University Review Committee. The departmental committee is chaired by the head of the unit and includes all tenured members of the department. This committee is responsible for establishing the standards of performance and for reviewing candidates for tenure. The College Review Committee includes a minimum of six tenured faculty and is chaired by the Dean. This committee reviews and approves departmental tenure standards, uses them to establish college-level criteria, and reviews recommendations for tenure and puts forth its own to the
university level committee. Finally, the institutional committee membership includes nine tenured faculty, the Vice-President, Academic and the Provost as chair. This body reviews and approves college level performance standards, uses them to establish institutional criteria, reviews all subsequent recommendations for tenure and makes its own to the President. Final recommendations are transmitted from the President to the Board of Governors.

Initial appointments at Saskatchewan are for terms of up to three years. Candidates may move forward for tenure consideration at this point or their probationary period may be extended. The Collective Agreement (2007) notes that “the approved criteria and standards of performance for tenure shall be communicated, in writing, to all probationary appointees at the time of their appointment” (Article 15.11.1, p. 31). The tenure standards are articulated at the institutional, college and the departmental levels. (This discussion will focus on the university-level criteria and standards.)

The Standards for Promotion and Tenure (2002) provides more extensive detail regarding the various categories of evaluation, the standards of evaluation for each area, and also lays out principles relating to the tenure review and the institutional mission and the process of evaluation. Here, the standards for tenure include demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, significance of scholarly work and contributions to service. Specifically, the document states,

Tenure will be granted on the basis of three primary categories: academic credentials, effectiveness in teaching, and, achievements in either research, scholarly and/or artistic work or scholarly practice of professional skills. The promise of future development as a teacher, scholar and professional, achievement in scholarly activity beyond that demonstrated at appointment and the attainment of a national or international reputation in the discipline, will be important criteria in the evaluation process (pp. 3-4).
In the first section of the *Standards* (2002) document, “Principles”, a set of four goals is identified, the first being “the intention to improve the quality of the instructional programs offered to students” requiring “that considerable attention be paid to the evaluation of teaching to ensure that the instruction provided is, and continues to be, of high quality” (Section A). A second goal notes that Saskatchewan has adopted a “teacher-scholar” model of faculty development, built on the “principle that universities acquire their distinctive character through their capacity to unite scholarship with teaching” (Section A). As such, Saskatchewan recognizes Boyer’s four categories of scholarship: teaching, discovery, integration and application, which they view as an inclusive approach that ensures and values interdisciplinary interests.

At Saskatchewan,

good teaching is expected of all faculty and evaluation of teaching will form an essential component of tenure and promotion considerations. University teaching requires more than classroom performance. Candidates will be expected to demonstrate mastery of their subject area(s) or discipline(s), to make thorough preparation for their classes, to communicate effectively with their students, to show a willingness to respond to students’ questions and concerns, and to exhibit fairness in evaluating students.

Both before and after tenure is awarded, faculty are expected to remain committed to improving/enhancing their teaching performance and to remedy problems identified with their teaching (*Standards for Promotion and Tenure*, 2002, Section D.2. Teaching Ability and Performance, p. 5).

Section D (Standards for each category of evaluation) of this document includes a table with the various teaching roles, the aspects to be assessed and the items and activities that may be reviewed (see Table 6.3 below). In addition, this section also includes a clear description of the
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various individuals involved in the review process, outlining what they will be reviewing and how.

**Table 6.3 – Evaluation of Teaching Practices, University of Saskatchewan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Roles</th>
<th>Aspects to be Assessed</th>
<th>Items and Activities to be reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching in introductory undergraduate courses</td>
<td>• Organization of class/course</td>
<td>• Teaching in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching in advanced undergraduate courses</td>
<td>• Preparation for classes</td>
<td>• Teaching in clinical or laboratory settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching in graduate courses</td>
<td>• Appropriateness of material presented; i.e. volume, level, currency</td>
<td>• Course outlines/syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clinical teaching in undergraduate or graduate courses</td>
<td>• Clarity of communication</td>
<td>• Instructional materials – written course materials, laboratory manuals, audio-visual resources,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching and/or supervision of students performing clinical work, practica or</td>
<td>• Ability to stimulate students’ interest</td>
<td>computer programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other types of field work, study-abroad or international exchange programs</td>
<td>• Responsiveness to students’ questions and concerns</td>
<td>• Examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervising honours students</td>
<td>• Fairness and adequacy of evaluation of students’ performance</td>
<td>• Involvement on graduate advisory and/or examination committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advising and supervising graduate students, post-doctoral fellows</td>
<td>• Willingness to try different or new teaching methods and technologies</td>
<td>• Supervision of undergraduate and graduate student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching courses in certificate or diploma programs</td>
<td>• Availability for students outside of class time</td>
<td>• Progress/success of graduate students supervised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordination or administration of multiple section or multiple instructor</td>
<td>• Adequacy of support and direction provided to graduate students</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses</td>
<td>• Fairness in dealing with students</td>
<td>• Development and supervision of academic exchange and/or study abroad programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contributions to internationalization of educational experience</td>
<td>• Teaching innovation in curricular design</td>
<td>• Pedagogical research, publications and presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching at a distance</td>
<td>• Incorporation of teaching innovations into teaching pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extent to which scholarly work is brought into the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: University of Saskatchewan Standards for Promotion and Tenure, 2002, p. 6)

When assessing a faculty member’s teaching contributions, Saskatchewan’s guidelines require that this be based on a series of evaluations of performance and materials over a period of time by both peers and students. While these evaluations will be used for summative purposes, including tenure, it is also recommended that they be shared with faculty for formative purposes. Peer evaluations will review the range of teaching contributions made by
the tenure candidate and evaluators will provide a written assessment for the file. The document references external referees (in Section E: Process of Evaluation); however, these appear to only be used for the review of research/scholarly activity. Feedback from students may include letters solicited through the department/division and/or questionnaires completed for particular courses. In addition, the candidate also provides materials for review, including a teaching dossier.

An additional document prepared by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic provides guidance regarding how to compile and assess a tenure file. The Guidelines for Preparation of Case Files for Renewal of Probation, Tenure and Promotion (2009) details the range of materials that should be included in a tenure file and indicates those which the tenure candidate is responsible for providing. In relation to establishing a case for teaching performance, tenure candidates are asked to provide a statement of teaching philosophy, information on teaching roles (courses, supervision, labs, etc.), a summary statement of their understanding of peer and student evaluations, and a statement regarding any improvements or enhancements made to their teaching or information on efforts to address problematic areas (e.g. attending courses/conferences, working with a mentor, using the services of a teaching centre) (Section III, p. 7).

The Guidelines (2009) also ask departments and colleges at the University of Saskatchewan to provide a statement of rationale for each of the categories of evaluation. For teaching, they are asked to provide an indication and assessment of the quality of the candidate’s teaching, an explanation of how student and peer evaluations were conducted, information on how the candidate’s teaching has changed over time (drawing on ongoing
assessments conducted over time), and to identify any problem areas in relation to the candidate’s teaching. In addition, this guide provides the candidates with suggested strategies and best practices for compiling a tenure dossier, including information on the scope and focus of material to provide to demonstrate teaching effectiveness.

Also included in the Guidelines (2009) are “Best Practices and General Observations from the University Review Committee (URC)”, which offers advice on how to prepare a comprehensive tenure file. The URC provides recommendations on how to prepare and present data from student course evaluations and provides suggestions for the scope and focus of the candidate’s teaching philosophy statement. In addition, it also requests that peer evaluations of teaching include assessments made for each of the levels in which the candidate teaches and indicates that this should include observations on classroom performance and a review of course design and content and other related materials. The URC also states that at a minimum tenure candidates should be evaluated once a year during their review period.

Saskatchewan’s policies and processes provide a clear understanding of teaching responsibilities, a description of what good teaching is in their context, and what the University expects in terms of the scope and quality of teaching contributions. These documents clearly and thoroughly outline for faculty and administrators the range of teaching roles, the various aspects of teaching that will be assessed, and the means (items, activities and sources) by which teaching will be reviewed. Moreover, the impact of the literature on teaching and teaching evaluation is evident as indicated by the integration of Boyer’s four categories of scholarship, the use of dossiers and peer evaluators, and the overall alignment of the evaluation framework with institutional priorities and goals.
Nipissing University

Nipissing University, located in North Bay, Ontario, is a small institution with a primarily undergraduate population focusing on teacher education, science, arts and professional programs. Enrolment numbers for 2009 show 3,500 full-time and 1,100 part-time undergraduates and a much smaller graduate population with 30 full-time and 170 part-time students. While its origins can be traced back to the 1900s, Nipissing University College was established in 1967 and was affiliated with Laurentian University. In 1992, Nipissing University became an independent institution. As noted on their web site (www.nipissingu.ca), the university adopts a student-focused approach “based on personal teaching practices, innovative approaches to learning, and a growing research culture”.

Three documents were consulted for this study: the Collective Agreement (2009); the Standards for Tenure and Promotion Procedures (2008a); and the Tenure and Promotion Procedures (2008b). Within the Collective Agreement the rights and responsibilities of Nipissing faculty are addressed. More specifically, Article 18.2 (Items b-d) outlines those relating to teaching and states that Nipissing faculty are responsible for organizing and structuring classroom and lab activities and other learning experiences, maintaining a productive and orderly learning environment, determining course content and evaluation methods, and providing relevant information regarding evaluation methods and timely feedback to students. In addition, the collective agreement states that “(m)embers have a responsibility to develop scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers” (Article, 18.2(a), p. 18).
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At Nipissing, probationary periods for faculty last between four and six years at which point they are assessed for tenure according to the following standards: a record of effective performance as a university teacher constituting promise for a successful career as a professor; a productive record of research, scholarship and/or creative achievement as constituting promise for successful career as professor; and a satisfactory record of service to university, profession and wider community. To achieve promotion to associate professor, candidates are expected to demonstrate: a sustained record of effective performance as a university teacher; a demonstrated record of sustained and productive research; and a sustained and satisfactory record of service to university, profession and community.

The Collective Agreement (2009) refers to the Standards for Tenure and Promotion (2008a) and the Tenure and Promotion Procedures (2008b) for specific information on the expectations and processes relating to tenure and promotion at Nipissing University. The Standards (2008a) document mirrors very much the approach taken by the University of Saskatchewan and begins with a set of principles for tenure and promotion that are linked directly to the institution’s vision, mission and core values. In terms of its vision, this document states that “Nipissing University is committed to providing a personalized student experience within a collegial learning community dedicated to creativity, innovation and excellence in teaching, research and scholarly activities” (2008a, Section A). In its mission statement, Nipissing identifies itself as a student-centred institution that is committed to the “highest standards in teaching, research and scholarly activities” and one that “encourages meaningful interaction between students and faculty”. To further emphasize this, Nipissing’s core values include: excellence (in teaching, research and services); student-centredness (placing students
at the core of its educational mission); academic freedom and integrity; community and people; and accountability.

As a student-centred institution, Nipissing, like Alberta, has adopted a “teacher-scholar” model which “builds on the principle that universities acquire their distinctive character through their capacity to unite scholarship and teaching” (Standards for Tenure and Promotion, 2008a, p. 5). Further, the Standards (2008a) document notes that “[g]iven the academic and educational breadth of Nipissing, the tenure and promotion process need embrace the four scholarships of, discovery, integration, application and teaching as defined by Boyer” (Section A, p. 5).

The Standards (2008a) document addresses each of the categories of evaluation, teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/artistic work, and service individually and provides a comprehensive description of expectations and assessment measures. To achieve tenure, faculty must demonstrate that they are effective teachers and show promise as a successful university teacher.\(^{81}\) To illustrate teaching effectiveness, “[c]andidates will be expected to demonstrate mastery of their subject area(s) or discipline(s), to make thorough preparation for their classes, to communicate effectively with their students, to show a willingness to respond to students’ questions and concerns, and to exhibit fairness in evaluating students” (Section E.2, p. 10). As outlined in this policy, Nipissing views teaching as a dynamic endeavour involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning. Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and relate directly to the subject taught. Good teachers stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on

\(^{81}\) For promotion to Associate Professor, candidates must have a sustained record of effective performance as a university teacher.
learning long after their university days at Nipissing are over (Standards for Promotion and Tenure, 2008a, Section E.2, p. 11).

Nipissing’s policy recognizes that no single evaluation method can be applied for all tenure candidates given the diversity across disciplines and therefore encourages evaluators to be “flexible in their assessment and weighting of the candidate’s accomplishments” (Section D(b), p.8). Evidence of teaching effectiveness comes from peers through a series of on-site observations (as requested by the candidate), from students through course evaluations, and from the candidate, through the submission of a mandatory teaching dossier. A table, identical to that found in the University of Saskatchewan’s Standards (2002) document is also included (see Table 6.3 above) in the Nipissing document. It also details the evaluation process, with the identification of teaching roles, the various aspects to be assessed and the items and activities to be reviewed.

As noted above, in Nipissing’s tenure policy “research activity” is defined in terms of Boyer’s four categories of scholarship, and as such includes the scholarship of teaching. The policy states, that regardless of their discipline or disciplines, all university faculty are teachers (i.e. professors) and the scholarship of teaching refers to scholarly activity related to that aspect of a faculty member’s professional work...This dimension involves an approach in which teachers read widely and are intellectually engaged while individualizing learning, adapting to different learning styles, integrating evidence-informed practice and understanding how knowledge is acquired and constructed. Teachers and students join together on a journey of inquiry and develop relationships that facilitate student learning. Further, good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are learners too (Standards for Promotion and Tenure, 2008a, Section E.3. p. 16).

The policy acknowledges the link between teaching activity and the scholarship of teaching, reflecting Nipissing’s commitment to the teaching-scholar model:
Although closely related to the evaluation of faculty as teachers for the purposes of tenure and promotion, the scholarship of teaching contributes to the work and productivity of faculty as scholars. As all faculty are engaged in the profession of teaching, they are in a position to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and practice in the area of university teaching.

Regardless of discipline or field of expertise, faculty members have the capacity to be scholars in teaching. The scholarship of teaching does not replace the requirement for discovery, integration, and/or application research as constituting the primary areas of productivity for faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion, but it does add to the scholarly activity of the candidate, and their work in this area deserves to be recognized and valued.

A common example of the scholarship of teaching for university faculty is the writing and publication of a textbook designed for teaching a course in a particular discipline or field of study. This type of publication is distinct from a book on a particular subject that might be used as a text in a course on that subject area (which would be considered integration research, or perhaps even discovery research). Another example would be the development of curricula that become adopted as standard or recognized curricula for teaching a particular subject (pp. 16-17).

Several forms of evidence are suggested to demonstrate contributions in the scholarship of teaching:

1. Peer reviewed presentations and/or publications regarding teaching and learning.
2. Peer reviewed grant awards for teaching and learning support.
3. Publication of a course textbook.
4. Invited presentations outside the university.
5. Creation and dissemination of innovative modes of teaching and learning.
6. Invitations as an external program evaluator.

A section of the Standards document is devoted to the role of the review committees; these are also addressed in more detail in the Tenure and Promotion Procedures (2008b) document. At Nipissing, tenure files are first considered by the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) which is composed of six tenured faculty, one of whom will be the associate dean. The FRC makes a recommendation to the University Review Committee (URC) which includes eight tenured faculty including the Vice-President (Academic and Research), serving as chair and a
Dean (appointed by the President). This committee makes a recommendation on tenure to the President who is charged with making a decision on behalf of the Board of Governors. The President’s decisions are reported to the Board. The Standards (2008a) document encourages members of all review committees to “consider teaching, research, scholarly and/or creative activities, and service in the context of the working conditions of Nipissing, a small university that is primarily focused on undergraduate education, with relatively few graduate programs” (Section F.c).

The third document reviewed for this study, the Tenure and Promotion Procedures (2008b) policy, provides detailed information on the structure and responsibilities of the various committees and individuals who conduct the review, the decision-making procedures, the criteria for tenure, the format of the application and the expectations in relation to the content of the dossier. Section 1.9(e), Part C: Teaching notes that:

This part of the dossier should provide information that conveys the scope, quality and effectiveness of the candidate’s teaching. Although student opinions provide an important assessment of teaching performance, the parties agree that such opinions must not constitute the sole basis for evaluating teaching, hence the need for the candidate to provide evaluators with additional information (Tenure and Promotion Procedures, 2008b, Section 1.9(e), Part C: Teaching, p. 10).

The article then lists a range of items that are required for inclusion in the dossier, which includes copies of the most recent syllabi, lists of student projects supervised or mentored, and lists of theses supervised. The candidate is also invited to provide additional evidence of successful teaching, which could include summaries of course evaluation data, sample course materials, contributions to curriculum development, information on awards and honours for teaching, letters from students or alumni, reports from internal or external reviewers who have
observed their teaching, information on outstanding achievements by their students, information on instructional development grants and the outcomes of those grants.

Nipissing’s policies for the evaluation of teaching at the point of tenure reveal a framework that is both comprehensive and aligned with the institutional mission and its core values. Moreover, these values are integrated within the primary policy document, further ensuring that this link is explicit and transparent. The specific criteria, and the expectations that Nipissing faculty are to meet in relation to teaching, reflect the student-centred mission of the institution and the materials required for the tenure dossier provide relevant evidence to assess these criteria. Following Boyer, Colbeck and others, Nipissing’s approach understands faculty work more holistically.

**The University of British Columbia**

The University of British Columbia (UBC) was established in 1908 and is currently located on two campuses in Vancouver and Kelowna, British Columbia. It is Canada’s second-largest university with 28,430 full-time and 10,900 part-time undergraduates and 8,220 full-time and 1,060 part-time graduate students in 2009. Its vision statement notes that

As one of the world’s leading universities, The University of British Columbia creates an exceptional learning environment that fosters global citizenship, advances a civil and sustainable society, and supports outstanding research to serve the people of British Columbia, Canada and the world. (Retrieved from the University of British Columbia web site at: From [http://www.ubc.ca/about/vision.html](http://www.ubc.ca/about/vision.html)).

UBC also identifies six values: academic freedom, advancing and sharing knowledge, excellence, integrity, mutual respect and equity, public interest.

---
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At the University of British Columbia, faculty are assessed for tenure on the basis of their contributions in teaching, scholarly activity and service. They are expected to demonstrate a “high standard of performance” in these areas and “show promise of continuing to do so”. Here, again, there is a clear articulation in the policy documents, both in the Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC (2010/11) and in the Faculty Agreement (2006), of the recommendations from the literature discussed in Chapter 2. In relation to the nature of teaching responsibilities, the Guide to Reappointment and the UBC Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty (2010) notes:

Teaching includes all activities by which students, whether in degree or non-degree programs sponsored by the University, derive educational benefit. This may include lectures, seminars and tutorials, individual and group discussion, supervision of individual students’ work, or other means (Article 4.02, p. 67).

As to how teaching effectiveness is to be evaluated, the Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures (2010) states:

3.2.3 Evaluation of teaching should be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor. Indicators of effectiveness include: command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students, and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students. Consideration shall be given to the ability and willingness of the candidate to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction.

3.2.4 The methods of teaching evaluation may vary, but will normally include student opinion and peer assessment by colleagues of performance. Other methods may include outside references concerning teaching at other institutions, course material and examinations, the calibre of supervised essays and theses, and other relevant considerations (p. 13).83

83 These passages also appear in the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty (2006), in Article 4: Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion.
In a subsequent section (4.3: Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness), the *Guide* (2010) notes that the types of evidence for teaching effectiveness will likely vary due to disciplinary contexts which can impact teaching styles and methods. Candidates are encouraged to consult with their departments for additional information.

While not a requirement, peer evaluation is one means of assessing teaching at British Columbia. The *Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures* (2010) includes a section on Selecting Referees (Section 4.4) notes that letters for the appraisal of teaching effectiveness shall be obtained by the Head from internal and external referees. In the directions to department heads (Appendix 6 – Head’s Letter (suggested format) the *Guide* further indicates that “peer evaluations should normally consist of reports from at least two colleagues who have each attended at least two lectures or other teaching activity. Deviations from these norms should be explained in the Head’s letter (p. 54).”

The UBC *Guide* (2010) also addresses all of the common elements found in tenure policies, including: expectations regarding tenure, criteria, timelines and the tenure clock, information for and responsibilities of the candidate, department head, department, dean, and faculty, the decision-making process, and the role of the president. At UBC, faculty must go forward for tenure no later than their seventh year of appointment. At this time, candidates are reviewed first by a standing committee in their department which is composed of all tenured faculty and is chaired by the head of the unit. The recommendation of the Head, on advice from this committee is forwarded to the Dean who must consult with a Faculty Advisory Committee. The Dean then forwards a recommendation along with those from the departmental standing committee, the department head, and the faculty advisory committee to the Senior
Appointments Committee (SAC), as the advisory committee to the President. The final decision is made by the President who informs both the candidate and the Board of Governors. (The Faculty Agreement echoes some of this information, including details regarding the various levels of review, including departmental review committees, the decanal review, and the recommendation by the Dean to the President. See Article 5: Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion.)

A document appended to the UBC Guide (2010, Appendix 3) provides an overview of the types of teaching evidence that should be submitted with a tenure file. This appendix acknowledges that a full teaching dossier may be most useful for a review at the departmental level, but instructs committees not to forward full-length dossiers to the university-level committee (the Senior Appointments Committee). Instead, a 2-3 page brief is to be prepared with the following information:

- A quantitative summary regarding the amount of teaching the candidate performs.
- A quantitative summary and qualitative assessment of student evaluations (including a comparison to expected norms).
- A summary of qualitative peer evaluations.
- A statement regarding the candidate’s performance as a graduate supervisor.
- A description of the candidate’s major teaching or educational activities.
- A list and brief description of teaching awards/honours.
- A list and brief description of any special or remedial efforts to improve teaching performance.
- An overall summary of the candidate’s performance as a university teacher and educator and a statement describing how this compares to the expected norm for the department/school/faculty.

In 2007 the University of British Columbia implemented a Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching that is part of a “modular evaluation process that enables the key stakeholders who influence the quality of the learning environment at UBC to ask relevant questions of students
at appropriate times” (p. 1). Here, course evaluations form part of an overall system of evaluation that includes peer review and faculty self-assessment. The policy further states that the evaluation of teaching should be student-focused, and that the products of evaluation be used to inform teachers on how they can continuously improve their practice and to support the university efforts to monitor and nurture its teaching and learning environments (p. 1).

Additionally, the document lays out the various responsibilities of its constituents in relation to the evaluation of teaching, noting that students, administrators, faculties, departments and individual instructors all have a role to play. For example, administrators (including deans, department heads and directors) are expected to ensure consistent administration of the evaluations, to be familiar with institutional procedures and relevant policies, and to review the collected data for personnel decisions and, where necessary, address “less than satisfactory teaching performance” (p. 4). Individual faculty are advised to “avail themselves of services offered through the UBC teaching and scholarly units ... in order to understand how they can use student evaluations of teaching to inform and improve their teaching practice” (p. 4).

Also of note, like Nipissing, Alberta, York and Saskatchewan, UBC recognizes the scholarship of teaching as a form of scholarly activity, as detailed in its Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures (2010):

Article 3.1 Scholarly Activity
3.1. b) Scholarship of Teaching
3.1.6 Under Article 4.03 of the Agreement and the definition of “Scholarly Activity”, scholarship of teaching ranks equally with scholarly research. The following notes are offered in order to assist in assembling the evidence concerning the scholarship of teaching.

3.1.7 Scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching. Rather, scholarship of teaching makes a broader contribution to the improvement of teaching and learning beyond one’s own teaching responsibilities.
3.1.8 For scholarship of teaching, scholarly activity may be evidenced by factors such as originality or innovation, demonstrable impact in a particular field or discipline, peer reviews of scholarly contributions to teaching, dissemination in the public domain, or substantial and sustained use by others. For example, textbooks and curriculum reform that changed academic understanding or made a significant contribution to the way in which a discipline or field is taught might constitute useful evidence of the scholarship of teaching, whereas textbooks or curriculum revision of a routine nature would not (from Art. 4.03(a) of the Agreement).

3.1.9 It must be demonstrated that an individual is a leader, or possesses outstanding stature or expertise, in the scholarship of teaching.

3.1.10 Evidence of assessment of the significance and impact of a candidate’s scholarship of teaching is essential. External peer evaluation is particularly important.

3.1.11 Work that is not published in a refereed system that makes a significant contribution should be specifically evaluated by the external referees (pp. 10-11).

This acknowledgment of the scholarship of teaching reveals that policies from UBC, and the four other institutions profiled here, incorporate a much broader understanding of teaching activities and contributions than documents from most other Canadian universities.

While the UBC policy is a fairly lengthy document in comparison to those found at many other institutions, it is well-organized and comprehensive. It also reflects a wide range of the recommendations from the literature, as in its understanding of faculty work. There is a clear sense that UBC aims to view faculty contributions in teaching, scholarship and service holistically and in an integrated manner, as the literature has recommended. As with Alberta, York, Saskatchewan and Nipissing, the UBC documents reveal a comprehensive approach to the evaluation of teaching.
Summary

The profiles provided here for Alberta, Nipissing, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and York reveal that there is no one institutional type that has more effectively defined their approach to the evaluation of teaching; nor is there a particular jurisdiction that has systematically improved their efforts in this regard. However, common to all of the examples is the extent to which they each reflect elements recommended in the literature on teaching evaluation frameworks. As demonstrated here, each of these universities has developed comprehensive policies and related documents that clearly articulate the institutional expectations for teaching – outlining criteria, faculty roles and responsibilities and standards of performance. Perhaps more importantly, they have taken steps, some greater than others, to define teaching and teaching effectiveness for their contexts at the institutional and divisional/departmental levels. Most have moved beyond simply providing a list of teaching-related activities; rather, they have developed more holistic understandings of teaching, in many cases adopting the teacher-scholar model. It was particularly interesting to find that in all five of these examples the policies adopt and integrate some or all aspects of Boyer’s categories of scholarship. This recognition of Boyer’s work may have been a factor in enhancing the overall approaches taken by these five universities. Such flexible understandings of teaching and the clear, transparent and rigorous means for evaluating teaching articulated in these policies combined with the integration of institutional mandates leads to a contextually-aligned framework.

These five institutions have also clearly identified and called for a range of mechanisms and types of evidence for evaluating teaching, in an effort to ensure that teaching is assessed through more than one indicator or measure. Additionally, there is comprehensive...
documentation to support the tenure process and those involved in it and a clear articulation of the structures and decision-making processes. In most cases, initiatives that aim to provide ongoing support for teaching, outside the tenure process, can also be identified in the use of formative assessment, the presence of faculty development centres, and the existence and availability of additional resources and guides. Together, these help shape institutional cultures.

This chapter has provided an in-depth look at a sub-set of the 46 institutions reviewed in the previous section. While these institutions offer more substantive examples of comprehensive teaching evaluation frameworks that is not to suggest that some of the elements discussed here are not present in the other 41 universities. Indeed, as discussed in Chapter 5 and as indicated in Appendix E and Appendix F, many Canadian institutions reflect elements recommended in the literature for teaching evaluation frameworks. The five universities reviewed in this chapter demonstrate how much richer and more thorough evaluation frameworks can be when they reflect these recommendations more fully.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS: LESSONS LEARNED

Much has been written in the scholarly literature and in the popular media about the ways in which teaching is valued or undervalued in universities. Moreover, significant attention is often paid to this issue on university campuses in informal conversations among faculty. A common thread that connects all of these discussions is the belief, or perception, that university reward structures, including tenure, have led to the under-recognition of teaching. More specifically, many have argued that the tenure review does not effectively evaluate the teaching contributions of faculty and that it privileges research activity. In order to unpack this idea and to explore the veracity of such perceptions, this study began with four primary questions:

1. How can teaching in higher education most effectively and comprehensively be evaluated, according to the literature?
2. How have faculty evaluation systems developed historically in Canada, and in response to what factors?
3. What role does the evaluation of teaching play in current tenure policies at Canadian universities?
4. To what extent are the recommendations emerging from the current literature on teaching and teaching evaluation reflected in Canadian tenure policies?

In seeking the answers to these questions, and in conducting a review of policies and related documents from 46 institutions, a number of key findings about the approaches to the evaluation of teaching and to tenure policies at Canadian universities have come to light. This chapter provides an overview of my findings focusing particularly on how teaching is currently being evaluated at the point of tenure across Canadian universities and the extent to which these policies reflect recommendations from the literature on teaching and teaching evaluation. I also discuss, in brief, some of recommendations from the literature that go beyond the context of the tenure policy and that focus more broadly on strategies that seek to improve
institutional teaching cultures, perceptions about teaching and the way in which it is valued within higher education and from outside our institutions. This discussion also includes, where possible, reference to efforts outlined in any of the policies or related documents from the 46 institutions reviewed for this study.

**The Development of Canadian Evaluation Frameworks**
Teaching evaluation frameworks in Canada began to emerge with the formalization of tenure in the mid-20th century. Here, for the first time, the terms and conditions of employment were being set down in writing. Academic appointments shifted from being held at the “pleasure of the board” to “tenure during good behaviour” to “tenure as employment contract”. Institutional expectations of faculty members were being articulated as were the responsibilities and commitments of universities to these individuals. By the 1970s, with the spread of unionization efforts across Canadian university campuses, contractual obligations were further cemented through bargaining processes and the drafting of collective agreements. While some have argued that unionization “rigidified” decision-making (Cameron, 1994), others have countered by stating that bargaining helped to bring about and ensure ongoing clarity and fairness in tenure procedures (Savage, 1994b). As tenure policies and collective agreements were developed, so too were the related criteria for tenure, with faculty being assessed on their teaching, research and contributions in service (to the institution, discipline and/or community). These criteria were codified in institutional documents and served as the basis for the tenure review process – and remain so today.
Current Practices in the Evaluation of Teaching for Tenure

All of the 46 institutions reviewed for this study have tenure policies and processes in place and in writing. These policies may be institutional documents, approved through governance structures, such as senates or governing boards, or may be embedded in collective agreements negotiated through bargaining exercises. Sometimes, the details of the tenure process are included in both types of documents. As outlined in Chapter 4, where unionization has happened, current tenure policies are more commonly found in collective agreements/memoranda of agreement. This is the case at 89% (41 of 46) of the universities reviewed for this study. In 10 instances, tenure processes are addressed in both collective agreements and other institutional policies, and in 15 these appear only in policies approved by boards or senates (see Table 4.2 in Chapter 4 for details regarding specific institutions.)

In general, the scope of Canadian tenure policies is quite similar in that they all tend to address the same sorts of information: tenure criteria, standards of performance, mechanisms for assessment, forms of evidence, committee structures and decision-making processes, and timelines or the tenure clock (including probationary periods). As outlined in Chapters 5 and 6, the amount of detail for each of these elements, and the extent to which they reflect the recommendations from the literature, varies considerably across institutions. Thus, this study demonstrates that while some common elements exist, there is no one standard approach to tenure or to the evaluation of teaching within the context of the tenure review process at the Canadian universities reviewed here. Rather, it is clear that tenure is institution-specific.

84 There are of course many other elements to tenure policies that also commonly appear, such as appeal and grievance processes; however, these were not reviewed for this study.
This review of institutional policies and related documents has also revealed that all 46 Canadian institutions continue to evaluate faculty on the basis of teaching, research and service. In other jurisdictions, concerns have been raised about the lack of emphasis, and sometimes the complete absence, of teaching criteria in institutional policies. As Gibbs and Habeshaw (2003) and Ramsden and Martin (1996) have noted for the United Kingdom and Australia respectively, promotion policies in these jurisdictions have for many years excluded details regarding teaching expectations – such as criteria and standards of performance. My review has demonstrated that this is not the case across the Canadian landscape; rather, all universities reviewed include teaching as one of the three primary responsibilities of faculty, all state that teaching is one of the criteria for tenure, and all include reference to the institutional expectations regarding standards of performance (the only exception being those institutions that refer this role to the divisions/departments, as at Regina and Manitoba). As such, it is easy to conclude that the Canadian institutions selected for this study recognize teaching in the tenure process and there is no evidence, at this level, to suggest that it is a lower priority than research. One therefore can also assert that there is nothing explicit at this level that would send a message to faculty or other members of the university community that teaching is not valued. Rather, teaching is clearly placed on equal footing with research and identified as a key institutional mission and a primary responsibility of all faculty members.

**Recommendations from the Literature**

As evidenced in Chapter 2, there is remarkable agreement in the scholarly literature regarding the characteristics of an effective teaching evaluation framework. Within this literature, a
comprehensive teaching evaluation system is viewed as one that encompasses the following elements:

1. Evaluation goals and purpose are established and align with institutional mandates.
2. A clear understanding of faculty responsibilities is provided.
3. Teaching effectiveness is defined.
4. Evaluation criteria and the related standards of performance are articulated.
5. A range of evaluation mechanisms are used and multiple forms of evidence are sought.
6. Clear and transparent governance and decision-making structures are established.
7. Sufficient support and/or training for all involved in the review process are provided.
8. Effective and consistent communication to all relevant constituents is ensured.

Certain elements of this framework have been debated by scholars over the years, and some have continued to raise questions and concerns in both the scholarly and popular literature. For example, there is still some disagreement about the ability to define “teaching effectiveness”. While there is general agreement that such a definition is fundamental for establishing an evaluation framework, there is not yet a commonly accepted definition of this term that can be applied across all contexts. Many have insisted that this is an impossible task; however, others have argued that “effective teaching” can and should be defined by universities to accurately reflect their academic missions, and/or at the disciplinary levels where teaching activities occur and where pedagogical approaches themselves are established and realized. This approach helps to ensure an accurate and context-specific understanding that is meaningful to faculty and administrators. Even though a common definition is lacking, there is agreement in the literature regarding the characteristics of effective teaching. For example, we know that certain instructor behaviours and actions help to facilitate learning and therefore can be deemed effective (Berk, 2005; Gross Davis, 1988; Seldin, 1980).

Another aspect of the evaluation framework that has led to a healthy discussion among scholars and practitioners relates to the evaluation mechanisms and types of evidence. Thirty-
odd years ago, education scholars were paying increasing attention to the notion of peer assessment in relation to teaching – specifically, in-class observations of teaching. Many (Centra, 1979) were recommending this approach for formative purposes, to enhance an individual instructor’s teaching performance. At that time, concerns were raised regarding the use of this approach for summative decisions, including those made for tenure and promotion reviews. Specifically, many worried about the potential for bias, whereby peers based their evaluations on their own assumptions or expectations about teaching. Over time, many of these concerns regarding peer review have been addressed through recommendations for improved training materials, more comprehensive definitions of teaching effectiveness, and more explicit statements regarding standards of performance. Current literature on peer observations of in-class teaching sees this as a valuable means of collecting evidence for both formative and summative purposes. Centra (1979, 2000), who once raised concerns about its use during the tenure review, now argues that it allows for a triangulation of data, along with that collected from the instructor (i.e. in the form of teaching materials or a dossier) and from students (i.e. in the form of course evaluations).

Course evaluations have long been debated as a means for collecting feedback on teaching. The validity and reliability of these instruments has been addressed at length in the literature as has their role in relation to summative decision-making (e.g. for tenure decisions). The bulk of scholarship produced over the last several decades has affirmed the ability of course evaluations to effectively measure particular aspects relating to teaching and learning. This research has consistently shown that if well-designed, appropriately tested and ideally linked to institutional teaching priorities, course evaluations are valid instruments for both the
formative and summative assessment of teaching. As such, they are now a widely accepted form of evaluation and have become one of the most commonly used mechanisms for assessing teaching across North American campuses. In the universities reviewed for this study, course evaluations are used at 29 of 46 institutions (with six additional universities recommending their use, and five noting that they are optional for the tenure review). This is not to suggest that this form of evidence is accepted by all in academia. In fact, the use of course evaluations is regularly questioned by individual faculty members, whose perceptions and attitudes are often shared in editorials and reflective articles in a range of media. These works are more often than not, based on personal experiences with course evaluations, and typically do not consider or incorporate the findings of systematic research on this issue.

Aside from defining “teaching effectiveness”, and the discussions regarding particular types of evidence used in the tenure review, the other elements of the evaluation framework have received little criticism in the scholarly literature. Moreover, particular aspects have been lauded by organizations such as the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA), the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Association of American University Professors (AAUP). This includes support for the recommendations for clear and transparent decision-making processes, the content and scope of tenure policies, the need to articulate faculty roles and responsibilities, and the importance of communicating policies and procedures to faculty members. Several CAUT policies and documents echo these very recommendations (see for example its policy on Criteria and Procedures in Renewal, Tenure and Promotion Decisions (2010) and their Model Clause on the Evaluation of Teaching Performance (2007; see Appendix D), which provide
suggested templates for tenure and teaching evaluation policies) as does the *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation* (2000) guide produced by the American Council on Education (in association with the AAUP) and the AAUP *Statement on Teaching Evaluation*, which was originally adopted by the Association in 1975. The CAUT and the AAUP documents reinforce this notion that tenure processes should be transparent and fair, but that they should also be rigorous in their evaluation of faculty work. This includes the need to incorporate multiple forms of evidence for the evaluation of teaching during the tenure review, as addressed in the CAUT teaching dossier guide (2007a, see Appendix A). However, this emphasis on rigour has not escaped criticism. Some have expressed, most often outside of the scholarly literature, that the evaluation of teaching and the overall tenure process is excessive, onerous and “a waste of faculty time” (see for example, Bercuson et al., 1997).

In spite of these concerns, there is a high level of consensus among scholars working in the field of higher education. Overall, the literature calls for teaching evaluation systems that are not only comprehensive, addressing the elements noted above, but that also align with institutional goals and mandates and that are integrated with a full range of institutional policies, supports and resources. Numerous studies have revealed that faculty continue to believe that teaching is undervalued and that it should be more appropriately recognized by institutions. The scholarship has found that in many cases, insufficient policies were the root cause (see studies from the United Kingdom and Australia). Gibbs and Habeshaw (2003) and Ramsden and Martin (1996) discuss the need to narrow the gap between institutional policy and individual faculty perceptions. Ramsden and Martin (1996) have suggested that one way to accomplish this is for institutions to use valid measures that treat teaching and research
equally; another is to allow faculty to be promoted on the basis of teaching excellence, which is a possibility at some Canadian institutions (although it is difficult to say how often this happens). For some time, the criticism that the institutional reward structures in the United Kingdom and Australia do not adequately recognize or reward teaching has been voiced. Studies have found that altering this perception would require changes to the promotion policies, viewed by most as the most meaningful reward structure. The same conclusions have been reached by American scholars (see Fairweather, 2002a, 2005; Trower, 2000). While there are limited data about the perceptions of Canadian faculty, in comparison to these other jurisdictions, studies have demonstrated that here too personnel policies provide the most effective way to recognize and reward teaching and to affect institutional culture (Britnell, et al., 2010; Wright & Associates, 1995). So, how do the 46 Canadian universities reviewed for this study measure up?

**Lessons Learned: Current Policies in Relation to the Literature on Teaching Evaluation**

As already noted above, it is evident from this review that all 46 Canadian universities include teaching as a primary faculty responsibility. Additionally, faculty are evaluated on their teaching contributions during the tenure review. As noted in Chapters 5 and 6, variations occur in Canadian polices in relation to the standards of performance, definitions of teaching and teaching effectiveness and the mechanisms for evaluation and types of evidence used in decision-making processes (see also Appendix E and Appendix F). However, this study has also revealed a number of emerging trends and common practices, along with some atypical approaches to teaching and its evaluation.
Standards of performance and “effective teaching”

While all 46 Canadian institutions clearly indicated the primary criteria for tenure, drilling down deeper into the policies and related documents, it was apparent that they were not all as thorough in their elaboration of teaching expectations. All policies and related documents reviewed indicated that a faculty member’s teaching contributions were to meet a particular standard. For example, across the sample set of institutions, policies stated that instructors would need to demonstrate “a strong record of achievement in teaching”, “effectiveness and scholarly competence as a teacher”, “competence” or “excellence” in teaching, or “quality and effectiveness as a teacher”. However, further elaboration regarding these expectations was not typically provided. In the majority of examples, terms such as “competence”, “excellence” and “quality” were not defined or explained. The same was true for “teaching effectiveness” which was defined only in a small percentage (30% or 14 of 46) of institutional policies and in each case with varying levels of specificity (see Appendix E).

As Colbeck (2002), Knapper (2001), Pratt (1997), Seldin (1999a, 2006) and others have recommended, institutions need to go further than simply stating that “effective teaching” is a requirement for a successful tenure application; they must define what “effective” means in their context. Arguably, at the departmental or divisional level this may result in a more detailed understanding based on disciplinary standards or needs but institutions should also provide a clear definition since it is the institution that grants tenure and the institution that can set the tone.

As this analysis has revealed, most institutions addressed “effective teaching” by simply providing a list of activities in which faculty were expected to engage. So, in most cases
“effective”, “satisfactory” or “competent” teaching meant designing and teaching courses, supervising undergraduate and/or graduate students, assessing student work, consulting with students on academic matters, and so on. In some cases, as at Queen’s, these activities were framed in relation to goals for student learning and the instructor’s role in facilitating this learning was made more explicit (see Appendix G). Although perhaps somewhat aspirational, this framing also enables and allows for flexible and diverse individual and disciplinary approaches. While the Queen’s Statement on Effective Teaching (1995) is outside of the formal policy, but referenced within it, it is perhaps the closest and most thorough example of the approach recommended in the literature – incorporating the characteristics of effective teaching and the recognition of distinct teaching contexts.

The lack of such a definition presents a problem not only for tenure candidates but also for academic administrators advising and mentoring new faculty and for members of tenure review committees who are assessing an individual’s contributions. In the absence of such definitions, there is a risk that individuals and administrators may bring their own perceptions to bear when assessing teaching. Or they may apply their own interpretations which may not align with institutional or disciplinary understandings. This could negatively impact the evaluation process, resulting in inconsistent and inequitable application of the standards. To avoid this scenario, and even the perception that this could occur, Canadian institutions could improve their frameworks in this regard by providing clearer, more thorough definitions of teaching effectiveness that are rich but also flexible. Such definitions need not be rigid or overly prescriptive, as evidenced by a number of strong examples identified in this study, including at York, Nipissing and British Columbia. In many of the institutions that have taken this step we
also see a rich and comprehensive evaluation framework surrounding the definition of teaching effectiveness. In other instances, we see a thorough definition of teaching effectiveness, but the overall framework is less comprehensive, as at St. Francis Xavier or Waterloo. But even in these cases, there is value in providing these definitions as they enable more consistent evaluation of teaching and subsequent tenure recommendations. Defining teaching effectiveness need not occur within the policy or collective agreement, recognizing that for some institutions, making changes at this level can be difficult and time consuming. Rather, a definition may be provided in a complementary document, such as that of Queen’s with its *Statement on Effective Teaching* (1995).

*Holistic approaches to teaching roles and responsibilities*

Although all institutions have identified key faculty responsibilities, and included teaching among them, they do not for the most part reflect the recommendations from the literature that suggest teaching be understood as a more holistic enterprise. Colbeck (2002), Pratt (1997) and others have suggested moving away from viewing teaching as a set of actions and have called for a more substantive approach that considers the motivations and rationale of faculty approaches to teaching. By and large, this approach is not reflected in Canadian tenure policies but a few institutions come close. Arguably, teaching philosophy statements or other documents that allow tenure candidates to reflect on their teaching approaches and accomplishments provide rich evidence that demonstrates how an individual teaches, why they have adopted particular pedagogical strategies and how this enhances student learning. Although, as Pratt (2005) cautions, in practice such statements may not always form an integral
part of the review process in spite of the valuable insight they can provide into teaching approaches. Additionally, as outlined in Chapters 5 and 6, a number of institutions have adopted Boyer’s (1990) framework for scholarship in their tenure policies. In doing so, these institutions signal that they view teaching as more than a set of activities but rather that they understand faculty work in a more comprehensive and integrated manner, focusing on more than the “what” but also on the “how” and “why”.

The literature has also stressed the import of recognizing the differences in teaching approaches that may result from disciplinary contexts and cultures. This review has revealed that a number of institutional policies and related documents have acknowledged this. For example, the University of Toronto’s *Provostial Guidelines for the Written Evaluation of Teaching* (2003b) provides the institution-level understanding of competence and excellence but asks that divisions develop supplementary guidelines that reflect disciplinary teaching approaches and cultures. Such an approach ensures that institutional priorities are addressed, since it is the institution that administers the policy and grants tenure, but also builds flexibility into the overall system in recognition of diverse practices and contexts. This approach was also evident in policies at 11 other institutions and in an additional 16 the differences in disciplinary contexts were acknowledged as something that needed to be considered during the review process (see Table 5.4 in Chapter 5).

*Mechanisms for review and evidence of teaching effectiveness*

As this study has revealed candidates for tenure are a significant, arguably the primary, source for information regarding their teaching contributions. In all 46 institutions, they are expected
to provide substantial information and materials to demonstrate that they have met the tenure criteria and expectations. For teaching, this evidence ranges in scope but typically, at a minimum, includes representative course and instructional materials and a list of teaching responsibilities. Such information may be contained in a teaching dossier, or portfolio, and may also include details on their activities related to curriculum development, supervision, professional development, awards/honours, and publications and/or presentations on teaching and learning. In 25 of 46 institutions reviewed for this study, a teaching dossier was either required or recommended for the tenure review process (in four other universities it was optional). The inclusion of materials from the candidate is seen as essential and is recommended in the literature as it allows an individual faculty member to provide a self-assessment of their own practice. As Ory (2000) notes,

> assessment is more than counting, measuring, recording, or accounting. It promotes teaching evaluation not as a scientific endeavor, with absolute truth as its goal, but rather as a form of argument where the faculty use their data to make a case for their teaching. It incorporates the institutional context, the role of colleagues in judging and helping others, and the need to observe the actual work of the faculty. It touches on self-reflection, dialogue, and discussion. It is learning, developing, and building (p. 17).

In addition to the instructor, or tenure candidate, many policies made reference to data to be gathered from internal colleagues (only two policies recommended assessments from external peers – at British Columbia and Toronto). As outlined in Chapters 5 and 6, this could take the form of letters, written and signed appraisals, interviews or on-site observations. In all cases, it involved a review by a committee of peers with most (31 of 46) institutions initiating the review process at the department/unit level before moving to divisional and/or institutional reviews. Although the literature has increasingly emphasized the need for faculty to be
assessed ‘in situ’ – in the classroom, I found that this was an uncommon requirement in Canadian tenure policies. On several occasions, committees or evaluators were assigned this task as part of the tenure review (e.g. Ottawa and Ontario Institute of Technology); but in all 19 other instances where this appeared in policies it was presented as a recommendation or option.

Again, reflecting the recommendations from the literature, students also play a prominent role in the evaluation of teaching for tenure. Such evidence might come in the form of letters (as in 20 of 46 policies) or interviews (in 3 of 46) with the former being required in 6 of 46 policies. In some cases, samples of students work were requested (4 of 46), but this was only required in one instance. Overwhelmingly, information from students tended to come through course evaluations (87%). This is a required form of data in 29 institutions, and a recommended or optional form in 11, revealing that Canada, like many American institutions, has developed a heavy reliance on this type of information.

Most policies indicate that tenure decisions should not be made on the basis of course evaluations alone, or on one singular source of data. This approach is in line with the literature which recommends that mechanisms be put in place to ensure that material is gathered from peers, students and the instructor. Such an approach is undertaken in an effort to both reach a full and comprehensive understanding of a faculty member’s teaching but also to ensure the triangulation of data, so that no one piece of evidence is used for summative decisions.

When assessments of teaching are based solely, or primarily, on a review of submitted course materials or a dossier and student course evaluations, the scope of the evaluation may be rather limited. Effective teaching is more than the ability to develop a course or
instructional materials; it also requires the ability to interact with students and engage them with the content, key issues and ideas. While an instructor can describe the pedagogical approaches he/she uses to achieve these goals, observing it first-hand enables a review committee to assess these abilities more accurately and to align their assessment with an instructor’s self-assessment and that of their students. Moreover, peers are best-suited to assess an instructor’s knowledge of the subject area and his/her ability to transmit this information appropriately and effectively to students. As such, peer observation and review are essential for ensuring that instructors are effective in both their teaching approaches but also in their ability to impact student learning.

The use of multiple sources of information provides a more complete picture of the tenure candidate’s contributions and alleviates the reliance on any one indicator that might not fully capture the full nature and scope of these contributions. In the absence of clear definitions of teaching effectiveness, this approach provides a more solid base for making evaluations and subsequent recommendations on teaching. In all 46 Canadian institutions reviewed, the policies list possible sources of data, for example, letters and peer observations; however, these are frequently optional or recommended sources and rarely ever required (see Appendix F). As such, this allows for the possibility that evidence would not be collected from multiple indicators, or as it was in most cases that it would come primarily from the tenure candidate and from course evaluations.

Of course, tenure review committees are made up of faculty colleagues, thus ensuring that there is a peer review element within the overall process. Charged with providing an assessment of the candidate’s teaching, these committees are asked to review the range of
materials compiled within the tenure file, be it a teaching dossier, course evaluations and/or letters. However, the processes by which these materials are assessed are often shrouded in mystery, particularly when tenure policies are not explicit about standards of performance or “teaching effectiveness”. As a result there may be skepticism regarding the way recommendations and subsequent decisions are made and whether certain pieces of data are being weighed more heavily or if personal opinions or biases are influencing the process. In my own professional work, I have encountered a common perception that data from student ratings are used as the primary indicator of teaching effectiveness. Thus, many faculty and administrators assume that “good” scores (however that may be defined) are sufficient to demonstrate a candidate’s successful teaching contributions. Perhaps to counter this perception, many institutional policies explicitly state that course evaluation data should not be the sole source of information for tenure decisions. But given that they are the most common form of evidence, it is perhaps no surprise that this belief exists.

In part, because of this concern, there is an ongoing emphasis in the literature on the need for more substantive peer assessment. Many have argued that until such practices are fully integrated into the tenure review process, teaching will continue to be undervalued in comparison to research (Knapper, 2001; Wright, 1998). Furthermore, tenure candidates may perceive that the review of their teaching is less rigorous or perhaps even less objective. To address this may, for example, require selecting tenure committee members on the basis of their teaching experience or expertise, rather than based solely on their tenured status within a department or division. Or it may necessitate using external colleagues, who can provide arms-length assessments, as is done for a candidate’s scholarship. Mechanisms have long been in
place to assess research using a peer review process, whereby scholarly publications are reviewed by others in the field to assess the value and impact of such contributions. Arguably, there may be some level of subjectivity in this process as well; however, this may be tempered by the fact that a faculty member’s publication record is rarely, if ever, assessed by only one individual.

Although this review has revealed the intention to gather evidence from multiple sources of evidence for the evaluation of teaching, the institutional policies do not consistently bear this out. Too frequently, the policies steer clear of requiring a range of data and instead indicate that additional evidence is optional or recommended allowing for the possibility that it may not be included. In doing so, this counters the stated desire to ensure decisions are based on multiple means of evidence. To address these issues, the various elements of the tenure policies need to be more carefully aligned.

*Integrated support for and recognition of teaching*

Although tenure is a summative decision, a comprehensive evaluation system will also build in opportunities for ongoing formative assessment. A number of scholars have emphasized the need to integrate formative assessment practices into teaching evaluation frameworks (Cavanagh, 1996; Johnson & Ryan, 2000; Ory, 2000; Ramsden & Martin, 1996; Smith, 2001; Wright, 1998). Such opportunities should link to broader institutional goals to encourage and foster teaching improvement practices as faculty move toward tenure and promotion and beyond (Ory, 2000). In general, the entire evaluation framework should incorporate a feedback process.
The literature indicates that opportunities for formative assessment can have broad impact. When instructors engage in formative assessment of their teaching this helps to improve teaching practices. When this sort of activity is encouraged by academic administrators it can demonstrate that teaching is recognized and valued, thus enhancing the overall culture of teaching within an institution (Johnson & Ryan, 2000). And when such practices are institutionalized in policy, this impact is deepened further. Several of the institutional policy documents reviewed for this study have stressed the value of and encouraged ongoing formative assessment of teaching, including McMaster, York, British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan. York’s Guide to Teaching Assessment and Evaluation (2002) provides a thorough look at both formative and summative assessment and related strategies for both. Of course, formative assessment is not intended to form a part of the evaluation of teaching for the formal tenure review; however, it is seen as an essential component for improving the recognition of teaching and encouraging the ongoing enhancement of individual teaching practice. As a broader goal, formative assessment also aims to positively impact institutional teaching cultures.

Another element of a successful evaluation framework is the integration of faculty development initiatives and support. Wilcox (1997) has suggested that a lack of such support may be viewed by some as a sign that a university does not fully support teaching. Many have argued that faculty development resources can play an essential role in shaping institutional teaching cultures (Arreola, 2000; Wilcox, 1997). For these reasons, many scholars have advocated for an integrated system of faculty support and faculty evaluation (Arreola, 2000; Braskamp, 2000). For Arreola (1995) “faculty evaluation and faculty development are really two
sides of the same coin” (p. 3) and he argues that if faculty development is not linked to an evaluation framework its success is greatly hindered since “the operational rule of thumb assumed here is if some aspect of faculty performance is to be evaluated, then there should exist resources or opportunities which enable faculty to develop that performance” (p. 3).

Of the 46 institutions reviewed here, 45 possess teaching and learning centres: a notable exception is Nipissing. Each of these units offer the typical set of programs and resources in support of teaching, including events (workshops, courses, symposia), assistance with educational technologies, consultations with faculty, and publications such as guides and tip sheets on a range of teaching topics. Some of the centres offer, or facilitate, teaching or scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) grants or provide peer mentorship programs. Alberta’s Centre for Teaching and Learning offers a peer consultation program whereby faculty are paired with colleagues from outside their discipline to discuss teaching. A similar program is in place at Saskatchewan’s Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness. This unit also offers a formal peer mentorship program where faculty are placed in small interdisciplinary groups for structured, non-evaluative consultation and feedback on classroom teaching. The program aims to build communities of teachers. Less formal initiatives are available too, including a reading group and a teaching in Canada discussion group. The centres at Saskatchewan and York provide information about various teaching awards/grants available on their campuses, and York’s centre explicitly states its staff can provide advice regarding nominations and applications.

None of the centres identify on their web sites a direct role in relation to tenure and promotion processes or policies. British Columbia’s centre offers a program for Pre-Tenured
Faculty which provides participants with information on their administrative responsibilities, guidance on how to develop as a teacher and graduate supervisor, how to set career goals, and how to clarify departmental expectations. New faculty at York can participate in a similar program. Most institutions with teaching and learning centres provide information (guides/publications) and resources (workshops) on documenting teaching contributions through the use of teaching dossiers. The Centre for the Support of Teaching at York, for example, offers a workshop on preparing a dossier for tenure and promotion and a complementary workshop that provides an overview of York’s tenure process, the required documentation and relevant requirements, and the resources available to support faculty through the process. Similar offerings are provided to faculty at the University of Toronto through its Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation and the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life and at the University of Windsor. While the presence of teaching and learning units on university campuses can certainly be viewed as evidence of a strong support for teaching, it is not clear if these Canadian centres have been fully integrated into institutional evaluation frameworks as the literature has recommended.

As noted in Chapter 2, the ability of teaching and learning initiatives to effect change within an institution has not been adequately studied. While individual centres may assess their programming, they have typically not engaged in longitudinal studies to evaluate the impact of their work on teaching behaviours, attitudes, approaches and cultures across and within their institutions (see Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Kreber & Brooks, 2001; Stes et al., 2007). Nor is there a clear sense as to how involved these centres are in the development, administration and/or support of policies related to teaching and its evaluation. However, in spite of this, they are still
generally viewed as an essential means of faculty support for teaching and as such, should be in place.

*Implementation and administration of tenure policies*
While the tenure process is often anxiety-ridden, arguably much of this stems from a lack of transparency and consistency in the process. Faculty who are unclear regarding the criteria against which they will be evaluated, or the expected standards of performance, will inevitably be faced with anxiety. Similarly, when academic administrators are not well-versed in the relevant policies, this can negatively impact candidates. If those involved in the decision-making process are poorly trained or lack clear guidance, the evaluation process may be mismanaged or potentially even less objective. The literature has stated unequivocally, that tenure policies need to be clear and transparent in order to be effective. Seldin (1980, 1984) has identified a number of significant elements which he believes are essential to ensuring faculty and administrators fully comprehend the review process. Specifically, he recommends that tenure policies include information on the following:

- The probationary period and pre-tenure review
- The particular procedures relating to tenure and promotion
- The role and responsibilities of the faculty member
- The role and responsibilities of departmental and/or divisional administrators
- The tenure/promotion review committee (constitution and mandate)
- The adjudication process (who is involved in the review and what are the related roles and responsibilities)
- How decisions are communicated to candidates
- The appeals process.

As noted in Chapter 5, the Canadian universities reviewed for this study addressed these elements in their tenure policies.
Seldin’s list contains items that relate not only to the content of the policy but also to its implementation and administration. Other scholars have similarly emphasized these facets of the process, highlighting the importance of support, communication and training (see for example, Diamond, 1999). Although administrators and members of tenure and promotion review committees are likely themselves teaching faculty, this does not guarantee that they are effective evaluators. Institutions need to develop training programs and resource materials for those involved in personnel decisions. Theall and Franklin (2001) and others (Cashin, 1996; Pratt, 1997; Seldin, 1980, 1999b) have noted that this is a crucial part of any effective evaluation system. Pratt (1997) recommends more focused training be given to those responsible for “making the tenure case” to help ensure that teaching is well-documented and in-line with institutional policies. In addition, institutions should ensure that those involved in the tenure process are aware of the criteria and are applying them consistently and equitably (ACE, 2000; Miller, 1987). This should involve training evaluators on how best to review the various measures (dossiers, course evaluation data, teaching materials) and what specifically they should be looking for (ACE, 2000; Seldin, 1999b).

Guidelines should also be developed for those involved in the evaluation process. These may include handbooks highlighting the roles and responsibilities of various individuals and could also include forms for evaluators to use as they review tenure files. For example, institutions may prepare a form for classroom observations that guides the reviewer through the process and highlights particular areas that should be addressed; others may develop similar forms for the assessment of teaching materials which may be based on Braskamp and Ory’s (1984) list of items to consider. When reviewing course-related materials they suggest
that all items be reviewed in relation to three broad categories: course organization (e.g. objectives, syllabus design); course content (e.g. relevant readings and selected texts, variety of assignments); and course evaluation (e.g. appropriateness of assignments in relation to course goals, fair grading practices). Alternatively, Pratt’s framework (1997) for substantive evaluation could also be used (see Chapter 2, Table 2.3). This framework focuses on planning, implementation and results and identifies what should be evaluated and the appropriate forms of evidence for each category of evaluation. In addition to developing their own resources, institutions may wish to provide administrators with copies of existing guides, such as the American Council on Education’s Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators (ACE, 2000).

A number of Canadian institutions have developed materials that aim to clarify tenure policies and processes for all involved. In some cases, this is achieved through extensive policies themselves, as at Nipissing and Saskatchewan. In other cases, it is addressed through supplementary documents as at Windsor, York and Toronto. Additionally, some institutions also offer information sessions on the tenure process, which may be delivered by faculty associations, as at Toronto, or by academic administrators, as at York, McMaster and Toronto.85 In spite of these examples, the general lack of direction that policies provide for the review of teaching contributions is of particular interest for this study. This is significant given the often very prescriptive nature of such documents whereby extensive details are frequently

85 For example, the Centre for the Support of Teaching at York’s web site advertises a session “T&P: Process and Documentation”. The description for the workshops states: This T&P session is specifically geared for full-time faculty who will be coming up for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor in the next few years. We will discuss the details of the T&P process, its documentation requirements, and available resources (http://www.yorku.ca/cst/workshops/2010-11/20101208-carter.htm).
provided in regard to the preparation of tenure files, the establishment and structure of review committees and the role of their members, the timelines associated with the review process and the steps involved in appeals and grievance procedures. I have already noted above the lack of clarity that institutional policies offer in terms of providing a definition for “teaching effectiveness” that committee members can use to assess a candidate’s teaching contributions. Similarly, while institutions may expect faculty to meet specific criteria for tenure and may ask for particular types of evidence to demonstrate that they have done so, rarely do they provide guidance to review committees to assist them in the effective assessment of this evidence. As a result, committees or individual members may determine, on their own, how to weigh or consider the various pieces of evidence put forth. This could result in some elements of the dossier being privileged over others. Whether this is true or not, there is certainly a widespread perception that this occurs and that in and of itself suggests universities must do a better job of articulating expectations regarding teaching contributions and the manner in which these are assessed.

Additionally, when institutions expect faculty to demonstrate a higher level of performance in either teaching or research (and allow for a slightly lower standard in the other), as is the case at St. Francis Xavier, McGill, Toronto, Waterloo and York, one could argue that this may open the door for the privileging of research. Although institutional guidelines do not explicitly identify one of these responsibilities as a priority over the other, those following tenure policies might. Faculty members seeking tenure, departmental/divisional heads providing advice to candidates, or members of tenure review committees may weight research contributions more heavily. Surveys and interviews conducted with these groups reveal that
there is a tendency to focus on research contributions in the belief that this will increase the likelihood of a positive tenure review (Britnell et al., 2010; Mullens, 2002; Wright & Associates, 1995). Although there is nothing in the policies themselves that suggests this, the reading of policy often leads to multiple interpretations (Ball, 1993; Taylor, 1997). This opens the door to the possibility that, in institutions where the research culture is dominant, there may be a stronger likelihood that such activities are more predominantly weighted in tenure files.

The value of providing transparent and consistent information is hard to argue against. However, developing the documentation is not enough, as institutions must also ensure that it reaches faculty and others involved in the review process. The literature reviewed for this study stresses the importance of strong communication networks to ensure that relevant stakeholders are well-informed about the tenure review process. It is difficult to ascertain the means by which such information is translated to faculty. One can presume that this is likely achieved through the distribution of memos or email communication from the administration (provost, deans, chairs/unit heads) or faculty associations. A search of institutional web sites located samples of such documents, produced at the institutional and divisional/departmental levels (e.g. as at Alberta, Manitoba, Toronto and York). Or information may be shared at the time of appointment through orientation kits and sessions (as at McMaster). Ideally, relevant information is shared directly with pre-tenure candidates by their department heads at the appropriate time.

While it is difficult to determine with absolute certainty whether institutions are successful in achieving this goal, all 46 institutions reviewed have made relevant materials available on their web sites, and thus they are easily accessible by all members of their
communities. This aligns with the recommendation that faculty should be provided easy access to information that they will deem important and useful (Arreola, 2000). Most often these documents are found in a number of locations, including the web pages of governing boards, offices of the provost/vice-provost, faculty associations, human resource offices, and occasionally linked to on faculty development centre web pages (as at Saskatchewan for example).

Perhaps not surprisingly, this review of policy and related documents and resources did not reveal many details regarding communication strategies. However, as noted in Chapter 6 the University of Saskatchewan’s collective agreement includes an article on communication in the section on tenure. It states that the criteria and standards of performance “shall be communicated, in writing, to all probationary appointees at the time of their appointment” (Article 15.11.1, p. 31). Arguably, in the end it is likely more important that faculty, administrators and review committee members receive this information, than to determine the means by which it was distributed. This is perhaps something that subsequent research could address: with a more complete knowledge of the institutional policies, interviews and surveys of faculty and administrators could question individual levels of understanding about these policies and awareness of particular documents.

Similarly, this review did not allow me to explore the level of training that tenure committee members and academic administrators receive in relation to the evaluation of teaching. The literature identifies such training as an essential element of an effective evaluation framework. In most cases, institutional policies clarified the roles and responsibilities that these individuals are expected to fulfill, but overall, they did not refer to any type of
training that was available to guide them through the process. Prince Edward Island was an exception. Here, the Collective Agreement (2010) indicates that members of tenure review committees are to receive training on the review process. The guides produced by York’s Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning indicate that they may be used for such purposes, and the authors encourage such use. I know from my own institution that sessions and retreats offered to academic administrators provide advice, guidance, and the details of their role within the tenure process. Again, it is difficult to assess within the context of this review whether or not the practices of Canadian universities reflect this recommendation from the literature.

Maintaining a sustainable evaluation framework
A final aspect relating to the implementation of a tenure review policy relates to an institution’s ability to effectively administer the policy and its various elements. An evaluation system should be rigorous and comprehensive; however, it must also be manageable for all parties involved (Miller, 1987; Seldin, 1999b). It is necessary, therefore, to find a workable balance between overall goals and purpose and the required elements of the system. The policy should not be cumbersome or difficult to navigate and support should be readily available. Expectations should not be vague, nor should they be unachievable. The request for too much evidence in a tenure or promotion file may result in the perception that the evaluation system sets faculty up for failure. It could also lead to beliefs that the process is onerous and overly bureaucratic.

86 The Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life, at the University of Toronto delivers a series of sessions each year for academic administrators, including an annual two-day retreat for new academic administrators.
Teaching evaluation policies should be periodically reviewed to ensure that they accurately reflect current practices recommended in the literature and are inclusive of institutional and disciplinary approaches and cultures. Cashin (1996), Seldin (1980, 1999b,) and others have recommended that a mechanism be established, such as a committee on the evaluation of teaching with wide representation from faculty and administration and the inclusion of undergraduate and graduate students, to periodically review policies and update them as necessary. This need not mean a complete overhaul of the policy on a regular basis; rather, it may simply involve an assessment of how the policy is being implemented across the institution in an effort to ensure consistent and equitable application. Building a regular review process into the evaluation framework also helps to engender faith in the system and allay fears about transparency. At least one policy reviewed for this study included a statement about such a process. Northern British Columbia’s collective agreement includes a clause that states the teaching evaluation process will be reviewed by a joint committee with membership from the faculty association and the university (see Article 21.1.7.5, p. 65).

All members of the university community – administrators, faculty and students – should be involved on some level in the evaluation process and, when possible, in the development of the evaluation system itself (Cashin, 1996). More specifically, as Paulsen (2002) suggests “faculty should be actively involved in articulating and negotiating department specific faculty responsibilities and criteria and the methods standards used to evaluate teaching” (p. 7). Not only will this ensure transparency in the processes, it will serve to open communication and help to foster ongoing commitment to, and ideally acceptance of, established policies and practices.
Seldin (1999a) has argued that there are a number of factors that hinder the success of evaluation frameworks. These include: a lack of defined purpose; the absence of administrative support; a lack of faculty involvement; faculty resistance; poor communication; a lack of sufficient training of evaluators; an absence of mechanisms to evaluate the program; the improper use of data; improper administration of the overall system; poor explanation of expectations; reliance on too few sources of evidence; and an inefficient use of on-campus expertise. Seldin notes that the failure of these programs often results from flaws in the system: it may be too detailed or too vague; it may be administered improperly or inconsistently, or it may incorporate unclear standards or instructions. As a result, this may cause confusion among those engaged with the review process or worse, distrust of the system of evaluation. This may result in faculty resistance or administrator apathy, which Arreola (2000) cites as two of the main threats to a successful evaluation framework.

Crucial for the successful development, implementation and administration of a tenure policy and related teaching evaluation framework is strong leadership at all levels (Cashin, 1996; Diamond, 1999; Gibbs & Habeshaw, 2003; HEA, 2009a, b; Ramsden & Martin, 1996; Seldin, 2006; Wright, 1998). Senior academic administrators can help to shape policies and ensure that teaching is appropriately addressed and evaluated. Moreover, those involved in the review process, can help to maintain and ensure consistency and rigour in the evaluation of teaching and during the decision-making process.

The ability to initiate support, resources and programs and processes, as discussed above, requires effective leadership. Beyond involvement with policies, academic administrators can also implement programs such as awards, educational development or
teaching innovation grants, mentorship programs, or faculty development initiatives. Signals sent from the top levels of an institution can invariably impact faculty perceptions and campus cultures. As such, strong leadership and support for institutional policies and teaching support more broadly is key.

Further Considerations: Ensuring Teaching Matters
While my study has focused on a particular set of recommendations from the literature that relate directly to the evaluation of teaching during the tenure review process, it also began with the question: does teaching matter? It is quite clear, that universities expect faculty to engage in teaching and these responsibilities are laid out in various institutional policies and collective agreements. It is also evident from a range of studies (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Gray, Diamond & Adam, 1996; Wright & Associates, 1998) that faculty spend a significant amount of time on teaching (including course development and design, assessing student work, mentoring students, and so on). However, several Canadian (see Britnell et al., 2010 and Wright & Associates, 1995) and international studies (Gibbs & Habeshaw, 2003; Ramsden & Martin, 1996) reveal that faculty, and sometimes academic administrators, believe that the recognition of teaching contributions should be enhanced. Improving tenure policies and related processes is one effective means of achieving this and of demonstrating that teaching does matter.

Beyond the tenure context, the vast and growing body of literature on teaching in higher education also considers the means by which teaching is evaluated throughout an academic’s career and the way in which universities can more effectively value and reward
teaching at both the level of the individual faculty member and at the institution more broadly. The tenure review is a significant process in the academic life cycle but it is not, and should not be the only point at which teaching is reviewed, nor is it the only time at which teaching is supported or rewarded. As such, much of the literature on teaching in higher education calls for an integrated and comprehensive approach to both the evaluation of teaching and its support that takes into consideration the full span of an academic’s career. Initiatives, resources, practices and policies together can enhance and improve the teaching culture on university campuses, particularly when they are aligned. Specifically, this includes hiring and appointment procedures, the creation of new appointment streams, the development of enhanced training programs and post-tenure review strategies. In addition, this literature also takes into account the impact of additional reward structures and initiatives within the institution and more broadly at the provincial and national levels. I would like to explore these issues in brief.

*Hiring and appointment procedures*

Although faculty are expected to demonstrate a certain level of performance for the tenure review, there is often a disconnect between these expectations and those held at the hiring and appointment stage. Many have observed that teaching is often overlooked, or under-emphasized, during hiring processes (Gibbs, 1995, 2005; Seldin, 1999a, 2006). Gibbs and Habeshaw (2003) recommend that institutions improve hiring practices by stating that teaching will be a significant component of the position in job postings, by requesting teaching materials or evidence of teaching activity from candidates, and by requiring a teaching talk during the interview process. They point to a practice at Princeton, whereby job candidates are asked to
deliver a pedagogical talk that addresses their approach to teaching and how they would develop and deliver courses within the program to which they are applying.

Gibbs and Habeshaw (2003) argue that such practices not only serve to enhance the culture of teaching but also assist the future faculty member in their acclimatization to the institution. More specifically, a thorough consideration of a candidate’s teaching helps to prepare them for the eventual tenure review and allows hiring committees to assess whether or not the candidate can reasonably be expected to meet institutional tenure criteria in the time allotted. Additionally, hiring and appointment policies, which also articulate and codify expectations about teaching, should also align with future teaching expectations for the benefit of new faculty and administrators engaged in the hiring process. In the absence of this, new faculty may begin their academic careers with the perception that research is preeminent and an incomplete understanding of institutional expectations regarding teaching.

A review of current hiring practices at Canadian universities was beyond the scope of this study but would be an ideal topic for future research. More specifically, an examination of hiring and appointment procedures in relation to tenure policies could provide a rich understanding of how these universities assess teaching at various points in the academic life cycle and how they support and recognize this work during these stages.

One approach seen by some as a means to ensure a strong focus on teaching and learning is the adoption of teaching stream appointments. There is an ongoing debate in the literature and on university campuses about this type of appointment and whether or not it enhances institutional teaching cultures or reinforces the divide between teaching and research. Faculty who hold teaching stream appointments are primarily responsible for
teaching, and are typically not required to conduct research, although they are expected to keep abreast of the relevant research in their discipline. In some cases, if they are engaged in research, it is often related to the study of pedagogy, or the scholarship of teaching and learning. Supporters have argued that these positions can help to ensure teaching, and student learning, receives the attention it deserves. Others have argued that such appointments can be viewed as “lesser” or “second-tier”, with those faculty engaged in research holding the top spot.

In Canada, approximately 25% of universities now have teaching stream appointments in place. These include: Bishop’s, Carleton, Dalhousie, Laurentian, McMaster, New Brunswick, Nipissing, Regina, Saskatchewan, Simon Fraser, Thompson Rivers, Toronto, Saskatchewan, UBC and Victoria. Canada is not unique in this regard; other jurisdictions have adopted similar types of appointment, including the United Kingdom and Australia. In the Canadian context, teaching stream faculty, referred variously to as lecturers, teaching professors, or instructors, fulfill the responsibilities noted above, primarily teaching and/or research on or service to teaching and learning. In most cases, faculty in these roles follow a career path that allows for promotion, advancing from, for example from lecturer to senior lecturer. Teaching stream faculty undergo a review process that mirrors that for tenure-stream appointments; however, the criteria are modified, and typically the emphasis is on teaching contributions and educational leadership (which may include pedagogically-focused research). The end result is a permanent appointment that is similar, but not identical to a tenured appointment (as at the Toronto, Nipissing, and Saskatchewan for example).
At present, there is limited research about the impact such appointments have had in the Canadian context, probably due in part to the fact that these are a relatively new appointment type, emerging over the past two decades. A current study is underway in Ontario, funded by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) that will look at teaching stream appointments and will examine the rise of this role, its potential for growth and the benefits and/or implications for implementation. Those who have recommended the creation of such appointments believe that they can help to elevate the status and recognition of teaching: perhaps the forthcoming HEQCO study will shed some light on whether or not this is true.

Probationary periods, pre-tenure support and reviews

As noted in Chapter 5, tenure-stream faculty at the universities reviewed for this study move through a probationary period that may last anywhere from three to seven years. At all of the 46 institutions reviewed, faculty contributions in teaching during this period are considered as part of the tenure review. As such, faculty should receive ongoing support throughout this period which would include information about performance standards and expectations and advice on how they can effectively meet the requirements for tenure.

Given that the majority of faculty begin their academic appointments with limited experience in teaching some have recommended that new faculty participate in formal training programs during the pre-tenure period (Hunt, Wright & Gordon, 2008; Ramsden & Martin, 1996; Smith, 1997). Such initiatives would provide exposure to pedagogical theory and

---

87 A call for proposals for this study was issued by HEQCO in 2010 and was distributed to universities across Canada.
approaches including course and assessment design, grading practices, means for providing
effective feedback, the use of academic technologies, and so on. The Professional Standards
Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education program in the United
Kingdom is one example of such an initiative (see also Beaty, 2001 for a discussion of
accreditation programs in the United Kingdom). This coordinated, national effort was
established on the basis of recommendations in the 2003 White Paper on the Future of Higher
Education in coordination with the Higher Education Academy (HEA). The program is based on
six areas of activity, six areas of core knowledge and five professional values (see Table 7.1
below). For each of these areas of teaching, the framework is organized to capture the
following levels of experience: 1) graduate teaching assistants, new faculty and those with a
limited amount of teaching/learning responsibilities; 2) faculty with a more substantive role in
teaching and learning activities; and 3) experienced faculty. Those who participate in the
program are recognized with a particular status (associate, fellow or senior fellow) through the
HEA accreditation scheme (Hunt, Wright & Gordon, 2008).

Hunt, Wright and Gordon (2008) have lauded the scope, goals and success of this United
Kingdom initiative and have recommended a similar approach be undertaken in the Canadian
higher education context. While such programs are viewed as a means to promote the
professionalization of teaching and to formalize its value (Beaty, 2001; Ramsden & Martin,
1996; Smith, 1997), they have not been adopted nationally in Canada. Rather, some universities
have implemented institution-based initiatives that are less time-intensive than the model
adopted in the United Kingdom. For example, the University of British Columbia’s Centre for
Teaching, Learning and Technology offers a range of programs for faculty including a four-day
institute (see: http://institute.ctlt.ubc.ca/). Other universities run similar programming which faculty can enroll in voluntarily (see for example the University of Windsor’s University Teaching Certificate Program, http://www.uwindsor.ca/ctl/utc).

Table 7.1 – United Kingdom Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Activity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Designing and planning learning activities and/or programmes of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching and/or supporting student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment and giving feedback to learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing effective environments and student support and guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and supporting learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Knowledge: Knowledge and understanding of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The subject material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriate methods for teaching and learning in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How students learn, both generally and in the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The use of appropriate learning technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Methods of evaluating the effectiveness of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The implications of quality assurance and enhancement for professional practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Values:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Respect for individual learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment to incorporating the process and outcomes of relevant research, scholarship and/or professional practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment to the development of learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment to encouraging participation in higher education, acknowledging diversity and promoting equality of opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commitment to continuing professional development and evaluation of practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Higher Education Academy; see. www.heacademy.ac.uk)

Post-tenure review
Many in higher education have called for the implementation of post-tenure review processes (Aper & Fry, 2003; Licata, 1987; Licata & Morreale, 1997). Much of this literature has emphasized the ability of post-tenure review systems to encourage and nurture faculty growth
(Licata & Morreale, 1997). Morreale (1999) sees post-tenure review as an integral part of ongoing faculty development initiatives.\(^{88}\) In this sense, it serves less of a summative role and functions primarily as a means to provide regular formative feedback. Establishing a post-tenure review process for this purpose can help to further foster a culture that values teaching and can help to avoid any perception that the evaluation of teaching is merely a hoop for faculty to jump through to obtain tenure.

A number of surveys conducted during the last two decades reveals that there is a growing trend toward the use of post-tenure review in American higher education,

A 1996 survey of 1,200 four-year colleges and universities showed that 23 percent had post-tenure review policies in place, while another 6 percent were devising them. By 1998, thirty states required post-tenure review at their public colleges and universities. As of 2002, thirty-seven states had implemented post-tenure review. And, while post-tenure review is predominantly a phenomenon of public colleges and universities, a good number of private institutions have implemented it as well (Neal, 2008).

A 2000 survey of 192 American institutions found that 88 (46%) of them had adopted post-tenure review processes (Sternman Rule, 2000). Sternman Rule found that these reviews were cyclical and in some cases might be triggered by performance issues but could also be used for a range of formative or summative purposes. In some cases institutions used post-tenure review to impose sanctions, others to reward exceptional performance. Aper and Fry (2003) have also looked closely at the post-tenure review policies at research institutions in the United States and found variation in implementation and practice.

The adoption of formal post-tenure reviews, as described in the literature, does not appear to be wide-spread in Canada. Here, faculty are typically reviewed annually by their

\(^{88}\) Similarly, AAUP believes that post-tenure reviews should be implemented for faculty development purposes and not as accountability measures. See their statement Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response (1999).
departments or divisions through the use of activity reports and many of the institutional policies reviewed for this study refer to ongoing review processes (which may be annual, as at Saskatchewan and Brandon, or every three years, as at Regina). Such reviews may be linked to merit increases and this may not include a formative assessment component but in some cases ongoing enhancement is the expressed goal. As with the procedures in place during the hiring, appointment and pre-tenure periods, a more thorough review of ongoing evaluation practices at Canadian universities would be beneficial. Understanding how teaching is assessed in the post-tenure years would enable a more complete picture of the entire faculty evaluation system in place at universities across Canada.

**Internal and external reward structures**
Aside from tenure, promotion, merit and pay, which are almost universally seen as the most effective means to reward teaching, there are other mechanisms that can be implemented that work to enhance the recognition of teaching in higher education. To encourage and foster an institutional culture that recognizes excellence in teaching, institutions may wish to develop and implement teaching awards concurrently with the development of tenure and promotion policies. Seldin (1980, 1984), Cashin (1996), and Svinicki and Menges (1996) have argued that rewards function as an important aspect of any evaluation system. While some have questioned the value of teaching awards, arguing that they may do little to effectively recognize and encourage great teaching (D’Andrea, 2007), they are widely accepted as valid indicators of a commitment to teaching (Menges, 1996). They are also seen as a means to invigorate mid-
career faculty and encourage ongoing creativity and innovation in their teaching (Oosthuizen, McKay & Sharpe, 2005).

Teaching award winners can fulfill many roles on campus and in the wider community. Their experience and expertise enables them to serve as ambassadors or models of excellent teaching, as mentors for new and continuing faculty, as advisors in the development or revision of teaching-related policies, as facilitators of pedagogically-focused workshops, as members of tenure and promotion committees, as peer reviewers of teaching or as heads of institutional teaching and learning centres. To current and future students they can also demonstrate the quality of teaching at an institution and to the broader community they can represent the institution by delivering public lectures and participating in scholarly conferences on teaching.

Almost all of the universities reviewed for this study offer teaching awards, frequently at both the departmental or divisional and institutional levels. Such awards vary in criteria, scope and remuneration. For example, the University of Saskatchewan has a number of institution-level awards that honour a range of teaching contexts, including: awards for excellence in international teaching, in aboriginal education, innovation in learning, a new teacher award, and a sessional lecturer award. In addition, they offer a Master Teacher Award, stating that,

\[\text{The University of Saskatchewan recognizes teaching as one of its primary functions, and it expects its faculty members to strive for excellence in teaching and learning. Faculty invest in their teaching so our students can receive a rich and satisfying educational experience in an academically vibrant learning environment. The University wishes to encourage investment in outstanding teaching and the Master Teacher Award provides one tangible acknowledgement of exceptional pedagogy at the U of S.}^{89}\]

\[\text{89 Retrieved from the Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness web site at:} \]
\[\text{http://www.usask.ca/gmcte/drupal/?q=node/6}\]
The award is given to two faculty members each year during convocation ceremonies. Recipients receive a ring or pin and an award of $1,000, and their names are displayed on a plaque on campus. The University of Alberta’s General Faculty Council has a policy on Awards for Teaching Excellence which outlines the goals for such initiatives and provides details about five different awards. At the University of Toronto, the President’s Teaching Award, the institution’s highest award for teaching, is given to a maximum of five individuals each year in recognition of sustained excellence in teaching and educational leadership. Recipients of this honour receive an annual stipend of $10,000/year for five years (an amount equivalent to that awarded University Professors in recognition of their research contributions\(^{90}\)) and become members of the Teaching Academy, which serves in an advisory capacity to the President and Vice-President and Provost on matters relating to teaching. Members also engage in and advocate for teaching and learning initiatives, mentor colleagues, and participate in programming that strengthens the institutional culture of teaching.

In addition to awards, teaching-related grants or other financial incentives are also considered a useful means to recognize and reward teaching and to enhance the institutional culture. A number of institutions reviewed for this study have programs in place to support faculty in this way. These include grants to support the scholarship of teaching and learning, teaching development, research on teaching, or the development of innovative programs or pedagogical tools. At York, two of these programs are supported by the faculty association: the

---

\(^{90}\) At Toronto, “the University recognizes unusual scholarly achievement and pre-eminence in a particular field of knowledge through the designation of University Professor. The number of such appointments does not generally exceed two per cent of the tenured faculty. Its very exclusivity stands to underline the highly prestigious nature of the University Professor designation.” Retrieved from the Office of the Vice-President and Provost’s web site at: http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/Awards/uprofessors.htm.
Teaching-Learning Development Grant and the Release-Time Teaching Fellowship which provides funding for faculty to reduce the amount of teaching they do to spend time on teaching enhancement programs (see the Centre for Support of Teaching web site at: http://www.yorku.ca/cst/profgrowth/grants.html). While grants for teaching innovation are often welcome, they are frequently insufficient to develop, implement and sustain initiatives for wide-scale impact. As such, any program that adopts this approach would need to take this into consideration.

An initiative at Queen’s University reveals an interesting approach that may help to enable more sustained impact. In 2004, Queen’s implemented Chairs in Teaching and Learning. As noted on their web site,

the Queen’s University Chairs in Teaching and Learning recognize teachers who have a record as excellent teachers and as scholars of teaching and learning, who have demonstrated educational leadership at Queen’s and elsewhere, and who have a program of activities that would allow them to make their expertise widely available to the university community.

Chairs receive a 3 year non-renewable appointment and $20,000 annual discretionary funds to be spent in support of their program. One chair is selected annually. The Chairs work collaboratively with the Centre for Teaching and Learning and during their term give a Public Lecture.91

To my knowledge, this initiative is unique to Queen’s. While there are no published studies on the impact of this program, such research would be beneficial, particularly if it could be demonstrated that these chairs have a significant impact on teaching at this university. If this were true, it may serve as a motivation for other institutions to adopt similar models.

Universities are not the only institutions that can establish mechanisms to recognize teaching in higher education. This can occur at the provincial and or national levels through

91 See the Queen’s University web site at: http://www.queensu.ca/ctl/chairs/
government-sanctioned initiatives. In Canada, Knapper (cited in Wilcox, 1997) has called attention to the lack of national funding for teaching innovation or pedagogical development in comparison to the grants and infrastructures that exist for research. He cites Britain, Australia and Hong Kong as examples of jurisdictions that surpass Canada in their support of teaching at a national level. In the United Kingdom for example, significant and substantial national efforts to improve teaching and enhance its recognition have been undertaken. Here, over 300 million pounds has been earmarked for such initiatives as the Higher Education Academy, Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Centres for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELTs) and the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (see Court, 2008; Ramsden, Gosling & Hannan, 2007; Skelton, 2007b, c). The teaching fellowships, implemented after the Dearing Report (NCIHE, 1997), award 50,000 pounds to 20 individuals each year in recognition of their contributions and to fund further development (Skelton, 2007c). The Australian Awards for University Teaching provide a cash amount of between $40,000 and $100,000 and are given to 16 faculty from four different categories (individual, themed, institutional, overall). Comparatively, up to four faculty receive the Professor of the Year Award in the United States and the $5,000 that comes with it (Skelton, 2007c). Interestingly, Gibbs and Habeshaw (2002) witnessed a stronger impact on teaching development when a higher number of smaller awards were given out versus a smaller number of larger awards. It is important to note, however, in spite of the large sums of money and resources dedicated to these initiatives, they have not escaped criticism.  

92  D’Andrea (2007), Fanghanel (2007), Zukas & Malcolm (2007) have questioned the ability of these teaching excellence initiatives to raise the quality of teaching and learning.
In Canada, fewer provincial or national opportunities are available to individual faculty members or to institutions, particularly in comparison to other systems of higher education. Rather, additional reward structures are typically located within an institution, as Kreber (2007) has shown, and these most often take the form of teaching awards or grants. Although attempts have been made at the provincial and national levels to develop similar initiatives, this has yet to materialize in any substantive form. Instead, most provincial and federal initiatives for Canadian faculty have focused on the support of research, through granting programs, or opportunities like the Canada Research Chairs (CRC). However, Kreber (2007) and Christensen-Hughes (2006) have both recommended, and Christensen-Hughes along with the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) have lobbied the government for the creation of a CRC for the scholarship of teaching and learning. Such a program would not only help to raise the visibility of the scholarship in this area but also legitimize it and bring attention to the significant role that teaching plays in universities.

In Canada, national or provincial teaching reward structures have typically taken the shape of teaching awards. The 3M National Teaching Fellowship is an example of this. Administered by the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, the 3M award recognizes up to ten faculty each year from across Canada who demonstrate excellence in teaching and educational leadership but does not come with any financial prize. STLHE also administers several other awards including the Alan Blizzard Award in honour of collaborative teaching partnerships and the Christopher Knapper Lifetime Achievement Award for sustained

---

93 Christensen-Hughes and the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education have lobbied for the creation of a CRC chair in teaching. Christensen-Hughes, discusses this in an undated article for STLHE, available on-line at: http://www.stlhe.ca/resources/member-publications/
contributions to faculty development. Other initiatives include the National Technology Innovation Awards, which recognize the achievements of faculty in the use of educational technology. This honour (on hiatus since 2009) is offered through the Learning Partnership, a charitable organization that is dedicated to promoting public education. Additionally, there are dozens of other awards administered through discipline or profession-based organizations (e.g. for engineering, medical professions).

The value of external awards should not be overlooked. Internal recognition is often enhanced when awards are bestowed by organizations external to the university. These awards indicate that an institution’s teaching is being reviewed and recognized by external peers, something that typically only happens for research. The receipt of such an award, signals to other universities that exemplary teaching is occurring at these campuses and could further reveal the presence of a strong teaching culture.

Awards recognizing teaching excellence help to raise awareness of effective practice; however, they alone may not lead to significant change in teaching culture although this is not to say that they could not. In a review of international strategies to promote teaching excellence, D’Andrea (2007) argues that teaching awards, honours or grants can help to raise the status of teaching but are insufficient to bring about change in approaches to teaching since they do not necessarily impact the practices or attitudes of others, especially if there is no requirement for award winners to share their strategies or the results of their studies with a broader audience. This failing occurred in a program launched in 2007 by the Ontario provincial government, the Leadership in Faculty Teaching (LIFT) award. This initiative called for
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94 See their web site at: http://www.thelearningpartnership.ca/page.aspx?pid=191
nominations from all of the province’s colleges and universities and the program bestowed awards on 100 faculty (selected from thousands of submissions) which included a cash prize of $20,000 divided over two years. The financial reward came with no strings attached and no requirement for further commitment from the recipients. In the end, this initiative was a missed opportunity – for the province, for higher education and more specifically for teaching and teachers in higher education. The province might have asked this significant group of excellent teachers to engage in some sort of activity that could have had widespread impact. These faculty might have served as consultants to the educational development community or to government agencies or as contributors to resources or publications on teaching in higher education.

The Ontario LIFT award was a rare occurrence in the Canadian context (and one that was not repeated by the provincial government). Awards for teaching in Canada rarely come with such a hefty financial prize (Kreber, 2007). This is also true in the case of grants for teaching initiatives. While the major granting agencies in Canada may provide funding for research projects that address or may impact teaching on some level, there are no significant grants to engage in research to improve or enhance one’s own pedagogical strategies.

*Teaching communities and academies*
Establishing communities of teaching scholars or academies has also been discussed in the literature. As Shulman (1993) has suggested, “if we wish to see greater recognition and reward attached to teaching we must change the status of teaching from private to community
property” (p. 6). One means to establish communities is through teaching academies. Chism, Fraser and Arnold (1996) describe the “teaching academy” as loosely defined as a group of faculty who are considered excellent or highly interested in teaching and who have been tapped by their institutions to engage in advocacy, service, or advising on teaching matters. The central idea of the academy is that effective teachers, working through an honorary and service-oriented collective, can have a significant impact on an institution’s pursuit of teaching excellence (p. 25).

They argue that while there may be initial cynicism regarding the ability of such initiatives to effect change, this tends to subside over time as academies engage with the broader university community and help to initiate change. In doing so, this group is viewed in a more positive light and is seen as a means of focusing attention on teaching and teaching quality. In their review of models from a range of institutions, Chism and colleagues found that the “teaching academy can and does become a force for good teaching that has potential to influence all levels of university activity” (p. 31). In a study of programs at U.S research universities, Sorincelli and Gross Davis (1996) found that teaching academies can also be an effective means of increasing the attention on teaching and impacting the way in which it is valued. They also concluded that academy members helped to highlight exemplary teaching and pedagogical innovations and provided a mechanism for supporting further advancements in teaching.

**Summary**

These additional considerations regarding the evaluation and recognition of teaching, beyond the tenure review process, reveal that there is much that universities can do to enhance teaching cultures within and across their campuses. It is not enough to say that teaching matters in mandates or mission statements or to simply engage in the activity of teaching itself.
Rather, a wealth of evidence, gathered from empirical studies, interviews, surveys, and recommendations based on reflective practice over several decades, indicates that institutions need to adopt substantive and integrated policies, processes, resources and initiatives to truly effect change.

As evident from the literature discussed in Chapter 2, policies are an essential component of any evaluation framework. These documents establish and codify institutional reward structures and in doing so establish standards, outline processes, and signal what an institution values. It is these documents that form the basis for significant decisions regarding the academic functions of the institution, and this, therefore necessitates that they be clear, transparent and comprehensive, that they be effectively communicated to the community and that they be consistently applied. This helps to ensure a successful evaluation framework but also minimizes distrust in the system and alleviates concerns about its rigour and its goals.

On the whole, Canadian institutions have designed and implemented reasonably comprehensive teaching evaluation frameworks embedded in or aligned with institutional tenure policies. This review demonstrates that, as a result, institutions have avoided some of the issues raised in other higher education environments, such as the omission of teaching from personnel policies (as found in the HEA study, 2009a and 2009b). Practices at Canadian institutions also reflect some of the other recommendations, reviewed above, that call for initiatives, resources, and supports that complement tenure policies and teaching evaluation frameworks and further enhance teaching cultures. This is particularly true in relation to the presence of teaching awards and faculty development centres. Thus, my review has revealed
that Canadian institutions have made efforts to shape teaching cultures and provide supportive environments for instructors.

This review also makes clear that formal policies or initiatives to recognize and reward teaching are not necessarily the root or sole cause for ongoing perceptions that teaching is undervalued in Canadian higher education. Moreover, there is nothing explicit in institutional documents or priorities that relegate teaching to an inferior position behind research. My findings align with Shulman’s (1993) statement from two decades ago, in which he notes that “it is not that universities diminish the importance of teaching because they devalue the act itself; it is not that research is seen as having more intrinsic value than teaching” (p. 6). Rather, my findings suggest that the problems are more likely to lie in the interpretation and application of institutional policies and in the lack of, or insufficient efforts to improve teaching cultures more broadly.

Based on the evidence presented here, I conclude that, in part, perceptions that teaching is devalued in universities persist due to several factors relating to implementation and administration. It is apparent from a number of studies that faculty feel teaching is not effectively evaluated during the tenure review. They have questioned the rigour and scope of the assessment methods and, as a result, have raised concerns that evaluations and subsequent decisions are arbitrary. Faculty have also voiced concerns that teaching is considered less important than research contributions in general, and particularly in tenure decisions. This review has demonstrated that the policies themselves do not entirely bear this out. It is possible that a significant gap, or failing, may be found in the communication strategies and networks institutions use to share essential policy information with faculty. It is more likely
that the manner in which policies are interpreted and applied has contributed to such ongoing perceptions.

Thus, the failure is in the process and not necessarily the tenure policy alone. Arguably, this may be something that faculty developers can, and in some cases do, have a more direct role in. These professionals frequently possess a deep understanding of pedagogical approaches, the means by which teaching is, and can be, evaluated, and the extensive literature that outlines these practices. As such, they could be effectively integrated within institutions into the review process, to help build the capacity of reviewers (administrators, committee members) and to offer guidance to junior faculty.

I would also argue that while tenure policies may reflect some of the recommendations from the literature in relation to the content and scope of evaluation frameworks, institutions also need to consider how they align with other practices and policies, including those for hiring and appointment, promotion and annual review. The attention to teaching and its evaluation should be ongoing and sustained in all evaluation frameworks within a university. While tenure may be the point at which faculty attain permanency of appointment, their teaching careers do not stop (or start) with the granting of tenure. Rather, if universities wish to successfully and faithfully fulfill their mission to transmit knowledge and educate future generations, attention must be paid to teaching throughout an academic career.

These suggestions encompass more than policies and their implementation and ongoing administration. They also take into account the culture, norms and attitudes within an institution. If institutions continue to focus only on a candidate’s research productivity and promise at the hiring stages, because that is the “norm” in a particular discipline, this sends a
message that teaching is less important; that it does not matter. New faculty will inevitably focus on their research and buy into the belief that only their contributions in this area will garner them tenure – and they may believe that if their scholarly work is exceptional, this may make up for deficiencies in teaching. This may occur even though institutional and divisional policies, drafted and sanctioned by their peers, explicitly state that a tenure track faculty member has a responsibility to research, engage in service and teach. Some may believe that there is time to focus on their teaching after they have been granted tenure, once they are “safe”, and have cleared the tenure hurdle. But what message does this send to our students who are being taught by junior faculty in courses across the curriculum? How can we expect them and the broader public to have faith in a higher education system that puts them in classes taught by faculty who are frequently more focused on their research outcomes? And who have little or no training or experience in teaching, in course design, in assessment techniques and in providing feedback to facilitate learning?

This emphasis on research can also negatively impact faculty who have devoted a great deal of time and attention to their teaching in their pre-tenure years. These individuals wish to have their significant contributions recognized – and rightly so, but a system that is designed or administered in such a way as to discount or de-emphasize teaching is unfair to these members of the academic community and to the students who benefit from these efforts. I have heard all too often in my professional work that faculty have been advised to “tone down” their teaching contributions for fear that this might be read as a sign that their research is weak. This is troubling to say the least and can be extremely demoralizing for junior faculty.
All of this is not to suggest that institutions need to put in place additional evaluation measures but rather, that they require evaluation measures that are more carefully and more thoughtfully aligned with the realities and diversity of faculty work. This is also not about accountability or increased bureaucratization, but about developing an understanding of teaching that is holistic, that sees teaching integrated with scholarship. Thus, overall, this is about ensuring more meaningful evaluation.

So, what does all of this mean for the place of teaching in higher education? Unlike Smith who (quoted in Lanau, 2010) suggested that nothing much has changed in relation to teaching over the past twenty years, I conclude that there have been significant changes. For one, the scholarship on teaching and teaching evaluation has greatly expanded in the last two decades resulting in an extensive body of literature to inform and guide institutional practice and approaches. This study has revealed that on many levels universities have put in place comprehensive evaluation systems to ensure that teaching is rewarded and that it is effectively evaluated during the tenure review. These systems themselves reflect many of the recommendations from the literature; however, I would argue that there is still work to be done. This work requires a commitment at all levels, from the institution, divisions, departments and individual faculty members.

While the policies may incorporate aspects of the recommendations from the literature, including the need for evidence from the tenure candidate and from students, and the use of teaching dossiers and course evaluations, many policies do not go far enough and in many cases they fall short of incorporating the full scope of the various recommendations. As such, the success of the system may be jeopardized. Such gaps were particularly evident in relation to
the recommendations regarding multiple means of evidence and those which called on institutions to clearly define the standards of performance (and the terminology used within these standards) and “teaching effectiveness”. For me, these are some of the most critical aspects of the evaluation framework. Without a clear understanding of teaching effectiveness, it is unclear to me how committees can effectively and rigorously evaluate teaching. Without multiple sources of evidence, I do not believe the full picture of an individual’s teaching contributions is available to them. Institutions would not assess someone’s research on the title of a journal article alone, so, why would they assess someone’s teaching on the basis of a list of teaching responsibilities, or a course outline?

Acknowledging that the increased attention placed on evidence and outcomes in relation to teaching may seem threatening to some individual faculty members, Knapper (2001) has argued that,

if university teaching is to be a professional activity, then the honest appraisal of ourselves and our peers is surely an inherent part of our role and obligations as a teacher (p. 8).

For me, this notion of approaching teaching as a professional practice is key. On some levels this is already occurring at the graduate level where programs to train graduate students and teaching assistants are in place at institutions across Canada and the United States. Such initiatives, in many cases, go simply beyond providing basic skills training in teaching but have transformed into larger professional skills training programs that provide opportunities for graduate students to learn and practice the skills necessary for all facets of academic work (e.g. communication skills, time management, teaching, grant writing, and so on). In terms of teaching, these programs offer opportunities to practice teaching, to develop courses and
related instructional materials, to learn about educational theory, and to start to document their teaching in dossiers. As such, these individuals are beginning their academic positions better-grounded in pedagogical training than the generations that preceded them. Moreover, these programs build an enhanced set of overall skills that set them apart as they seek out academic appointments.

Universities can capitalize on this shift as it emerges at the graduate level and can reinforce the value of teaching during the hiring and appointment stages and the probationary period, as discussed above. As this new generation of faculty move through their careers, this attention to teaching should continue, enabling an overall shift in the way that teaching is valued. Of course, I recognize that this may seem like an idealistic approach, a Utopian model for teaching in higher education, but if institutions choose to ignore the skills that many graduate students have acquired during their doctoral studies and to focus only on their research in hiring procedures, this continues to reinforce the status quo. The changes that are occurring at the graduate level provide a unique opportunity for universities, and I would argue, one that they should not miss.

While this study has revealed some interesting trends in current tenure policies at Canadian universities and identified some serious gaps in relation to the evaluation of teaching, there are a number of opportunities for additional research that will extend this work. For example, to more accurately determine whether perceptions about the undervaluing of teaching are a result of the implementation and/or administration of policy or of the interpretation of policy would require interviews and/or surveys with faculty members, administrators and members of tenure committees. While these approaches were beyond the
scope of this study, a fair amount of data of this type has been collected over the years for a number of jurisdictions, some of which has been highlighted here. With a more complete understanding of current Canadian policies and evaluation frameworks, a further study could ask more specific questions about their implementation and administration. For example, knowing now that teaching dossiers are an increasingly common form of evidence in tenure reviews, surveys of Canadian faculty and administrators could be conducted to determine how this document has altered their ability to effectively document and assess teaching contributions. Or, given that several institutions across the country have integrated Boyer’s (1990) understanding of scholarship into their policies, we might ask how this has impacted the evaluation of teaching at the point of tenure. Has it enabled more holistic assessments as Colbeck (2002), Pratt (1997) and others have called for? Having identified the key documents that address the tenure process and the evaluation of teaching, studies can investigate the level of awareness among faculty and administrators regarding these specific materials and inquire how these were communicated and shared with members of the academic community. This could enable the identification of any gaps in the administrative structures and allow for recommendations for improved practice.

Perhaps one of the most effective ways to test perceptions about institutional policies would be to examine how they are put into practice. Some studies (see HEA, 2009a and 2009b) have attempted to gather data on the application of academic personnel policies, with limited success. The HEA studies specifically asked institutions to report on the number of faculty who had been promoted on the basis of teaching; however, a small number of universities were willing to share this information. Accessing such data for the Canadian university context would
be illuminating given that all of the institutional policies reviewed for this study state that faculty can be granted tenure on excellent or superior teaching. One might argue that sharing such data, at the institutional level, not necessarily for individual instructors, could signal a university’s commitment to recognizing and promoting quality teaching and that institutional messaging about valuing teaching is more than mere rhetoric.

Additionally, future studies could build on this review of Canadian policies through interviews or surveys with faculty and academic administrators who are involved in the tenure review process. A window on the inner workings of tenure committees could enhance our understanding of the way in which policy is enacted and would allow Ball’s (1993) notion that, as discourse, policies enable multiple interpretations to be tested. Subsequent studies might then ask a range of questions of tenure committee members to unpack their reading and use of policy. How carefully do committees review institutional tenure criteria and expectations regarding standards of performance? How carefully do they ensure that they have all of the required pieces of evidence, from all of the relevant stakeholders, when assessing a tenure candidate’s file? How helpful are the various components related to teaching in the decision-making process? Are they provided with additional training or support in how to interpret and assess various pieces of evidence, such as course evaluations, to ensure a thorough and rigorous the review of the files?

As noted above, further research on the procedures and mechanisms in place for assessing teaching at the hiring and appointment stages and during the pre- and post-tenure years would be useful. Combined with the data collected and analyzed for this study in relation to the tenure review, it would provide a more thorough understanding of institutional
evaluation frameworks across Canada. Such additional research might also reveal other gaps in these evaluation systems or further highlight existing mechanisms for recognizing and valuing teaching.

Another study might compare the ways in which tenure-stream faculty are assessed in relation to the methods of evaluation for teaching-stream faculty. Policies and related documents could be collected from those Canadian institutions that have in place teaching-stream roles and an analysis of the content of these documents could be conducted. It would be interesting to have a more thorough understanding of the different expectations in terms of standards of performance for these two categories of appointment. Are teaching-stream faculty expected to perform at higher levels? Do the mechanisms for evaluation and types of evidence in use for teaching-stream appointments mirror those used in the evaluation of tenure-track faculty? If so, are these practices more reflective of the current literature?

This study highlighted the role that unionization and collective bargaining exercises played in shaping tenure policies following the emergence of faculty unions on Canadian campuses in the 1970s. Further investigation could be undertaken to look more closely at how bargaining processes have addressed the evaluation of teaching. A comparative analysis of current and past collective agreements, for example, might reveal additional details about the extent to which unions have influenced this aspect of the tenure policy over time.

One additional area of research might address the issue of institutional culture in relation to teaching. Specifically, it would be useful to gain an understanding of how policies can, or do, impact the ways in which teaching is valued, or whether a positive teaching culture led to a strong, comprehensive policy. A study such as this might investigate more fully whether
institutions have adopted any of the additional recommendations discussed above (e.g. in relation to hiring practices, formative assessment, reward structures, and so on) and how these align with or relate to tenure policies.

This research study provides a new and valuable understanding of the approach to teaching evaluation during the tenure review process across 46 Canadian universities. It has illuminated commonalities in practice and distinct and innovative approaches to understandings of teaching, teaching effectiveness and evaluation frameworks overall. In addition, it has revealed the extent to which Canadian universities have integrated or adapted recommendations from the diverse and vast body of literature on teaching and teaching evaluation. This study also provides a foundation for further studies that may build on this literature and investigate matters pertaining to the administration and implementation of institutional tenure policies and the ways in which universities cultivate and maintain teaching cultures on their campuses.
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APPENDICES
CAUT suggests the following items for inclusion in a teaching dossier:

**Teaching responsibilities and practices**
1. List of course titles and numbers, unit values or credits, enrolments with brief elaboration.
2. List of course materials prepared for students.
3. Information on academic’s availability to students and evidence of prompt and effective correspondence via email.
4. Report on identification of student difficulties and encouragement of student participation in courses or programs.
5. Steps taken to emphasize the interrelatedness and relevance of different kinds of learning.
6. Statement about quizzes and examination items being keyed to instructional objectives.

**Products of good teaching**
7. Student scores on teacher made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course has been taken as evidence of learning.
8. Student laboratory workbooks and other kinds of workbooks or logs.
9. Student essays, creative work, projects and field work reports.
10. A record of students who select and succeed in advanced courses of study in the field.
11. A record of students who elect another course with the same academic.
12. Evidence of effective supervision of Honour’s, Master’s or Ph.D. theses.
13. Setting up or running a successful internship program.
14. Evidence of help given to colleagues on teaching improvement. Evaluating and improving one’s teaching.
15. Maintaining a record of the changes resulting from self-evaluation.
16. Instructional innovations attempted and evaluation of their effectiveness.
17. Reading journals on improving teaching and attempting to implement acquired ideas.
18. Reviewing new teaching materials for possible application including exchanging course materials with a colleague from another institution.
19. Conducting research on one’s own teaching or course.
20. Becoming involved in an association or society concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning.
21. Participating in seminars, workshops and professional meetings intended to improve teaching.
22. Using general support services such as the Education Resources Information Centre in improving one’s teaching.
23. Participating in course or curriculum development.

**Contributions outside of the classroom**
24. Preparing a textbook or other instructional materials such as on line ‘courseware’.
25. Editing or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one’s subject.
**Information from students**
26. Student course and teaching evaluation data which suggests improvements or demonstrate effectiveness or satisfaction.
27. Evidence of student satisfaction including written comments received during the term or after a course has been completed.
28. Interview data collected from students.

**Information from colleagues**
29. Statements from colleagues who have observed teaching either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course.
30. Written comments from those who teach courses for which a particular course is a prerequisite.
31. Evidence of contributions to course development and improvement.
32. Statements from colleagues from other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
33. Requests for advice or acknowledgment of advice received by a committee on teaching or similar body.

**Information from others**
34. Honour received such as being nominated or named “teacher of the year.”
35. Statement about teaching achievements from administrators at one’s own institution or another institution.
36. Alumni ratings or other graduate feedback.
37. Comments from parents of students.
38. Reports from employers of students (e.g., in a work study or cooperative program).
39. Invitations to teach from outside agencies.
40. Invitations to contribute to the teaching literature.
41. Other kinds of invitations based on one’s reputation as a teacher such as a media interview on a successful teaching innovation.


© Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2007 (included with permission from the copyright holder)
APPENDIX B
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE LITERATURE ON TEACHING EVALUATION

Evaluation policies should:
1. Reflect and respect institutional culture while allowing for disciplinary/divisional differences.
2. Align with stated institutional goals and purpose and other relevant policies.
3. Clearly articulate the purpose and goals of evaluation.
4. Include a description of faculty roles and responsibilities.
5. Describe and define institutional expectations for the pre-tenure, tenure and post-tenure review.
6. Establish and define relevant timelines (probationary period, timing of the pre-tenure, tenure and post-tenure reviews), expected deadlines, and any terms relating to the stopping of the tenure clock.
7. Clearly articulate the adjudication and approval processes.
8. Describe the constitution and mandate of tenure review committees.
9. Define an institutional understanding of effective teaching.
10. Be flexible to recognize non-traditional teaching approaches.
11. Draw on multiple measures as evidence teaching effectiveness.
12. Provide details regarding the required documentation and sources of evidence.
13. Be easily accessible to faculty and those involved in the review process.
14. Be reviewed regularly to ensure that they accurately reflect institutional goals and interests.
15. Be transparent.
16. Be in writing.

Institutions should:
17. Develop a comprehensive evaluation framework that uses multiple indicators.
   a. This may include the adoption of an institution-wide student course evaluation system (with common items and a common scale) that allows divisions, departments and individual faculty to append additional items.
18. Encourage divisions to develop division-specific policies to supplement and complement institution-wide policies.
19. Ensure faculty understand their role in the tenure and promotion process (i.e. what is expected of them, what materials and evidence they should provide, etc.).
20. Develop a statement on effective teaching and foster an institutional understanding of teaching competence and excellence.
21. Train administrators in the effective evaluation of teaching and provided with clear guidelines for decision-making processes.
22. Develop handbooks and other resources (e.g. workshops) for faculty to help guide them through the process and include information about the types of information to be included in tenure and promotion dossiers.
23. Work to ensure that evaluation systems are integrated with faculty development programs.
Tenure constitutes the primary procedural safeguard of academic freedom, and is essential for the maintenance of intellectual liberty and high standards in postsecondary education and in scholarship. It is the means by which academic staff are protected against personal malice or political coercion. Tenure, following rigorous evaluation by peers, ensures secure continued academic employment. Once academic staff receive tenure, they retain that status should they move from one position to another, or from one rank to another, within the institution.

By definition, employment in a tenured position involves responsibilities of teaching, research, professional activity, and service and the right to salary and benefits that are appropriate to the nature of the position. In those cases where a tenured position is less than full time, the responsibilities attached to the position should be the same as those for a full-time position on a pro rata basis and salary and benefits should be no less than for a full-time position on a pro-rata basis.

The word tenure and its derivatives mean that such an appointment can only be terminated for just and sufficient reasons, which are limited to the areas of financial exigency or of grave misconduct, and which must be proved through procedures that ensure fairness before a properly constituted and independent tribunal. The phasing out of courses or programs by the university or college is not a reason for terminating a tenured appointment. In these circumstances the university or college has the obligation to transfer a member with a tenured appointment to another position for which the member is qualified or to provide training so that the member can take up an alternative position. In either case the appointment to which the member is transferred is tenured.

(Approved by the CAUT Council, November 2005)

© Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2005
(included with permission from the copyright holder)

APPENDIX D
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS (CAUT), MODEL CLAUSES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE (2007)

1. Evaluation of Teaching Performance
1.1 Whenever this agreement calls for an evaluation of the teaching performance of a member of the bargaining unit in relation to contract renewal, tenure, promotion, or discipline for deficient performance of workload duties, the evaluation, recommendations and decisions shall be carried out in accordance with this article.

1.2 Teaching includes but is not limited to the following activities performed by members:
   (a) giving courses; conducting seminars; guiding tutorials, laboratories and studio work; supervising fieldwork, coaching and individual study projects;
   (b) preparing, grading and correcting assignments, tests and examinations;
   (c) guiding the work of teaching assistants, graders, markers and laboratory instructors;
   (d) guiding and evaluating students’ individual work, such as theses and papers;
   (e) consultations with students outside of class or laboratory time;
   (f) participating in the development of teaching methods, programs or course content;
   (g) preparing course outlines, instructional material, laboratory exercises and course notes; and
   (h) writing textbooks: textbooks may also be considered when evaluating a member’s scholarship.
   (i) all other activities in which the member engages to prepare for teaching, including activities to ensure that the member’s teaching is in keeping with the current state of the subject taught.

2. Procedures
2.1 An evaluation of a member’s teaching performance shall only take place when required by the collective agreement. An evaluation of teaching performance shall consider a minimum of three years, unless it is for renewal of a contract with duration of less than three years.

2.2 Anonymous commentary, regardless of how it is collected, shall not be seen or used by individuals other than the member.

2.3 Any evaluation of a member’s teaching performance shall consider all aspects of the member’s teaching activities as well as the departmental and/or faculty context. Assessments of teaching performance must take due note that:
   (a) a member’s strong performance in some aspects of teaching may compensate for a weaker performance in other aspects of teaching;
   (b) a member’s teaching shall be considered that much better if performance is good in several kinds of teaching activities;
   (c) differences between departments and disciplines must be considered when assessing teaching performance.
   (d) student evaluations may reflect historical patterns of discrimination.

2.4 Any evaluation of a member’s teaching performance shall review all relevant information including but not limited to:
   (a) the teaching dossier submitted by the member;
   (b) the size, type and nature and level of courses taught;
   (c) the nature of the subject matter;
(d) the experience of the instructor with the course, and the number of new course preparations assigned to the instructor;
(e) the role of the instructor and the method of delivery;
(f) the pedagogical materials prepared by the member;
(g) the member’s contributions in the areas of pedagogical development and innovation, and the complexity and risk such innovation entails;
(h) the results of anonymous numerical student questionnaires, that were carried out in accordance with the collective agreement.3

2.5 Any member whose teaching performance is being evaluated has the right to submit any information the member believes to be relevant to the evaluation.

2.6 No evaluation of teaching performance may rely exclusively or primarily upon student questionnaires.

2.7 Any person or committee evaluating a member’s teaching performance shall make due allowance for any special circumstances which may affect the member’s teaching performance.

2.8 Any person or committee evaluating a member’s teaching performance shall meet with the member to establish relevant facts about the member’s teaching.

2.9 Any person or committee preparing an evaluation of a member’s teaching performance shall include in that evaluation, in writing:
   (a) a statement of the scope of the evaluation;
   (b) a summary of the information that was used, and the sources of the information, including any factors of bias or discrimination that may have affected the evaluation;
   (c) an analysis of the information that was used; and
   (d) a statement of the results of the evaluation.

2.10 The evaluation of a member’s teaching performance shall determine, in writing, with reasons, that performance is either “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”.4

2.11 The member shall have the right to meet with the person or committee that did the evaluation, and to respond in writing to the evaluation. The member’s response shall be attached to the written evaluation.

1. Negotiate procedures for gathering information which are consistent with the rest of your collective agreement.
2. For additional information see CAUT Teaching Dossier, (December 2006).
3. In negotiating such a questionnaire care must be taken to assess the validity of the questions and the reliability of the results. Negotiated language should cover the procedures for administering the questionnaire, the collection and reporting of results, and interpretation of the results.
4. Ensure that the number of categories and the terms used to describe these categories conform to the criteria for tenure, promotion, or other relevant clauses of your collective agreement.

(Approved by the CAUT Council, November 2000; revised, September 2007)

© Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2007
(included with permission from the copyright holder)

# Appendix E - Standards of Performance and Definitions of Teaching and Teaching Effectiveness in Canadian Tenure Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Activities include:</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Newfoundland & Labrador** | • Documented effectiveness and scholarly competence as a teacher  
• Demonstrated record of research, scholarship or creative professional activities  
• Demonstrated record of academic service  
*(Collective Agreement, Article 11.26)* | The criteria for granting tenure shall be satisfactory academic performance considering the tenure-track period as a whole, demonstrated professional growth since the date of appointment, and the promise of future development.  
*(Collective Agreement, Article 11.26)* | • Teaching undergraduate and graduate courses  
• Designing methods of evaluation  
• Evaluating student work  
• Academic advising and consulting with students  
*(Collective Agreement, Article 3)* | Documented effectiveness and scholarly competence as a teacher is required for the granting of tenure. Recommendations and decisions are based on the evaluation of documentation compiled by the candidate.  
No definition of “effectiveness” is provided.  
*(Collective Agreement, Article 11.26)* |
| **Acadia**           | • Evidence of good performance as teacher  
• Evidence of established foundation of an enduring and productive involvement in scholarly activity  
• Evidence of participation in activities which contribute to the function of the university  
For promotion to Associate Professor:  
• Evidence of positive record of performance as a teacher  
• Evidence of accomplishment in discipline as demonstrated by scholarly activity  
• Evidence of service to the university, community, discipline and/or community |                                                                                                                        | • Teaching undergraduate and graduate courses  
• Providing academic counseling  
• Supervising students  
• Serving as a course coordinator  
• Preparing course materials and assessments  
• Contributing to the delivery of academic programs  
*(Collective Agreement, Appendix I and Article 17)* | Tenure requires evidence of good or positive performance as a teacher.  
*(Collective Agreement, Article 12.92 (b); 12.95(a))*  
“Good performance” and “positive performance” are not defined. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton</td>
<td>• At least acceptable performance in teaching, research and service</td>
<td>Review ratings are: excellent, acceptable and unacceptable</td>
<td>Tenure requires a rating of at least acceptable in teaching. “Acceptable” is not defined. (<em>Collective Agreement, Article 33.12.4</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>• General criteria for tenure include:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Determined at the faculty level. “Effectiveness” is not defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Academic and professional qualifications;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Teaching effectiveness;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Contributions to an academic discipline;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Ability and willingness to work with colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional tenure standards/weighting are identified at the faculty level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Saint Vincent</td>
<td>• Satisfactory teaching performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure requires evidence of satisfactory teaching performance. “Satisfactory” is not defined. (<em>Collective Agreement, Article 20.43</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing involvement in individual/joint scholarly activity and/or professional activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuing participation in internal and external collegial service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrated competence in teaching performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuing participation in internal and external collegial service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing involvement in individual or joint scholarly/professional activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of Teaching Activities:

Teaching activities include:

- Teaching courses
- Supervising student work, exams and assignments
- Designing courses
- Assessing student work

(*Collective Agreement, Article 18.2*)

Supervising student work, exams and assignments
- Assessing student work

(*Collective Agreement, Article 18.2*)

Undergraduate and/or graduate teaching
- Consulting with and counseling students
- Supervising students
- Assessing and evaluating student work

(*Collective Agreement, Article 17*)

Undergraduate and/or graduate teaching
- Thesis and project supervision
- Instructional and programme development
- Supervision of practica, internships, cooperative education work terms and projects, and teacher education programmes

(*Collective Agreement, Article 20.27*)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Teaching activities include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| St. Francis Xavier  | • Clear promise of future intellectual and professional development  
• Excellence in teaching or scholarly activity and clearly established competence in the other  
• Reasonable service to the university |                                                       | • Undergraduate and/or graduate teaching  
• Consult with students outside of class  
• Counsel students on academic matters  
• Supervise students research and practical work  

(*Collective Agreement, Article 2.01*) |

**Definition of Teaching Effectiveness**

Teaching Ability

2.1 Teaching, at all levels, is the primary activity of a University. It is not confined to a commitment to formal instruction, but includes every way in which a teacher has influence upon students -- by lecturing, by inspiring, by encouraging, and by guiding and directing. Also, it may involve day-to-day participation in the intellectual, social, and recreational environment of the campus.

2.2 Effectiveness in teaching is demonstrated in lectures, seminars, laboratories, and tutorials as well as in more informal teaching situations. It is recognized, however, that scholarship must be manifested in the teaching function and that a dogmatic attempt to separate “scholarship” and “teaching” is somewhat artificial.

2.3 Three major elements are considered in assessing teaching effectiveness:

1. The degree to which the faculty member is able to stimulate and challenge the intellectual capacity of students
2. The degree to which the faculty member is able to communicate well
3. The degree to which the faculty member has a mastery of his/her subject area

2.4 Quality of teaching may also be judged from the academic reputation enjoyed by a faculty member with his or her students, and with colleagues at the University and at other institutions.

(*Collective Agreement, Article 2.0*)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Teaching activities include:</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>The following criteria are to be considered by the department:</td>
<td>Assessments of teaching performance much take due note that: (a) an Employee’s strong performance in some aspects of teaching may compensate for a weaker performance in other aspects of teaching; (b) An Employee’s teaching shall be considered that much better if performance is good in several kinds of teaching activities; (c)An entire Department or discipline may differ significantly from the academic staff as a whole, and this may influence interpretation of information on teaching performance by individual Employees. Differences between Departments and disciplines may be considered when assessing teaching performance. <em>(Collective Agreement, Article 15.6.5)</em></td>
<td>• Giving courses, conducting seminars, guiding tutorials and laboratories, doing fieldwork involving students, and supervising individual study projects • Preparing and correcting assignments, test and exams • guiding the work of teaching assistants, markers and lab instructors • guiding and evaluation student's individual work • granting individual consultations outside of class • participating in the development of teaching methods, programs or course content • preparing instructional materials • writing textbooks <em>(Collective Agreement, Article 11.1.4)</em></td>
<td>Tenure requires the demonstration of quality and effectiveness as a teacher. <em>(Collective Agreement, Article 11.1.14)</em> “Quality” and “effectiveness” are not defined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure will be recommended if the candidate has established self as a “successful teacher”, has “contributed to the discipline through research and publication” and is a “person who will contribute to the growth and stature of the university and will promote its objectives”. *(Collective Agreement, Article 11.1.22)*

Promotion to Associate Professor requires:
• Successful experience in university teaching
• A significant record of scholarship
• A satisfactory record of service to the university/professional community

*Collective Agreement, Article 15.6.2*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Prince Edward Island | - Evidence of satisfactory performance as a teacher  
- Evidence of established foundation of an enduring and productive involvement in scholarly endeavours  
- Evidence of participation in activities which indicates potential for continued satisfactory involvement in functioning of university  
- Evidence of satisfactory professional service contributions  
Appointmeny and Promotion to Associate Professor:  
- Evidence of continued success in university teaching  
- Significant record of scholarly endeavour  
- Evidence of continued success in professional service contributions  
- Satisfactory record of service to university, profession and community | Any person/committee assessing teaching shall balance all aspects of teaching as well as departmental/faculty context and take note that:  
- A faculty member’s stronger performance in some aspects of teaching may compensate for weaker performance in others  
- Teaching shall be considered stronger if performance is good in several kinds of teaching activities | Giving courses, conducting seminars, guiding tutorials, labs or studio work, supervising fieldwork and study projects  
Preparing or correcting assignments, tests and exams  
Guiding the work of teaching assistants, markers or laboratory instructors  
Guiding and evaluating students’ individual work  
Conducting consultations with students  
Participating in the development of teaching methods, programs or course content  
Preparing instructional materials  
Authoring or reviewing textbooks and other instructional material | Quality and effectiveness as a teaching involves:  
- The ability to assist students to develop their competence in a subject area and ability to advise students when required as a part of their academic development.  
(Collective Agreement, Section E2.2.1) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Brunswick | Mount Allison | • High quality teaching and academic guidance  
• High quality and reasonable quantity of research and/or creative activity  
• Willingness to perform reasonable service to the university | • Teaching courses  
• Providing academic guidance to students *(Collective Agreement, Article 12)*  
Teaching activities may also include:  
• Preparation of courses  
• Supervision of students (undergraduate and graduate)  
• Organization of field schools or labs  
• Involvement in curriculum development and the development of new courses  
• Publication or production of original materials related to teaching effectiveness  
• Organization and direction of workshops on teaching techniques and teaching effectiveness *(Collective Agreement, Article 17.09)* | Teaching and academic guidance of students must be of high quality.  
“High quality” is not defined. *(Collective Agreement, Article 17.11)* |
| St. Thomas | Evidence of good quality teaching  
Evidence of continual and consistent scholarly contributions  
Participation on regular basis and at continuing level in university governance, service to  
Submitted teaching materials will be reviewed for evidence of comprehensive preparation, use of current materials, | • Teaching courses  
• Contributing to the creation, content, implementation and delivery of academic courses and programs  
“Quality and effectiveness” as a teacher is a criteria for tenure. No definition of “quality and effectiveness is provided.” *(Collective Agreement, Article 8.02.1a)*  
For promotion to Associate Professor, “good |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Brunswick | - Demonstrated academic competence within their area of expertise  
  o Dissemination of knowledge documented by achievement of continuing and satisfactory record of teaching competence  
  o Achievement of continued development as a scholar  
  - Acceptable record of academic service  
  *(Collective Agreement, Article 25D.06)* | theoretical competence and appropriately challenging character of courses. *(Collective Agreement, Article 4.1)* | - Developing and maintaining scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers within their discipline  
  - Informing students about methods of instruction and evaluation  
  - Academic advising and consulting duties  
  - Providing access for students outside of class  
  - Examining and evaluating student progress *(Collective Agreement, Article 4.02.1)*  
  Satisfactory record of teaching competence is to be demonstrated by the provision of a range of evidence. No specific definition of “competence” is provided. *(Collective Agreement, Article 25D.06)* |
| | community/scholarly organizations  
 For promotion/appointment to Associate Professor:  
 - Evidence of good quality teaching over the term of employment  
 - Evidence of continuing, consistent scholarly contributions  
 - Participation on a regularly basis and at a continuing level in university governance, professional service to community/scholarly organizations | - | - quality” teaching is to be demonstrated by a range of evidence. No definition of “good quality” is provided. *(Collective Agreement, Appendix E)* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Teaching activities include:</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elicit and advance teaching effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Collective Agreement, Article 25D.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop’s</td>
<td>• Satisfactory performance in teaching and research</td>
<td>Teaching is the primary criterion for evaluation but the policy states it must be informed by adequate scholarship</td>
<td>No specific details provided.</td>
<td>Teaching is the primary criterion for tenure and must be informed by adequate scholarship. (Collective Agreement, Article 7.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure requires the demonstration of satisfactory teaching performance. “Satisfactory” is not defined. (Collective Agreement, Article 7.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Concordia  | • Demonstrated level and quality of competence and promise in teaching, research and service | • Preparation, organization and presentation of course materials  
• Availability to students outside of class hours  
• Curriculum development  
• Preparation of course materials for student use  
• Direction and evaluation of student progress in courses and practical work  
• Student supervision (Collective Agreement, Article 16.01) | Tenure requires a demonstrated level and quality of competence and promise in teaching.  
Quality and competence are not defined. (Collective Agreement, Article 18.02) |                                  |
| McGill     | • Superior performance in two of teaching, research or service  
• Reasonable performance in 3rd category | • Teaching graduate and undergraduate classes  
• Supervision of individual student programs | Reasonable or superior performance in teaching is required for tenure. Reasonable and superior are not defined. |                                  |

Quebec
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching activities include:</td>
<td>(Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic Staff, Article 1.3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic Staff, Article 5.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algoma</td>
<td>● High degree of effectiveness in teaching&lt;br&gt;● Satisfactory performance in research/scholarship&lt;br&gt;● Service is taken into consideration</td>
<td>Tenure cannot be granted on service alone.</td>
<td>• Teach courses&lt;br&gt;• Deal fairly and ethically with students&lt;br&gt;• Supervise undergraduate and graduate students&lt;br&gt;• Establish and maintain a positive learning environment (Agreement, Article 6)</td>
<td>Teaching effectiveness shall include knowledge of the subjects taught and ability to communicate to students. (Agreement, Article 15.04(i))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>● Clear promise of continuing intellectual and professional development as demonstrated by:&lt;br&gt;○ Sustained satisfactory and effective teaching&lt;br&gt;○ Clear evidence of ongoing high quality scholarly/creative work&lt;br&gt;○ Evidence of service to university</td>
<td>Tenure requires the demonstration of sustained satisfactory and effective teaching. (Collective Agreement, Article 21.04)</td>
<td>• Being accessible to students for academic consultation&lt;br&gt;• Informing students regarding course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation (Collective Agreement Article 12.05(a))</td>
<td>“Sustained satisfactory and effective teaching” are not defined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Carleton    | • Effective teaching  
            • Evidence of scholarly work  
            • Professional achievement  
            • Contributions to administration and development of the department  
            The Collective Agreement refers only to “promotion” in Appendix B: Guidelines for Promotion.  
            There are no specific criteria for “tenure”. | • Teaching courses  
            • Evaluating student work  
            • Supervising students  
            • Providing academic counseling  
            • Organizing and structuring class/lab activities  
            • Dealing fairly and ethically with students  
            • Maintaining knowledge of field (Collective Agreement, Article 15.2) | Promotion requires effective teaching.  
            “Effective” is not defined.  
            Guidelines for promotion to Associate Professor state that “effectiveness as a teacher should imply a concentrated and successful effort to create the best possible learning situation for students. It should involve continuing attention to course design and to alternative modes of presentation. (Collective Agreement, Appendix B) |
| Guelph     | • Established record of performance in teaching, scholarship and service  
            • Specific criteria are developed at the departmental level  
            (Collective Agreement, Article 21.9) | Specific criteria and standards are detailed in department-level documents. | Not specified in institutional documents. |

*Collective Agreement*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakehead</td>
<td>- Satisfactory quality teaching&lt;br&gt;- Demonstrated contributions in research/scholarly activity&lt;br&gt;- Discharged reasonable administrative responsibilities within the university to community and service to the profession and community</td>
<td>- Exceptional quality teaching can compensate for lesser research&lt;br&gt;- Exceptional research may compensate for lesser degree qualifications&lt;br&gt;- Exceptional competence in service and satisfactory quality teaching may compensate for lesser research&lt;br&gt;- Exceptional teaching and exceptional service may compensate for lesser research</td>
<td>Tenure requires the demonstration of satisfactory quality teaching. <em>(Collective Agreement, Article 25.02)</em>&lt;br&gt;“Satisfactory quality teaching” is not defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentian</td>
<td>- Record of satisfactory teaching&lt;br&gt;- Record of satisfactory scholarly activity&lt;br&gt;- Record of contributions to university governance and administrative duties</td>
<td>Faculty have an obligation to develop and maintain their scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers within their area of expertise. <em>(Collective Agreement, Article 5.15.5)</em></td>
<td>“Satisfactory” teaching is not defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</td>
<td>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</td>
<td>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| McMaster    | • Effective teaching  
• High quality scholarly achievement  
• Diligent and effective service  
For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:  
• Demonstrated effective teacher  
• Established promising program of scholarly work  
• Consideration given to performance of university responsibilities | • Selection and arrangement of course topics and materials  
• Lecturing, leading class and seminar discussions  
• Assisting students during office hours  
• Laboratory and studio teaching  
• Marking of student submissions  
• Setting of examinations  
• Supervision of student research at the undergraduate and graduate levels  
(Policy and Regulations with Respect to Academic Appointments, Tenure and Promotion, Section III (5)) | A candidate for re-appointment, tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher. Committees, in judging teaching effectiveness, shall seek assurance that the candidate has a scholarly command of his or her subject, is both willing and able regularly to assist students in understanding the subject, and is able to assess students’ performances in an equitable and effective manner.  
(Policy and Regulations with Respect to Academic Appointments, Tenure and Promotion, Section III (5)) |
| Ontario     | • Record of effective performance as a university teacher constituting promise for a successful career as a professor  
• Productive record of research, scholarship and/or creative achievement as constituting promise for successful career as professor  
• Satisfactory record of service to university, profession and wider community  
For promotion to Associate Professor:  
• Sustained record of effective | • Teaching in introductory and advanced undergraduate and graduate courses  
• Clinical teaching  
• Supervision of student work  
• Advising and supervising graduate students, post-doctoral fellows  
• Coordination or administration of multiple section or multiple instructor | Nipissing University prides itself on being a student-centred university where effective teaching is a highly valued institutional priority. Good teaching is expected of all faculty members and the evaluation of teaching will form an essential component of tenure and promotion considerations. University teaching requires more than classroom performance. Candidates will be expected to demonstrate mastery of their subject area(s) or discipline(s), to make thorough preparation for their classes, to communicate effectively with their students, to show a willingness to respond to students’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance as a university teacher</td>
<td>courses</td>
<td>questions and concerns, and to exhibit fairness in evaluating students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrated record of sustained and productive research</td>
<td>• Contributions to internationalization of educational experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustained and satisfactory record of service to university, profession and community</td>
<td>• Teaching at a distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Institute of Technology</td>
<td>• Demonstrated effectiveness and creativity as a teacher</td>
<td>• Course design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrated record of high quality and peer-assessed scholarship</td>
<td>• Development of assessment methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fair and ethical dealings with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching is a dynamic endeavour involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning. Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and relate directly to the subject taught. Good teachers stimulate active, not passive learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning long after their university days at Nipissing are over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Standards for Tenure and Promotion Procedures at Nipissing University, Section E.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Carried out her/his responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j. Demonstrated competence and effectiveness in the use of new information technologies;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k. Taken care to make herself or himself accessible to students for academic consultation, in person and on-line;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l. Informed students adequately of course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</td>
<td>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</td>
<td>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ottawa      | • Teaching meets expectations  
  • Good quality research/scholarly work  
  • Satisfactory quality service | Levels of performance for teaching include: Outstanding, meets expectations or unsatisfactory. *(Collective Agreement, Article 24.1.1.2)* | m. Maintained teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances;  
 n. Informed students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructors;  
 o. Complied with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of her/his students; and  
 p. Made an impact or contribution to the teaching practices of the discipline. *(Award of Tenure Procedures, Section 7)* |
|             |                                                               | Definition of Teaching activities include:            |                                   |
|             |                                                               | • Teaching undergraduate and/or graduate courses  
  • Supervising, guiding and evaluating student work  
  • Guiding the work of teaching assistants  
  • Consulting with students  
  • Participating in the development of teaching methods, programs or course content  
  • Preparing instructional material *(Collective Agreement, Article 20.2)* | Meets expectations shall mean teaching performance that is comparable to a relevant group of peers in light of the application or matter under consideration. *(Collective Agreement, Article 24.1.1.2)* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Queen’s     | • Record as a very good teacher committed to academic and pedagogical excellence  
• Record of high quality and expert peer-assessed scholarly/creative work  
• Record of professional, university of community service  
For tenure, candidates must demonstrate a commitment to academic and pedagogical excellence.  
Extraordinary contributions in teaching or research shall compensate for lesser in other or in service. | • Teaching undergraduate and/or graduate courses  
• Participating in the design of pedagogical programs  
• Assessing student work  
• Being accessible to students  
• Maintaining a positive learning environment  
(Collective Agreement, Article 15.2.1) | See Statement on Effective Teaching in Appendix G. | |
| Ryerson     | • Teaching competence as demonstrated both in the classroom and in carrying out the principles of effective course management  
• Competence and currency in his/her own discipline  
• Capacity for curriculum development  
• Demonstrated commitment to the professional collegial life of his/her Department/School  
• Fulfillment of his/her obligations as a faculty member  
• Satisfaction of such conditions of probation as were specified in his/her letter of appointment  
• Progress in overcoming weaknesses identified in the teaching and/or year-end assessments  
• Demonstrated capacity for, and commitment to, the Teaching, SRC and service components of the duties and responsibilities of faculty  
Prepare and present courses  
Available for student consultations  
Preparation, supervision, coordination and grading for all course assignments, tests and exams  
Serve as academic advisors  
Supervise Teaching/Academic Assistants | Teaching standards are developed at the departmental/school level and outline normal expectations regarding teaching activities (including those for tenure).  
(Collective Agreement, Article 10.18) | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Toronto     | • Excellence in teaching or research and competence in other OR • Excellence in both | (a) A faculty member shall carry out his or her responsibility for teaching with all due attention to the establishment of fair and ethical dealings with students, taking care to make himself or herself accessible to students for academic consultation, to inform students adequately regarding course formats, assignments, and methods of evaluation, to maintain teaching schedules in all but exceptional circumstances, to inform students adequately of any necessary cancellation and rescheduling of instructions and to comply with established procedures and deadlines for determining, reporting and reviewing the grades of his or her students. *(Memorandum of Agreement, Article 5.1(a))* | **Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**
A faculty member demonstrates capabilities as a teacher in lectures, seminars, laboratories and tutorials as well as in less formal teaching situations, including directing graduate students and counselling students. The guidelines for tenure and promotion prescribe in detail the procedures to be followed in the evaluation of teaching activities. The level of achievement deemed necessary will depend on the rank being sought. Accordingly, there will be some variation in the components and emphases of the documentation collected for each process, reflecting the different stages of an academic career.

**a) Evaluation of competence in teaching requires demonstration of:**
1. success in stimulating and challenging students and promoting their intellectual and scholarly development
2. strong communication skills
3. success in developing students’ mastery of a subject and of the latest developments in the field
4. success in encouraging students’ sense of inquiry and understanding of a subject through discovery-based learning
5. active engagement with students’ learning progress and accessibility to students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. promotion of academic integrity and adherence to grading standards of the division and, as appropriate, the ethical standards of profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. creation of opportunities which involve students in the research process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. creation of supervisory conditions conducive to a student's research, intellectual growth and academic progress consistent with the School of Graduate Studies Guidelines for Graduate Supervision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the minimum standards required of all faculty members and which must be demonstrated in the granting of tenure.  

b) Evaluation of excellence in teaching requires, in addition to the criteria for competence, demonstration of some combination of the following:  

1. superlative teaching skills  
2. creative educational leadership  
3. successful innovations in the teaching domain, including the creation of new and innovative teaching processes, materials and forms of evaluation  
4. significant contribution to the technological enrichment of teaching in a given area, for example, through the development of effective new technology or the use of new media to fullest advantage  
5. publication of innovative textbooks and/or teaching guides  
6. development of significant new courses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trent</td>
<td>• Demonstrated high quality in both teaching and research&lt;br&gt;<em>(Collective Agreement, Article 4.0)</em></td>
<td>Additional standards are applied at the departmental level</td>
<td>and/or reform of curricula&lt;br&gt;7. development of innovative and creative ways to promote students' involvement in the research process and provide opportunities for them to learn through discovery-based methods&lt;br&gt;8. significant contribution to pedagogical changes in a discipline. For tenure cases that are to be based on excellence in teaching the level of involvement will go well beyond that of competence.&lt;br&gt;(Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>• Record as a good teacher committed to academic and pedagogical excellence&lt;br&gt;• Record of high quality and peer-assessed scholarly/creative work&lt;br&gt;• Record of professional, university or community service</td>
<td>Tenure normally requires a record of strong performance in teaching and scholarship and satisfactory record in service OR very strong performance in teaching or research and satisfactory performance in other two</td>
<td>The purpose of teaching is to facilitate learning. Thus, effective teaching draws the strands of a field together in a way that provides coherence and meaning, places what is known in context, lays the groundwork for future learning, and opens the way for connections between the known and the unknown. High-quality teaching is an important goal of the University. In all of their teaching activities, faculty members are expected to be fair in the evaluation of student work and constructive in their comments. They are expected to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>• Undergraduate and graduate teaching and supervision&lt;br&gt;• Distance education&lt;br&gt;• Setting and grading of assignments and examinations&lt;br&gt;• Interaction with students outside the classroom&lt;br&gt;• Curriculum development <em>(Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members, Section 2)</em></td>
<td>• Teaching courses&lt;br&gt;• Grading student work&lt;br&gt;• Consulting with students&lt;br&gt;• Supervising students</td>
<td>“High quality” is not defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</td>
<td>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</td>
<td>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Western Ontario | - Sufficiently strong record of performance in teaching and research  
- Satisfactory record of performance in service  
(*Collective Agreement, Article 4*) | Teaching and research are weighted equally and are given more significance than service | “Strong record of performance” not defined. |

Teaching activities include:

*Performance Standards*

available to students for interviews and consultations outside the classroom at reasonable times. They must always respect the integrity of their students and carefully avoid any exploitation of them for private advantage. They must maintain strict confidentiality with regard to students’ personal lives and political and religious views. They must comment on academic progress and provide judgments on character only to appropriate persons and in appropriate circumstances, and must always be as fair and as objective as possible when making assessments and providing letters of reference.

(*Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members, Section 2: Performance Standards*)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Teaching activities include:</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) assessment of the academic work of students;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) being available to students for consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and academic counselling;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) being available as a supervisor or academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>advisor to students who are engaged in research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and in the preparation and defence of theses or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project reports;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) supervision of graduate teaching assistants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier</td>
<td>• Satisfactory record as a teacher</td>
<td>Faculty are expected to develop and maintain</td>
<td>• Undergraduate and graduate teaching</td>
<td>“Satisfactory record” is not defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfactory record of scholarly activity and achievement, or</td>
<td>scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers.</td>
<td>• Counselling and supervision</td>
<td>(NB How a faculty member is to be evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>creative work in the performing and fine arts, to be normally</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop assessment mechanisms</td>
<td>is given a great deal of attention – e.g. by what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrated by presentation or publication in a credible academic,</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate student work</td>
<td>mechanisms and types of evidence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>artistic or professional forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultations with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfactory record of academic, professional and university</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Serve as academic advisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community service</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervise undergraduate and graduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure is granted when there is consistent evidence of satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Serve as external readers (graduate level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic performance, demonstrated professional growth, and the</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Guide the work of teaching assistants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promise of future development. (Collective Agreement, Article 15.7.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participating in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</td>
<td>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</td>
<td>Definition of Teaching Activities Include:</td>
<td>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>• Tenure should be awarded to a faculty member who has demonstrated academic excellence in his/her field, as exemplified in teaching and research, and has shown willingness to accept reasonable University responsibilities. <em>(Senate Bylaw 23B: Criteria for Tenure)</em></td>
<td>• Teach undergraduate and/or graduate courses • Foster and maintain a learning environment • Participate in program development, design, delivery and evaluation • Assess student work • Adopt reasonable means to maintain a positive learning environment • Consult with and advise students • Supervise the work of undergraduate and graduate students <em>(Collective Agreement, Article 5.25)</em></td>
<td>Excellence in teaching involves both method and content. Whether the content is conventional and routine or whether it reveals the reflection, analysis and synthesis of continuing scholarly endeavour is a proper concern. Innovation in content is especially deserving if undertaken with proper consultation. Good teaching also requires good communication. Not all scholars communicate well in all contexts, but highly effective communication with at least certain types of students at the University is to be expected. <em>(Senate Bylaw 23B: Criteria for Tenure)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>• Demonstrated superiority (excellence) in a minimum of 1 of 3 categories (teaching, research or service) with at least competence demonstrated in teaching and research or at least high competence <em>(Statement of responsibilities of faculty members, 1984)</em>.</td>
<td>• Delivery of lectures • Assessment and assignment design</td>
<td>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...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation

- in all 3 areas

### Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance

See also the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning’s Guide to Teaching Assessment and Evaluation, January 2002

### Definition of Teaching Effectiveness

Definition of Teaching activities include:

- synthesise 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. Today disciplines interpenetrate to such a degree that the researcher cannot rest tranquilly secure in his or her area of expertise, and the teacher cannot rest secure that a gentle summer’s preparation will be sufficient for a good introductory course.

- 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 or 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching activities include:</td>
<td>candidate should be superior in at least one area of teaching. (Tenure and Promotion Policy, Criteria and Procedures, Section B.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>• Evidence of success as a teacher in the university*</td>
<td>Weighting for categories of evaluation are based on rank. Excellence in teaching or scholarship/research can compensate for achievements less of that in 1 of the other criteria.</td>
<td>• Teaching in classroom, labs, tutorials, private instruction • Establishment of assessment measures • Supervision of students (Collective Agreement, Article 8.2)</td>
<td>Tenure requires evidence of success as a teacher. “Success” is not defined. (Collective Agreement, Article 8.4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear evidence of scholarship/research activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of a successful record of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*The Collective Agreement also notes that tenure recommendations and decisions must consider “teaching adequacy”. (See Collective Agreement, Article 13.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>• Determined at the divisional level</td>
<td>Institutional policy notes that teaching and research are the primary criteria and service is secondary</td>
<td>• Undergraduate and graduate teaching • Supervision of graduate students (Collective Agreement, Article 19)</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In Article 19.A.2.4.1: Teaching, the Collective Agreement notes that faculty members have the right and obligation to develop and maintain their scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers within their area of expertise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of satisfactory performance in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfactory progress in research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accepted and discharged reasonable administrative responsibilities within university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The categories of evaluation are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exceptional quality of teaching/professional service may compensate for lesser research or scholarly activity. Exceptional research and scholarly activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Available to students for academic consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform students regarding course formats, assignments and methods of evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tenure requires evidence of satisfactory performance in teaching. “Satisfactory performance” is not defined. (Collective Agreement, Article 24.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</td>
<td>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</td>
<td>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Regina      | Exceptional, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory.  
(Collective Agreement, Article 14.19(3)a) | may compensate for lesser degree in qualification.  
(Collective Agreement, Article 24.13) | Supervision of students  
Evaluation of student work  
(Collective Agreement, Article 14.07 (1)) |
| Saskatchewan | Effectiveness in teaching  
Significance of scholarly work  
Contributions to service | Not specified. | Good teaching is expected of all faculty and evaluation of teaching will form an essential component of tenure and promotion considerations. University teaching requires more than classroom performance. Candidates will be expected to demonstrate mastery of their subject area(s) or discipline(s), to make thorough preparation for their classes, to communicate effectively with their students, to show a willingness to respond to students’ questions and concerns, and to exhibit fairness in evaluating students. Both before and after tenure is awarded, faculty are expected to remain committed to improving/enhancing their teaching performance and to remedy problems identified with their teaching. As faculty progress through the ranks, they will be expected to extend their knowledge of their field(s) or discipline(s), i.e. with respect to classes, currency of the material presented, and new teaching methods.  
(Standards for Promotion and Tenure, Section D.2) |
| Saskatchewan | | | |

Teaching activities include:
- Teaching undergraduate and graduate courses  
- Clinical teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels  
- Teaching/supervising students performing clinical work, practica or other types of field work, study-abroad or international exchange programs  
- Advising and supervising graduate students, post-doctoral fellows  
- Teaching courses in certificate/diploma programs  
- Coordination or administration of multiple section or multiple instructor courses  
- Contributions to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Teaching activities include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>internationalization of educational experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching at a distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Standards for Promotion and Tenure, Section D.2, Table II)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>• Strong record of achievement in teaching and research</td>
<td>• Classroom teaching</td>
<td>Strong record of achievement in teaching is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrated capability of contributing effectively as a staff member</td>
<td>• Supervision of graduate students</td>
<td>necessary for tenure, as demonstrated by various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal interactions with and advising students</td>
<td>forms of evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course design</td>
<td>No definition of what constitutes a “strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>record of achievement”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Faculty Agreement, Article 13.05 and 13.06)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See also the description of the teaching and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning context at the University of Alberta and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the principles of good teaching/learning as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outlined in the <em>General Faculty Council Policy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Manual</em> <em>(excerpted in Appendix G).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>• Evidence of teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>• Delivery of classes, lectures, seminars, tutorials</td>
<td>The evaluation of teaching performance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognized research attainment or equivalent professional attainment</td>
<td>• Clinical, lab, practicum and graduate supervision</td>
<td>effectiveness should consider all ways a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfactory record of service</td>
<td>• Distance education</td>
<td>addresses the responsibility and interacts with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaborative teaching</td>
<td>students. It should also consider the extent of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(APT Manual, Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff, Article 3.2)</em></td>
<td>innovation, preparation, reflection of current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge, level of interest, direction, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>encouragement demonstrated by the faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in teaching development programs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and/or seeking expert help in the improvement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching, will be viewed as an indication of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commitment to teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(APT Manual, Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff, Section 3.2.2)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</td>
<td>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</td>
<td>Definition of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lethbridge        | • Established effectiveness of teaching and reasonable expectation of ability to create lengthy and meritorious record of effective teaching  
• Evidence of development of independent and productive program of research | | • Organization, preparation and delivery of courses  
• Evaluation of students’ academic progress  
• Individual consultation with students outside of class or lab hours *(Faculty Handbook, Article 13.02)* | Teaching Effectiveness  
Effectiveness as a teacher implies a concentrated and successful effort to create the best possible learning situation for students. It involves continuing attention to course work, course design and related activities; and to the supervision of students in alternative modes of learning. It may involve participation in seminars and colloquia, the design of innovative methods of teaching, or other contributions to the teaching activities of the University. Effectiveness as a teacher may be assessed by a variety of means including evaluation by fellow Faculty Members and through student appraisals though no assessment will be based mainly on student appraisals. *(Faculty Handbook, Article 12.01.1)* |
| British Columbia | • High standard of performance in meeting criteria of teaching, scholarly activity and service and show promise of continuing to do so  
• Demonstrated competence and responsibility in range of teaching and a commitment to the facilitation of student learning | Candidates are judged principally on performance in both teaching and scholarly activity. Service is taken into account but cannot compensate for deficiencies in teaching and research | • Presentation through lectures, seminars and tutorials, individual and group discussion  
• Supervision of student work *(Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures, Article 3.2 and Faculty Agreement, Article 4.02)* | Evaluation of teaching should be based on the effectiveness rather than the popularity of the instructor. Indicators of effectiveness include: command over subject matter, familiarity with recent developments in the field, preparedness, presentation, accessibility to students, and influence on the intellectual and scholarly development of students. *(Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures, Article 3.2.4)* |
| Northern British Columbia | • Demonstrated competence and responsibility in range of teaching and a commitment to the facilitation of student learning | | • Teach undergraduate and/or graduate courses  
• Assess student work  
• Adopt reasonable means | Demonstrated competence and responsibility in a range of teaching a commitment to the facilitation of student learning is required for tenure. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| British Columbia | - Demonstrated competence and productivity in scholarly activity and recognition of one’s works by academic peers  
- Made contributions in academic service  
For Associate Professor:  
- Record of effective teaching  
- Record of sustained and productive scholarly activity  
- Evidence of effective service to the university community, professional community, and/or community at large  
At a minimum, satisfactory performance in both teaching effectiveness and scholarly activity must be demonstrated. (Policy A11.05, 2.1) | to maintain a positive learning environment  
- Consult with and advise students  
- Supervise graduate students (Faculty Agreement, Article 29.3)  
“Demonstrated competence” is not defined. (Faculty Agreement, Article 22.12.5.1) | 2.2 Teaching Effectiveness  
Success as a teacher is of fundamental importance for evaluating the performance of a faculty member. Matters which should be taken into consideration in evaluating teaching include mastery of the subject, generation of enthusiasm in students, maintenance of appropriate academic standards, dedicated involvement within one's field(s), openness to innovation, graduate supervision, and development of academic programs. Consideration shall be given to the ability and willingness of a faculty member to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction. Teaching effectiveness should be measured or assessed through a combination of methods, including student questionnaires, the observations of faculty colleagues, teaching portfolios, and the calibre of |
| Simon Fraser      | - Continued growth as an established scholar as evidenced by the development of a significant program of research and scholarship  
- Sustained commitment to undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and supervision  
- responsible and contributing member of university/academic community | | | |

(From: Policy A 11.05 - Criteria for Appointment, Contract Renewal, Tenure, Promotion and Salary Review)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Thompson Rivers | ● Satisfactory record as teacher  
● Satisfactory record of scholarship  
● Satisfactory record of service | Teaching is a scholarly and dynamic endeavour that covers a broad range of activities with a commitment to creating the best possible learning situation for students. Teaching involves attention to course work, course design, methods of teaching, curriculum development and other instructional related activities.  
*Collective Agreement, Article 6.10.5.1* |
| | | | Tenure requires the demonstration of a satisfactory record as a teacher as measured against standards approved by University Council.  
There is no definition of “satisfactory”.  
*Collective Agreement, Article 6.10.6* |

Teaching activities include:

- supervised dissertations and theses. At a minimum, faculty members must follow the general procedures developed by their departments to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Services to students over and above formal teaching should also be taken into consideration, particularly where the service is of a time-consuming nature.  
*From: Policy A 11.05 - Criteria for Appointment, Contract Renewal, Tenure, Promotion and Salary Review*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Victoria    | - Teaching effectiveness at or above the level of quality appropriate to faculty member’s experience and with commitment to the importance of excellence in teaching  
- Scholarly or creative achievements of high quality  
- Service and professional activities that further goals of the university and discipline | Teaching effectiveness and scholarly achievements have paramount importance | Specified at the level of the academic unit. |

**Teaching Effectiveness**

Teaching effectiveness means the effectiveness of all of a Faculty Member’s methods and forms of teaching and student supervision that are described and evaluated in accordance with the Evaluation Policy of the Faculty in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment. Teaching effectiveness includes contributions to the Departmental or Faculty’s teaching program and to scholarship related to teaching as described in the Evaluation Policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Standards of Performance in relation to the Categories of Evaluation</th>
<th>Additional Details Regarding Standards of Performance</th>
<th>Definition of Teaching Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of each Faculty. Scholarship related to teaching includes, but is not limited to, the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) scholarly works relating to teaching, curriculum development or learning in a discipline in which such works would not normally form part of the Member’s Scholarly and Professional Achievement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) presentations and addresses related to teaching, curriculum development or learning in a discipline in which such activities would not normally form part of the Member’s Scholarly and Professional Achievement; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) contributions related to the Unit’s teaching program in the form of curriculum development, course design or other contributions that advance the Unit’s ability to meet its teaching responsibilities. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted on the basis of a Faculty Member’s teaching dossier that, in addition to teaching evaluations, may include such items as peer reviews, class visits, reviews of syllabi and examinations, evidence of innovative teaching, evidence of contribution to the Departmental or Faculty’s teaching program, teaching awards, and scholarship related to teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Framework Agreement, Article 13.1.2(a)*
## APPENDIX F
### EVALUATION MECHANISMS: SOURCES OF DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>From the Instructor</th>
<th>From Peers/Colleagues</th>
<th>From Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>• Statement on contributions/ accomplishments (REQ)</td>
<td>• Written comments from peers (REQ)</td>
<td>• Course evaluation data (OPT – at instructor’s choice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching Dossier (following CAUT guidelines) (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>• Assessment of teaching activities (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observation by peers (REC)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement of teaching accomplishments (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• List of courses taught (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie</td>
<td>This information is specified in faculty-level, not institutional, documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional documents only note that the candidate will provide relevant materials for the tenure review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Saint Vincent</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observation by peers (OPT)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement on teaching contributions (REQ)</td>
<td>• Peer review of course and program content (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publications on teaching (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Xavier</td>
<td>• Course materials (REC)</td>
<td>• In-class observations (REC)</td>
<td>• Student interviews (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sample student work (REC)</td>
<td>• Advice from colleagues (OPT)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement of teaching accomplishments and approaches (REC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course materials (REC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (OPT)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement of teaching objectives (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters/testimonials from students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• List of courses (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Allison</td>
<td>• Signed evaluation in writing from all members of department (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Written evaluations from students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td>• Teaching portfolio (REQ)</td>
<td>• Letters from colleagues (OPT)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters from colleagues (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters from students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>From the Instructor</td>
<td>From Peers/Colleagues</td>
<td>From Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Brunswick    | • Teaching dossier (OPT)  
|                  | • Statement of teaching accomplishments (REQ) |                       | • Course evaluations (REQ)                            |
| Bishop’s         | • Teaching dossier (REQ) |                       | • Submissions are invited from colleagues (OPT)          | • Course evaluations (REQ)                            |
| Concordia        | • Teaching dossier (REQ) |                       |                                                       | • Course evaluations (REQ)                            |
| McGill           | • Teaching dossier (REQ) |                       |                                                       | • Course evaluations (REQ)                            |
| Algoma           | • Annual reports, with information on teaching activities (REQ)  
|                  | • Teaching dossier (REC)  
|                  | • Publications on teaching and learning (OPT) | • Letters from colleagues (REQ)  
|                  |                                                       | • In-class observations by peers (OPT)  
|                  |                                                        |                                                       | • Course evaluations (REQ)                            |
|                  |                                                        |                                                       | • Letters from students (REQ)                          |
|                  |                                                        |                                                       | • Sample student work (OPT)                            |
| Brock            | • Evidence to demonstrate quality and effectiveness of teaching (REQ)  
|                  | • Course materials (REQ) | • In-class observations by peers (OPT)  
|                  |                                                        | • Written comments from peers (OPT)  
|                  |                                                        |                                                       | • Course evaluations (REQ)                            |
|                  |                                                        |                                                       | • Written comments from students (OPT)                  |
| Carleton         | • Course materials (REQ)  
|                  |                                                        | • Signed peer evaluations (REC)  
|                  |                                                        | • In-class observations by peers (OPT)  
|                  |                                                        |                                                       | • Course evaluations (REC)                            |
| Guelph           | • Course materials (REQ)  
|                  | • Specifics determined at the departmental level | • Determined at the departmental level                   | • Course evaluations (OPT)                            |
| Lakehead         | • Course materials (REQ)  
|                  | • Overview of teaching responsibilities (REQ)  
|                  | • Invited to appear before the tenure committee (OPT) | • Written comments from colleagues on tenure file (REC) | • Written comments from colleagues on tenure file (REC) |
|                  |                                                        |                                                        |                                                        |
| Laurentian       | • Teaching dossier (REQ) [must include course syllabi and materials]  
|                  | • Peer review (REC) | • Course evaluations (REQ)                            |
| McMaster         | • Interviews with candidate (REC)  
|                  | • In-class observations by peers (REC) | • Interviews with undergraduate and graduate students (REC)  
<p>|                  |                                                        | • Interviews with TAs (REC)                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>From the Instructor</th>
<th>From Peers/Colleagues</th>
<th>From Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td>• Peer review (internal/external) (OPT)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement regarding teaching accomplishments (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Testimonials/letters from students (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Institute of</td>
<td>• Teaching portfolio (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (REQ) (performed by 2 members of the Teaching Evaluation Committee)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters from Colleagues (REQ)</td>
<td>• Letters from students (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sample student papers, may be included in teaching portfolio (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>• Course materials (REQ)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s</td>
<td>• Summary of teaching experience (REQ)</td>
<td>• Invited comments from colleagues on tenure file materials (OPT)</td>
<td>• Letters from current and former students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers – through the Faculty Review Committee (REQ)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information on teaching innovations (REC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (REC)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer review (internal/external) (REC)</td>
<td>• Copies of graded student work (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent</td>
<td>• Course materials (REQ)</td>
<td>• Colleagues are invited to comment on teaching accomplishments of candidate (OPT)</td>
<td>• Letters from students (40-60 students are contacted; REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information on supervision (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters from former students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REC)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peer (REC)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of teaching materials by peers (REC)</td>
<td>• Letters from former students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ontario</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td>• Letters from colleagues (REQ)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters from students (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>From the Instructor</td>
<td>From Peers/Colleagues</td>
<td>From Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td>• Evaluation from Academic Administrative Unit Committee (REQ)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement regarding pedagogical goals and objectives (OPT)</td>
<td>• Report from Academic Administrative Unit Head (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters from internal colleagues (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters from external colleagues (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>• Course materials (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment statement (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REC)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (REQ)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters from colleagues (REC)</td>
<td>• Letters from undergraduate and graduate students (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>• Self-evaluation of teaching accomplishments (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (OPT)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessments by peers (OPT)</td>
<td>• Assessment by graduates (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>• List of courses taught (REQ)</td>
<td>• Written opinions of colleagues (REQ)</td>
<td>• Written opinions of students (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Materials selected by candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>• Teaching portfolio (REC)</td>
<td>• Peer evaluations (REC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>• Annual performance reviews (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching materials (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>• Teaching materials (REQ)</td>
<td>• Peer evaluations (REQ)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment of teaching (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observations (REQ)</td>
<td>• Written appraisals (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement regarding course evaluations (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement regarding teaching enhancement/professional development efforts (REQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>From the Instructor</td>
<td>From Peers/Colleagues</td>
<td>From Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>• Course materials (REQ)</td>
<td>• Peer review (REC)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment (REC)</td>
<td>• Administrative review (REC)</td>
<td>• Letters/testimonials from students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>• Course materials (REQ)</td>
<td>• Signed evaluations from peers (OPT)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Letters/testimonials from students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>• Teaching responsibilities and materials (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (OPT)</td>
<td>• Student appraisals (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REC)</td>
<td>• Letters from internal colleagues (REC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abbreviated dossier for the Senior Appointments Committee (REQ)</td>
<td>• Letters from external colleagues (REC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer review (REC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (REC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern British Columbia</td>
<td>• Performance evaluation report with information on teaching activities and progress (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observation by peers (REC)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement of teaching objectives (REQ)</td>
<td>• Peer review of course materials and student work (REC)</td>
<td>• Sample student work (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidate is invited to appear before the review committee (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews with students conducted by peer colleagues (REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser</td>
<td>• Teaching portfolio (REC)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (REC)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Rivers</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (REC)</td>
<td>• Letters from students (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement regarding professional development in pedagogy (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement regarding pedagogical goals and objectives (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comments on student evaluations (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>• Teaching dossier (REQ)</td>
<td>• In-class observations by peers (OPT)</td>
<td>• Course evaluations (REQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer review (OPT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

STATEMENT ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING, QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY (1995)

Through discussion, consultation and reading, the sub-committee (on teaching performance) has developed the following statement on effective teaching and learning. This statement is not intended to be exhaustive. Rather, it intends to signal some general criteria on what constitutes effective teaching and learning in the Queen’s context. The sub-committee takes a broad view of what constitutes teaching. Teaching includes not just in-class interaction between students and professors, but also, for example, such things as academic advising and graduate supervision.

(1) Effective teaching is a scholarly activity which is integral to the duties of all faculty members at Queen’s University, and to which they are expected to devote substantial proportions of their professional time. Effective teachers place high value on the teaching enterprise and the subject taught, manifest knowledge, interest and enthusiasm, and provide appropriate intellectual challenges to students. By inspiring and encouraging students, effective teachers draw students into the world of the disciplines, the university, and the habit for inquiry that guides the life-long search for understanding.

(2) Effective teachers have excellent communication skills, which include:
   • clarity in the organization and presentation of ideas
   • consistency and clarity on expected standards of student work
   • timely, appropriate, and helpful assessment of student performance
   • constructive feedback to students
   • opportunities for interaction with individual students and among students

(3) Effective teaching employs appropriate curriculum design delivery, and attends to the development, evaluation, and revision of curricula. Effective teachers employ appropriate course design and instructional methods, and are consistent in their attention to the development, evaluation and revision of courses. Materials and teaching strategies should:
   • be academically challenging
   • encourage critical thought and intellectual exchange
   • take account of recent developments in scholarship
   • reflect the diversity of student experience and issues, and the breadth and depth of their knowledge
   • be well-organized and coherent
   • be stimulating, responsive, flexible and open to modification in keeping with students’ needs
   • take account of recent developments in the delivery of curriculum, such as innovative instructional technologies and alternative teaching strategies

(4) Effective teachers recognize and engage with the diversity of student experience and intellectual perspectives. Teaching is a highly complex interplay of relationships between teachers and students within which an effective teacher reveals and encourages respect for differences amongst students and seeks to draw on that diversity in a way that builds a constructive experience of learning for all. Effective teachers are therefore committed to the equitable treatment of all students and to understanding and removing barriers to learning that may have impeded the academic progress of those who are non-traditional students.

(5) Effective teachers promote both independent and collaborative learning on the part of students by fostering the talents, skills, abilities, and most important, the desire of students to take responsibility for continued learning.

(6) Effective teachers are reflective, self-critical and flexible. They consistently seek to learn from their students, from their own teaching, and from the teaching of others, and, in response, are willing to
modify their instructional approaches. The committed teacher also serves as a role model and mentor to colleagues. What is effective teaching may vary with particular disciplines as teachers seek to address a wide variety of students, and approach diverse topics in diverse ways at different levels of expertise. Effective teaching and learning occur through intensive interaction of teachers and students in a variety of places, both inside and outside the classroom, and as changing technologies offer new opportunities for expanding and diversifying the contexts of learning.
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