

February 27, 2014

Members of the McMaster community:

The category of teaching-stream faculty was created by McMaster effective July 1, 2007. Now, with over 6 years of experience it is timely to consider the role and impact of this group of colleagues on the institution and how this might evolve over the foreseeable future.

The Joint Committee (MUFA-Administration) has had numerous discussions over the few past years regarding this category of appointment and, in particular, what is the appropriate ratio of teaching-stream to tenure-stream faculty at the university. A few weeks ago I [posted](#) a personal perspective on teaching stream faculty along with a proposal that the maximum number of such positions at the university be increased from the current allocations. I invite all members of the community to read, discuss and comment on this note.

In October 2012 Senate Committee of Appointment established a Sub-Committee to Review Policies and Procedures Surrounding the Appointment Category of Teaching-Stream Faculty. The rationale for the establishment of this committee and its terms of reference are outlined in the following two pages. Following this is the report of the committee. This report incorporates an analysis of the terms and conditions that apply to the role of teaching stream faculty at McMaster and makes recommendations for changes to these conditions. Some of the recommendations, if enacted, would require changes to the Yellow Document. In developing their report the committee held a couple of open sessions to solicit input from faculty members. Otherwise the recommendations are those of the committee members. This report is now being provided to the community for discussion and comment.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee for their time and deliberation in the preparation of this report. The committee consisted of:

Joe Kim (Chair), Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour (Teaching Stream)
Teal McAteer, DeGroote School of Business (Teaching Stream)
Sheila Sammon, School of Social Work (Teaching Stream)
Patty Solomon, Associate Dean, School of Rehabilitation Science (Tenure Stream)
Spencer Smith, Director Engineering 1 Program (Tenure Stream)
Ken Cruikshank, Department of History (Tenure Stream) – resigned as of April 2013 due to appointment as acting dean of Humanities.

Please feel free to provide your thoughts on these documents and on the future role of teaching stream faculty to my office (provost@mcmaster.ca) and/or to MUFA (mufa@mcmaster.ca). We would appreciate any feedback prior to the end of March 2014.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'D. Wilkinson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David S. Wilkinson
FRSC, FCAE, FCIM, FACerS, P.Eng.
Distinguished University Professor
Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES SURROUNDING THE APPOINTMENT CATEGORY OF TEACHING-STREAM FACULTY

McMaster University introduced the new appointment category of teaching-stream faculty, effective July 1, 2007. As part of its report to Senate in the fall of 2011, the *Drafting Committee to Review the Tenure and Promotion Policy Supplementary Policy Statements and Recommend Revisions and Additions* recommended a number of revisions to the Supplementary Policy Statements designed to accommodate the appointment and academic assessment of individuals in the teaching-stream category. That Drafting Committee noted, however, that a number of issues related to the teaching-stream category had been brought to their attention but were outside the mandate of the committee. At the conclusion of its discussion of the Drafting Committee recommendations on December 14, 2011, Senate moved to establish a committee to review policies and procedures surrounding the teaching-stream category of appointment.

The Drafting Committee provided to the Senate Committee on Appointments and to the McMaster University Faculty Association an outline of the issues and concerns that it had encountered in relation to the teaching-stream category of appointment. Further to this, the Senate Committee on Appointments asked the Joint Committee for advice regarding the issues to be addressed and the direction of any such review of the teaching-stream category.

The Joint Committee has recommended that the initial committee not be characterized as a “drafting committee” as envisioned by the Tenure and Promotion Policy, but rather be a more broadly based committee that might ultimately recommend the establishment of a drafting committee to deal with any necessary revisions to the Tenure and Promotion Policy or its Supplementary Policy Statements. The Senate Committee on Appointments concurs with the advice of the Joint Committee and now recommends the establishment of a sub-committee of the Senate Committee, with a mandate as follows to review policies and procedures surrounding the appointment category of teaching-stream faculty.

Within the context of the President’s Forward With Integrity document and McMaster’s tradition as a research-intensive institution which emphasizes excellence in teaching, the committee is charged specifically with:

1. reviewing the teaching load for teaching-stream faculty: Since research is not a requirement for teaching-stream faculty, the teaching load is normally higher so that the teaching/committee and administrative service ratio is 80/20. Should teaching loads be revised for those teaching-stream faculty interested in pursuing pedagogical research? If so, should their CP/M weightings be modified to reflect that?
2. defining scholarship for the assessment of teaching-stream faculty: Scholarly activity is not required for permanence but is for promotion of teaching-stream faculty. The Tenure and Promotion Policy specifies that the required scholarship must be in teaching or pedagogy. How should a teaching-stream faculty member who chooses to engage in discipline-specific research be assessed?
3. determining the appropriate length of research leave for teaching-stream faculty. The current policy allows for a four-month research leave. Should teaching-stream faculty be eligible for the

same length of leave as tenure-stream faculty? Should the length of the leave depend on the nature of the research being undertaken? On what basis should leave need to be justified?

4. reviewing the policies and practices regarding the involvement of teaching-stream faculty in the supervision of graduate students;
5. reviewing the integration of teaching-stream faculty into the faculty complement and recommending steps to enhance this process; recommending how to deal with faculty who teach extensively outside the department of their appointment (i.e., in Faculty general courses);
6. considering and recommending how the differing expectations for teaching quality for tenure-stream and teaching-stream faculty should be mapped onto merit evaluations;
7. reviewing the allocation of teaching-stream positions across Faculties and recommending any necessary revisions;
8. considering any other issues relevant to the teaching-stream position that the committee considers important.

Membership

Six members (including teaching-stream, academic administration, and tenure-stream individuals).



Department of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour (PNB)

1280 Main St. W., Hamilton, ON L8S 4K1
Phone: 905-525-9140, Ext. 23000
Fax: 905-529-6225
Email: psych@mcmaster.ca
<http://www.mcmaster.ca/psychology>

January 30, 2014

Senate Committee on Appointments
c/o University Secretariat
Gilmour Hall, Room 210

Re: Report from the Sub-Committee of the Committee on Appointments to Review Policies Surrounding Teaching-Stream Faculty

On behalf of the Sub-committee, I submit the enclosed report, which summarizes recommendations based on the questions originally proposed for consideration by the Senate Committee on Appointments, for changes to clarify the role of teaching-stream faculty. This report follows deliberation within the Sub-Committee, consultations with teaching-stream faculty members through a survey and a “town hall” meeting, and ongoing discussions with members of the University.

The Sub-Committee was first met on November 30, 2012. Appointed members represented a range of academic units, streams and levels and included: Joe Kim (Chair), Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour; Teal McAteer, DeGroote School of Business, Sheila Sammon, School of Social Work; Patty Solomon, Associate Dean, School of Rehabilitation Science; and Spencer Smith, Director Engineering 1 Program. Ken Cruikshank was also originally a member of the Sub-Committee, but later recused himself when he was appointed Acting Dean in the Faculty of Humanities.

We would be pleased to meet with the Committee to discuss these recommendations.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Kim, PhD
Chair, Sub-Committee

Senate Sub-Committee of the Committee on Appointments to
Review Policies Surrounding Teaching-Stream Faculty

Joe Kim (Chair), Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour
Teal McAteer, DeGroot School of Business
Sheila Sammon, School of Social Work
Patty Solomon, Associate Dean, School of Rehabilitation Science
Spencer Smith, Director Engineering 1 Program

The purpose of this sub-committee of the Senate Appointments Committee was to review the guidelines for the role of teaching-stream faculty with respect to the current policy, as outlined in the Yellow Document. Both teaching-stream and tenure-stream faculty members are viewed to make equally important contributions to the University and should have comparable rights and privileges. However, the expectations, workloads, and resources available vary widely for teaching-stream faculty members across the University.

The teaching-stream and tenure-stream positions can be distinguished by the relative weights for teaching, research and service as outlined in a letter of appointment; teaching-stream faculty have a more concentrated focus on teaching (typically 80% teaching and 20% service), while the duties of tenure-stream faculty include a focus on discipline-specific research (typically 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service). The current criteria for permanence and promotion and the differing hiring practices for teaching-stream faculty across academic units in the University have indirectly guided the emergence of two profiles within this stream: (1) teaching-stream faculty focusing exclusively on teaching and service (2) teaching-stream faculty augmenting this role by electing to engage in scholarly activity¹. These profiles can be formally recognized with specific guidelines for workload and the pursuit of “excellence in educational leadership”.

This report summarizes recommendations based on the questions originally proposed for consideration by the Senate Committee on Appointments, for changes to clarify the role of teaching-stream faculty with respect to six consolidated key issues:

- 1. Defining scholarly activity as “excellence in educational leadership”**
- 2. Assigning appropriate teaching loads**
- 3. Determining appropriate length of research leave**
- 4. Reviewing the policies on supervision of graduate students**
- 5. Integrating into the Faculty complement**
- 6. Establishing criteria for hiring, permanence, promotion, and merit evaluation**

An additional issue proposed by the Senate Committee on Appointments is not addressed in this report. The issue was the allocation of total teaching-stream positions allowed across academic units. We determined that differences in practice, policy, and resources among Faculties made

¹ In some cases, teaching-stream faculty may also elect to pursue discipline-specific research. As discussed in Issue 1, we recommend that the teaching-stream faculty member discuss with the supervising Chair or Director to determine if such scholarly activity may be considered as evidence of excellence in educational leadership.

this issue beyond the mandate of this sub-committee. We recommend that a Committee of Deans address this important issue.

Issue 1. Defining scholarly activity as “excellence in educational leadership”

There has been much speculation on whether discipline-specific research may be evaluated as part of the duties of teaching-stream faculty as is the case for tenure-stream faculty. Indeed, engaging in significant contributions to discipline-specific research that is formally evaluated may be an important distinguishing point between tenure-stream and teaching-stream faculty. Our recommendation is that in the context of teaching-stream faculty, “scholarly activity” should not normally refer to discipline-specific research and instead be regarded as engaging in “excellence in educational leadership” to complement the teaching focus of the teaching-stream appointment.

Recommendations

1. We define “excellence in educational leadership” to include active engagement in research, development and communication of best practices in teaching and learning. Examples include:

- Active engagement in pedagogy research and scholarship of teaching and learning through publications (articles in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, training guidelines and manuals), conference presentations and obtaining funding to support such pursuits
- Significant participation in workshops, conferences and communities of practice to improve curricula and pedagogical practices
- Organization of conferences, symposia and educational events on teaching and learning
- Teaching and mentorship of pedagogical training in faculty, graduate or undergraduate students
- Formal leadership responsibility and significant contributions to the Department/Faculty/University curriculum and learning initiatives and committees
- Development and evaluation of innovative approaches to teaching methodology, curricula, evidence-based teaching materials, widely adopted textbooks

2. The evaluation of excellence in educational leadership is only relevant to assessment for promotion to Associate or Full Professor. Teaching-stream faculty focusing exclusively on teaching may receive permanence but would not be considered for promotion and remain at a Assistant Professor level. Only teaching-stream faculty pursuing excellence in educational leadership will be given full consideration for promotion.

3. Discipline-specific research may be considered as evidence of excellence in educational leadership if it significantly contributes to enhancing teaching and service. It will be the responsibility of the teaching-stream faculty member to come to an agreement with the supervising Chair or Director to demonstrate how the discipline-specific research will meet these goals.

Issue 2. Assigning appropriate Teaching Loads

Most teaching-stream appointments carry a nominal load of 80% teaching and 20% service. If a teaching-stream faculty member were not expected to do anything but teach courses, as in the case of a contractually limited appointment, then we might expect them to carry a teaching load twice that of tenure-stream faculty. The university does expect, however, that teaching-stream faculty will excel in their teaching and provide educational leadership. To enable teaching-stream faculty to meet those expectations, we therefore recommend both an absolute and relational cap on teaching workloads. 1.5 times the teaching load of a tenure-stream faculty recognizes that more time should be devoted to classroom teaching, but that teaching-stream faculty members also require time to excel and be innovative in the classroom and be pedagogical leaders. Best practices from other institutions also suggest that if we are serious about having teaching-stream faculty providing leadership in teaching, there is an absolute limit to the course load they should be expected to carry, and we recommend that the normal limit be set at 18 units over a calendar year of teaching. These normal limits should be treated with the same flexibility as those of tenure-stream faculty. Our recommendations envision that Chairs and Directors apply the same discretion to assigning teaching duties as they apply to tenure-stream faculty.

Recommendations

1. The workload of teaching-stream faculty as outlined in a letter of appointment typically includes 80% teaching and 20% service. We suggest that the distribution of workload reflect the differences between teaching-stream faculty focusing exclusively on teaching and service from those also engaging in excellence in educational leadership. The latter group may have a workload reflecting this commitment to teaching, service and educational leadership in an appropriate ratio (e.g., 60, 20, 20%) as determined by the head of the academic unit in consultation with the teaching-stream faculty member.
2. Teaching-stream faculty who engage in educational leadership shall not teach more than the equivalent of a) 18 units, or b) 1.5 times the normal full teaching load of tenure-stream faculty in the same unit or sub-unit, whichever is less.
3. Individual teaching-stream faculty members who elect not to engage in excellence in educational leadership shall discuss with their Chair and Dean alternative ways in which they can effectively and equitably contribute to the goals of the University, including teaching a) 24 units, or b) 2 times the normal full teaching load of tenure-stream faculty in the same unit or sub-unit, whichever is less.

This recommendation mirrors the current practice that applies to tenure-stream faculty, where a faculty member has chosen not to engage in scholarly activity, or ceases to engage in scholarly activity. It is anticipated that such situations will be rare, and that most teaching-stream faculty will choose to actively engage in excellence in educational leadership. Some may choose otherwise, and indeed may be granted permanence without such a commitment, and this recommendation allows for that.

4. Chairs and directors who are responsible for assigning teaching duties should apply the same considerations to teaching-stream faculty as tenure-stream faculty:

a. Such factors as new course or laboratory demonstration preparations, class size and the expected total number of students in all of the instructor's courses, and marking/grading responsibilities of the instructor should be considered.

b. The same practices that apply to tenure-stream faculty in the same unit or sub-unit with regard to teaching release for particular administrative or other services to the unit shall apply to teaching faculty.

c. Temporary reductions in teaching loads for other special contributions may be negotiated, and require the approval of the Dean.

Issue 3. Determining appropriate length of research leave

The current 4-month leave for teaching-stream faculty is significantly shorter than the 12-month leave for tenure-stream faculty. This disparity can have negative consequences on perception of equality as well as having a practical limitation on the scope of a proposed project to be completed during the leave. Teaching-stream faculty who are dedicated to excellence in educational leadership would benefit from experiencing the research leave available to tenure-stream faculty. In particular, engaging in pedagogy research or new methods in teaching during this period can benefit all instructors in the home department and cultivate a spirit of innovation in teaching across the university. Teaching-stream faculty pursuing educational leadership from the outset should normally apply for permanence and promotion together, and thus follow the regular timeline for research leave. As noted in the recommendations for Issue 1, the definition of excellence in educational leadership can be used as the basis for guiding appropriate activities during the leave.

Recommendations

1. Only teaching-stream faculty who have been promoted to Associate Professor are eligible to apply for research leave to pursue scholarly activities related to excellence in educational leadership.

2. Teaching-stream faculty not engaged in excellence in educational leadership are not expected to be promoted to Associate Professor and thus ineligible for applying for research leave.

3. The maximum length of research leave will be 6 months every 6 years. This period reflects the relative weighting of assigned workload devoted to excellence in educational leadership (20% in a revised teaching-stream, compared to 40% for a typical tenure-stream)

4. With the exception of the length of the research leave (revised to 6 months) all other regulations should be matched with guidelines established for tenure-track faculty. In particular, a teaching-stream faculty member engaging in excellence in educational leadership would normally expect to be considered for permanence and promotion at the same time (please see Issue 6).

Issue 4. Reviewing the policies on supervision of graduate students

The direct supervision of graduate students should be restricted to teaching-stream faculty electing to also engage in educational leadership. Note that there are teaching professors engaging in disciplinary research which the AVP/Dean may consider for “non-standard” supervisory committee or supervision status.

Current policies related to PhD supervision in unique situations state that approval by the AVP/Dean of Graduate Studies is required and this should apply to teaching professors. There are no policies related to supervision of masters students and thus there is a need to change the policy on supervision to make it inclusive of all graduate levels and all teaching ranks.

Recommendations

1. Teaching-stream faculty engaged in excellence in educational leadership should be allowed to supervise graduate students in a Masters program of research if the following conditions are met:
 - a. have a program of research
 - b. have a regular flow of peer-reviewed publications
 - c. in professional programs, have an area of specialty that supports and contributes to the students area of study.
2. Teaching-stream faculty may be considered for membership on PhD supervisory committees or involvement with graduate supervision as a secondary supervisor if they have met the criteria above and have experience with the supervision of graduate research papers or master theses.
3. In unique instances teaching-stream faculty may be considered for PhD supervisory status and in this instance approval is required by the AVP/Dean of Graduate Studies.
4. Some teaching-stream faculty have supervisory privileges as they were already members of graduate faculty prior to the teaching-stream appointment and should continue with supervisory privileges in keeping with past experiences.

Issue 5. Integrating into the Faculty complement

Integration of teaching-stream faculty members requires a set of rules and regulations that distinguishes between the tenure-stream and teaching-stream as little as possible. Allowing permanent teaching faculty at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor to serve on departmental and faculty academic assessment committees removes an unnecessary distinction between the two streams. The rationale for this recommendation is as follows:

- By their expertise on teaching, permanent teaching faculty are highly qualified to judge the teaching of their colleagues.
- From their experience with pedagogical research, permanent teaching faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above, are suited to judge the research of their colleagues.

- Teaching-stream faculty being assessed for permanence or promotion should have a member of their direct peer group on the assessment committees.
- The number of permanent teaching faculty members on the assessment committees is limited to a maximum of one to maintain the emphasis on research for tenure-stream faculty.
- The recommendations above specifically call for letters from internal permanent teaching professors in the case of the permanence decision, since teaching professors are suited to judge the teaching quality of their colleagues.
- The modification of the Tenure and Promotion policy to specifically mention including the feedback from the unit where a teaching professor does the bulk of their teaching was done to make sure that all interested stakeholders are included in the process.

Recommendations

1. Allow permanent teaching professors to be on departmental and faculty academic assessment committees. This change would mainly impact two clauses of the Tenure and Promotion policy. The two clauses, and proposed new wording are given below.

Section III, Clause 38 b:

“Normally, only tenured (not including permanent teaching) faculty members should be members of a Departmental Committee. Any departure from this arrangement must receive approval of the appropriate Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee.”

Proposed new wording for Section III, Clause 38 b:

The Departmental Committee consists of tenured and permanent faculty members at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor. Of the Departmental Committee members at most one can be a permanent teaching faculty member.

Section III, Clause 44 b:

“five to eight tenured (not including permanent teaching) members of the full-time faculty (as specified in the Faculty By-laws) elected from those holding the rank of Professor or Associate Professor. ...”

Proposed new wording for Section III, Clause 44 b:

five to eight tenured or permanent teaching members of the full-time faculty (as specified in the Faculty By-laws) elected from those holding the rank of Professor or Associate Professor. Of these, at most one can be a permanent teaching faculty member. ...

2. Modify the Tenure and Promotion policy so that it specifically requires feedback from other teaching professors in the peer assessment for teaching professors being evaluated for permanence. Specifically Section III, Clause 25 b could have the following sentence added at the end:

The peer assessment should include at least two letters from permanent teaching-stream faculty within the University.

Clarify the language in the yellow document requiring T&P committees to include the input of supervisors external to the candidate's home department that supervise a significant portion of the candidate's teaching. The relevant clause from the Tenure and Promotion Policy is:

Section III, Clause 39 a:

"It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that the Departmental Committee considers the case of every member of the Department who is eligible to be considered for re-appointment, tenure, permanence, and/or promotion (see clauses 28 to 35 above). In the case of a faculty member who holds a joint appointment in two or more Departments, the Chairs of the Departments involved shall ensure that the assessment is properly coordinated. In the case of a faculty member who participates in a Program, the Department shall be responsible for carrying out the academic assessment, but the Program Director shall make a written submission to the Departmental Committee (see clause 49(c) below)."

Elsewhere in the Policy the definition of Program is given via:

"'Program' means a Senate-approved, interdisciplinary course of study at the undergraduate or graduate level which is not the sole administrative and academic responsibility of any one Department."

This definition of Program does not include all external "bodies" where a teaching professor might do the bulk of their teaching. For instance, if the teaching professor is teaching in a unit such as Engineering 1. To cover cases such as this, the following wording is proposed.

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that the Departmental Committee considers the case of every member of the Department who is eligible to be considered for re-appointment, tenure, permanence, and/or promotion (see clauses 28 to 35 above). In the case of a faculty member who holds a joint appointment in two or more Departments, the Chairs of the Departments involved shall ensure that the assessment is properly coordinated. In the case of a faculty member who participates in a Program, or does the bulk (greater than 50%) of their teaching in a unit external to their Department, the Department shall be responsible for carrying out the academic assessment, but the Program Director, or head of the external unit, shall make a written submission to the Departmental Committee (see clause 49(c) below).

If the above change is adopted, then similar text will need to be inserted at the locations that currently only mention the Program and Program Director. The impacted clauses include Section III, 49.a and Section III, 49.c

Issue 6. Establishing criteria for hiring, permanence, promotion and merit evaluation

The recognition of two profiles within the teaching-stream appointments – those pursuing excellence in educational leadership and those focusing exclusively on teaching – can clarify any confusion for expectations for hiring, permanence, promotion and merit evaluation.

Importantly, teaching-stream faculty members must be included in the process of evaluation and follow the same expected timelines for promotion as tenure-stream faculty members.

Recommendations

1. Expectations for teaching-stream faculty members must be explicitly made at the time of hiring. As described in Issue 1 and 2, letters of appointment should clearly allocate workload to indicate if the pursuit of excellence in educational leadership is an expectation.

a. Recruitment materials and letters of hire must be clear about the total units of courses to be taught and expectations regarding service, graduate teaching and supervision, and engaging in excellence in educational leadership.

b. If the expectation is not to engage in excellence in educational leadership, there should be a clear statement that the appointee's rank will remain at the assistant professor level.

c. Letters of hire should explicitly state if discipline specific research will be encouraged and considered as evidence of excellence in educational leadership.

d. Retain the procedures for hiring that are consistent with hiring of tenure track (research/teaching) faculty (SPS All).

e. Chairs and directors should periodically review the allocation of workload with the teaching-stream faculty member. At a minimum, this review should happen before renewal to a second 3-year appointment. This review allows for adjustments to be made to align with career goals. For example, an appointment may begin with a workload allocation of 80% teaching and 20% service, and with agreement, switch to 60% teaching, 20% excellence in educational leadership and 20% service.

f. The above recommendations should also be retained when following the procedures for conversion of CLA to Teaching Track which state that conversion will take place in "exceptional circumstances" based on a review of the candidates teaching and research by a department's T&P committee (SPS A 2)

2. Permanent teaching-stream faculty member (Associate and Full) should be eligible for membership on Tenure & Promotion Committees.

In practice, it may be difficult for tenure-stream faculty members alone to evaluate a teaching-stream faculty member's application for permanence or promotion because the normal methods of evaluating faculty (peer reviewed publications, research grants) may not apply in the same way. We recommend including permanent teaching-stream faculty members to improve the quality of evaluations for teaching-stream candidates before Tenure and Promotion Committees to allow for an informed interpretation of excellence in educational leadership.

3. Teaching-stream faculty members should normally follow the same timeline for permanence and promotion as tenure-stream faculty.

a. We recommend removing the phrase that states that promotion and permanence are only granted at the same time in “exceptional cases”. This phrase discourages applicants and needlessly duplicates the effort for both the applicant and the T&P committees. Indeed, candidates pursuing excellence in educational leadership would be expected to meet the requirements of both permanence and promotion. We recommend replacing the phrase with “When a teaching professor has established her/himself as an excellent educator and has a record of excellence in educational leadership, he/she may apply for permanence and promotion to Associate Professor at the same time.”

b. Remove the clause stating that promotion to full professor is “not expected to be the norm”. This phrase is unnecessary if criteria for promotion are clear. It discourages teaching faculty from meeting the requirements for promotion to Full professor.

c. Importantly, an exception to these recommendations are teaching-stream faculty members not engaged in excellence in educational leadership who would be expected to be able to gain permanence but not promotion.

4. Additional suggestions for criteria to consider for Appointment to Permanence, Promotion to Associate Professor, and Promotion to Full Professor are included in Appendix A.

Appendix A

Suggestions for criteria to consider for Appointment to Permanence, Promotion to Associate Professor, and Promotion to Full Professor are included in Appendix A.

1. Appointment to Permanence (T&P 2012 clauses 24, 25, 30)

a. Applications for permanence will proceed in a similar fashion to applications (of research faculty) for tenure.

b. Criteria for awarding Permanence should include:

- The candidate has demonstrated development as a skilled instructor and has demonstrated innovative and creative approaches to education
- The candidate shows leadership capacity
- The candidate shows potential for scholarship and/or pedagogical research (*if the position is designed to include scholarly work*)
- Student evaluations and peer observation may be two of many criteria used for review

2. Promotion to Associate Professor (T&P 2012 Clauses 26 & 35)

a. Applications for promotion will proceed in a similar fashion to research faculty's applications for tenure and promotion.

b. Tenure and Promotion Committees will include a Teaching Professor at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor. When this is not possible, the applicant's material will be reviewed by a faculty member who is a teaching professor.

c. Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor should include

- Excellence in education leadership
 - Skilled teaching and course design
 - Innovative and creative approaches to education
- Demonstrated educational leadership (e.g. mentoring, curriculum committees, interdisciplinary initiatives, committees related to education, membership in national educational bodies, workshops on teaching, conference planning etc.)
- Two external references with one outside the university
- Scholarship
 - Best practice-informed teaching materials, resource design, course design
 - Presentations at conferences related to education
 - Publications related to education
 - Dissemination of educational ideas/ materials (e.g. policy papers, magazine, newspaper, blogs etc.)

- Scholarly Work and/or pedagogical research
- Discipline related research and/or scholarly work that clearly relates to teaching and learning

3. Promotion to Professor (T & P 2012 clause 27)

- a. Applications for promotion to full professor will proceed in a similar fashion to research faculty's applications for promotion to full professor.
- b. Tenure and Promotion Committees will include a Teaching Professor at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor. When this is not possible, the applicant's material will be reviewed by a faculty member who is a teaching professor.
- c. Remove the clause stating that promotion to full professor is "not expected to be the norm"
- d. The applicant will provide evidence of national or international reputation as an educator (e.g. teaching awards, peer reviewed education-related scholarship)
- e. Three external references from outside the university will be required
- f. Criteria for promotion to Professor
 - Excellence in education
 - Outstanding skills in teaching and course design
 - Innovative and creative approaches to education
 - Reputation for educational leadership (e.g. participation on accreditation bodies, consultation regarding educational issues, leadership in educational organizations, mentoring, curriculum development, interdisciplinary initiatives, committees related to education, design and/or organize conferences, institutes, symposia on education etc.)
 - Scholarship
 - Research / Scholarly activities including peer reviewed conference presentations and/or publications
 - Best practice-informed teaching materials, resource design, course design
 - Invited presentations, keynote address, related to education
 - Dissemination of educational ideas/ materials (e.g. policy papers, magazine, newspaper, editorials, reports, blogs etc.)
 - Discipline related research and/or scholarly work that clearly relates to teaching and learning