

Criteria for Reviewing Performance Of Faculty Members

1 Preamble

The mission of La Cité universitaire francophone is to fulfill the university education needs of Saskatchewan's Francophones, whatever their first language. La Cité is charged with a provincial mandate to contribute to the development of the Fransaskois community via university programs, academic and university-community research, student services and university-community initiatives. In this context, La Cité initiates, encourages, develops and supports research and the dissemination of academic work in French on issues of concern to Francophone minority communities. La Cité fosters an accessible and stimulating Francophone environment and living space on the University of Regina campus.

This criteria document has been established in accordance with Section 17.11 of The University of Regina Collective Agreement, which states that the Dean of each Faculty (or Director of each Academic Unit) must establish criteria and procedures to guide performance review. It further states in part: *"When establishing review criteria and procedures, the Dean or equivalent shall consult in committee with the faculty members of the academic unit. The criteria and procedures shall be reviewed from time to time by the Dean through consultation in committee with the members of the academic unit."*

The Collective Agreement stipulates that ongoing performance review is part of an academic career at the University of Regina and faculty members are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with the sections of the Collective Agreement that pertain to performance evaluation.

Effectively applied, performance review is formative. Its purpose is not only to inform career decisions, but to enable those reviewed to develop their skills and move forward professionally. Performance review thus guides career progress through the ranks, and motivates all faculty members to pursue excellence in their assigned duties.

*The English version of this document prevails.

2 Criteria for performance review

The *Collective Agreement* specifies that the duties of a faculty member shall normally include:

- teaching and related duties (hereinafter "teaching")
- scholarship, research, or equivalent professional duties (hereinafter "scholarship")
- participation in collegial governance (hereinafter "administrative duties" and "public service")

All of the above duties are performed in a French and/or bilingual environment. They can also be performed in an interdisciplinary context.

The performance review of those in faculty ranks (Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) focuses on assigned duties in these areas. Though the evaluation of Instructors focuses on teaching and related duties, performance in one or more of the other areas will be regarded as contributory at the member's request.

2.1 Teaching

Teaching duties are assigned by the Associate Director in consultation with faculty members.

Building on this tradition and the criteria laid out in The University of Regina Strategic Plan for Teaching and Learning (January 2013) a set of descriptors is included below. Ideally, teachers at La Cité include many of them in their teaching practice. These criteria are aspirational in nature and their application may vary from one type of course to another.

A. PREPARATION FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOLARLY TEACHING

A good teacher:

- thinks critically about and reflects on their teaching practices and works continuously to improve them
- is well-prepared for their classes
- keeps current with the developments in their field
- informs their teaching by relevant research.

B. EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE COMMUNICATION

A good teacher:

- communicates enthusiasm for the subject and for the task of teaching
- provides conceptually clear and accessible explanation of course content
- actively engages students in the subject and in the classroom
- exhibits flexibility, adjusting well to unexpected questions or new and changing circumstances in the classroom
- recognizes that students have differing strengths and weaknesses. When students are having difficulty grasping new ideas, good teachers adjust their teaching to accommodate and overcome these difficulties
- grades fairly and gives prompt, constructive, and substantial feedback
- uses class time efficiently to guide students to course learning objectives
- encourages interaction and cooperation among students.

C. POSITIVE LEARNING EXPERIENCES & OUTCOMES

A good teacher:

- inspires students to be independent learners
- prepares students to critically evaluate and, when appropriate, assimilate new information and ideas
- develops more sophisticated minds in order to generate higher-level thoughts and actions

- enables students to build on and transfer learning from previous courses and to move quickly into areas of new related content
- enables students to creatively and critically apply problem-solving skills to address unique questions
- structures the teaching/learning environment to enhance the learning process
- has ambitious but reasonable expectations of their students, and communicates these clearly.

D. MENTORSHIP & SUPERVISION

A good teacher:

- motivates students to fully comprehend important issues in their chosen subject(s) of study is approachable, both in the classroom and other appropriate settings (such as office hours)
- treats their students with respect
- guides students in developing independent and creative research projects
- fosters the professional development of their students.

2.1.1 Teaching workload expectations

La Cité has a normal teaching load, which it defines for itself subject to a proviso that it not fall below 9 courses over 2 years for professors and lecturers (all ranks) and 6.0 per year for instructor ranks, without prior written approval from the Director. The Associate Director, in consultation with faculty members, determines the allocation of members' normal teaching load across the full academic year. Faculty members may decide collectively to ask additional teaching of their members to support grad programs or other internal priorities, in which case this additional workload is also to be equitably distributed among all members in the unit.

Members are generally expected to teach their normal teaching load each year. Temporary departures from this pattern (e.g. teaching one extra course in one year, so as to be able to teach one class less in another) can be arranged between the member and the Associate Director, but members seeking longer-term departures should first receive prior written approval from the Director.

2.2 Related duties

2.2.1 Administrative duties

Modern universities involve consultation and committee work at all levels of the organizational structure. Regular attendance at Program and Faculty meetings is expected. Faculty members are also expected to share in the administrative work of the university, as members of committees at the various levels within the university. Expectations relating to the range, weight and level of administrative responsibilities to be assumed will increase as the individual progresses through the ranks. The quality of the contribution, not merely the number of activities, is the important factor. Relevant factors include the scope of the activity (from program-level to international), the weight of responsibility, the leadership activities required or demonstrated, the expertise required, the nature of the assignment (appointed, invited, elected, volunteered), the time commitment, the distinction brought to the unit of the University as a whole, and the relationship of the

administrative duty to the member's role as a faculty member. Effective contributions to the timely and successful completion of administrative tasks including a professional and respectful treatment of both academic and support staff is expected. Administrative and committee work should not be the major factor when making recommendations for promotion, but especially meritorious work of this type should be seen as an important contributing factor. It is the Cité universitaire francophone faculty member's responsibility to take initiative with respect to administrative duties.

2.2.2 Public service

Faculty members are also expected to contribute to broader communities outside the University. This may include national or international academic bodies (e.g. board positions for "learned societies", editorial positions, conference organization, Program review for other universities). It may also include organizations outside academe, as long as the contributions in question utilize members' general or specialized academic expertise and bring good repute to the University. Examples include non-paid consulting work with professional organizations, invited public lectures, media commentary, and assistance to community organizations. Contributions to community organizations that do not make use of the member's scholarly expertise (e.g. coaching soccer), although meritorious in their own right, will not normally be considered to satisfy the requirement for public service. If they so choose, however, faculty members are free to make a case for why their specific efforts should indeed be considered relevant for this purpose. In assessing faculty members' service work, attention will be paid, not just to the number of different forms of contribution, but also to the amount of work each contribution requires. Faculty members will not even be considered for promotion to Full Professor unless they have offered good public service of the kinds just described.

La Cité universitaire francophone takes seriously its commitment to the community, especially the francophone communities of Saskatchewan and the Fransaskois community in particular. Within the framework of public service, La Cité therefore encourages a variety of contributions to the public good with a focus on these communities, flowing from members' expertise and interests. In the review of public service activities, the contribution of La Cité universitaire francophone member's professional expertise and the quality of the contributions will be considered.

2.2.3 Scholarship

Scholarship is part of the duties of faculty members. Faculty members at La Cité are encouraged to disseminate their work in reviewed community-based and scholarly publications. The following is a partial and not exhaustive list of examples of the outcomes of scholarship: refereed journal publications; articles in periodicals; books; monographs; bibliographic studies; translations; edited works; manuals; conference papers; invited reviews of grant applications, manuscripts, and books; novels; plays; poems; stories; public performances; participation in symposia and conferences; reviews of programs, and databases; policy studies; and reports.

In assessing the outcomes of the scholarship of its members, the emphasis will be upon quality as manifested in its importance, originality, erudition, workmanship, reliability or other scholarly virtues. Members are encouraged to aim for clarity and accessibility in their work.

Since evaluation by peers, or others as appropriate, is an integral aspect of scholarship, members need to publish or otherwise disseminate their work in ways that allow for a rigorous evaluation of its quality. (Hereinafter the term "dissemination" shall be used to refer to publication and all its professional equivalents.) Members' own participation in peer review processes shall also be recognized as a valued aspect of scholarship.

La Cité universitaire francophone strongly affirms the value of scholarship that addresses audiences wider than small groups of specialists. Such work does not replace more traditional scholarship, but rather supplements and enriches it by interpreting its meaning and significance for non-specialists. Where the quality of such 'accessible scholarship' is high as defined by the terms in the paragraphs above, it should be evaluated as comparable to peer-reviewed scholarship.

The Performance Review Committee will consider only work disseminated during the period under review. Work that has been completed and accepted but has not yet been disseminated for reasons beyond the control of the member, may be considered upon request by the member. It is each member's responsibility to report work in a way that ensures a given performance is not counted more than once.

Members engaged in long-term projects may request assessment of their scholarship at appropriate intervals. Similarly, the evaluation process should take into account the time required to secure funding from external sources.

2.3 Balance between duties

Members will be expected to make contributions in all of the areas that apply to their category and rank. Although members may choose to place more emphasis on one or another of these areas for some period of time, it will normally be expected that this will be roughly compensated for by focusing on the neglected areas at other times (e.g. professors may place relatively little emphasis on their scholarship during heavy teaching terms, but might devote more time to their scholarship during the summer months). Members who want to alter substantially the overall allocation of their responsibilities should apply to the Director for prior approval.

When faculty members are teaching courses, they are expected to make this their first priority. Scholarship and service duties must take a back seat to the member's duty to provide good-quality instruction, and timely assistance and feedback, to their students. Furthermore, in all ranks members will be expected to place more emphasis on their teaching duties than on their service duties.

La Cité universitaire francophone recognizes that academic members have academic freedom to define their research. There are consequently no specific expectations about how many hours are to be spent in scholarly activities, which hours these are to be, nor where these hours are to be spent. Scholarly work should be done at times that do not conflict with the needs of providing good-quality teaching in the member's assigned courses, or with the member's service commitments. Faculty members can decide how much of their remaining time they choose to devote to their scholarly activities, provided that the resulting scholarly output is sufficient so that their peers can judge that the member is making reasonable progress in this area. If members are uncertain whether their current rate of progress will be considered reasonable, they should seek advice from the Associate Director and/or the Director.

3 Regular performance review process

Members in the Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Instructor I or II ranks follow the performance review process outlined in articles 17.12 to 17.21 of the collective agreement. Any member in a term position also follows the regular performance review process. Members may choose to submit their performance review materials in French or English. Materials are submitted to the Initial Reviewer and evaluated by the Performance Review Committee.

This committee will consist of :

Ex officio	The Director of La Cité, observer only, according to 17.13 of the Collective Agreement
Elected	three faculty members with tenured appointments other than the Initial Reviewer and including at least one Instructor rank and one Professor/Lecturer rank. All committee members and all those voting for committee members shall be URFA faculty members at La Cité employed by the University of Regina. Ideally, no member may serve more than one consecutive two-year term.
External elected	One faculty member with tenured appointment; the Director in consultation with La Cité faculty members will solicit French-speaking faculty members of the University of Regina, who demonstrate an understanding of the unique mandate of La Cité, to allow their name to stand for consideration for membership on the committee. No member may ideally serve more than two consecutive years. If there is more than one candidate for a vacancy, La Cité faculty members will be asked to elect a candidate.

The committee shall, during the first meeting of a given review period, elect a Chair. The Chair shall normally be a non-voting member of the committee. In the event of a tie vote, however, the Chair shall cast the deciding vote.

3.1 Teaching

The evaluation and assessment of teaching are important parts of the performance review process. The Performance Review Committee will treat such evaluations as evidence of student satisfaction, although it is recognized that teaching subject matter that challenges students' own perspectives and underlying understandings of the world sometimes results in less satisfaction. The aims of the assessment and evaluation of teaching performance are:

- to encourage and recognize superior performance in teaching
- to assist members to improve teaching
- to assist in the performance review process.

3.1.1 Student Course/Instructor Evaluations

Evaluations must assure the confidentiality of responses and be obtained at the end of the term in the absence of the faculty member.

Original records of student evaluation belong to the faculty member. Copies of the aggregated and summarized data from a student course evaluation shall reside in the Program office. In compliance with Article 17.4.6 of the *Collective Agreement* members will append copies of the aggregated and summarized data to the Annual Information Form. It is up to each member to decide whether or not to include students' comments in the performance review. If they decide to do so, they must include all comments submitted.

3.1.2 Peer evaluation

Peer evaluations can be carried out by faculty members from their own Program, members from other departments, the Associate Director, the Centre for Teaching and Learning or some combination of these. These evaluations may include: classroom observation, review of course material, student focus groups, and evaluation of methods of delivery.

3.1.3 Teaching dossier

The teaching dossier is the most comprehensive documentation of teaching effectiveness. Teaching dossiers are prepared by faculty members. These dossiers may contain any information and documentation that the faculty member deems important for the evaluation of his/her teaching performance. This dossier should include the numerical results on the course evaluations. It may include any of the following materials that support a case for good teaching:

- teaching philosophy statement
- information on pedagogical strategies used inside and outside the classroom
- samples of student work
- syllabi and representative course materials
- information about course material and delivery
- evidence of mentorship
- evidence of research on teaching and learning
- information about professional development
- evidence of teaching awards
- self reflection on evaluation of teaching styles and strategies
- evidence of effective supervision of graduate and honours students, and membership on thesis and project committees
- evidence of using the results of one's scholarship and research in teaching
- evidence of applying knowledge gained from professional activities to teaching
- student evaluations of teaching
- evaluations conducted by the Associate Director or peers
- copies of relevant teaching materials such as syllabi, examinations, etc.
- evidence of the development of new resources including those in electronic form
- evidence of the development of new courses or new approaches to teaching
- evidence of keeping course content current
- evidence of steps taken to improve teaching and other material a faculty member may wish to submit.
- students' comments on evaluations
- evidence of an experiential approach to teaching

3.2 Scholarship

Faculty members should include evidence of scholarship, including evidence of knowledge dissemination as mentioned in 2.2.3.

3.3 Administrative duties

Faculty members should include evidence of administrative service. Examples can be found in 2.2.1

3.4 Public service

Faculty members should include evidence of public service. Examples of public service can be found in 2.2.2

4 Criteria for promotion and tenure

Those applying for promotion or tenure shall make written application to the Director no later than 30 September. All supporting documentation, including copies of material to be sent to referees, is due in the Office of the Director by that date.

Normally criteria for tenure and promotion include evidence of performance in teaching, research and service. Members who wish to be considered for tenure and promotion based more on either teaching or research shall provide more documentation in their preferred area. Tenured and tenure-track members, though they may place emphasis on one area of their career performance in a given review period, are expected to maintain a well-rounded academic profile, and to fulfill all of the duties corresponding to their appointment category and rank.

Sections 4.1 to 4.4 describe the normal path to promotion and tenure, in which faculty members are expected to provide evidence of good performance in all three areas of performance: teaching, research/scholarship as well as administrative duties and public service. For granting of tenure or promotion to Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor members must indicate in their written application to the Director if they intend to place more weight upon their teaching or their research and less upon the other areas. Members are encouraged to consult with the Associate Director and the Director in advance of making a formal decision.

4.1 TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

To be considered for promotion from Lecturer to the rank of Assistant Professor, the candidate must present a record of successful teaching at all assigned levels and clear evidence of the initiation of a substantive research program. Members are not expected to have made significant contributions to administration or public service, but their contributions in this regard will be valued in the performance review.

4.2 TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

To be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, members must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness at all assigned levels, good-quality scholarship,

dissemination of their work in peer-reviewed outlets or their professional equivalents, substantial investment in scholarship over their academic career, and substantive peer or public responses to their scholarship. A record of administrative contributions (at least some of them outside their own Program) and public service must also be present.

4.3 TO FULL PROFESSOR

To be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, members must demonstrate a record of teaching excellence at all assigned levels and widespread recognition by peers of a significant body of scholarship that has been disseminated in peer-reviewed outlets or their professional equivalents and is of very high quality. Recognition is defined as the extent to which other scholars or the public generally have found the scholarship worthy of mention and made use of it themselves or otherwise demonstrated that they deem it authoritative. Members must also provide evidence of substantial investment in scholarship over their academic career, meaningful participation in the collegial governance of the institution (at the levels of Department or Program, Faculty, and University), and service to the public.

As set out in the *Collective Agreement*, letters of reference, including three from referees proposed by the member and up to a further three solicited by the Director, will be used in the evaluation process. Members shall submit contact information for referees to the Office of the Director by no later than 30 September, on the understanding that the Director will choose the materials to be sent to each referee. Faculty members who want to work with the Director to choose the materials that will be sent to each referee must by 31 October provide the Director's Office with the works to be reviewed.

Materials forwarded to referees will include: those materials submitted by the member for evaluation by referees; a copy of La Cité's *Criteria Document*; and a letter from the Director to the referee requesting the reference and providing a date by which it is required. See *Collective Agreement*.

4.4 GRANTING OF TENURE

The *Collective Agreement* states:

Faculty members with appointments in the faculty, librarian, instructor, or laboratory instructor categories shall be granted an appointment with tenure when there is evidence of consistent performance that has met the standards for their category and rank of appointment through the probationary period (including, in the case of faculty members and librarians, professional growth and development demonstrated by contributions to their discipline and to the University) and where there is promise of future contributions that will enhance the academic reputation of the University.

To be granted tenure, a member must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness at all assigned levels. With the exception of instructors, members must also provide evidence of good-quality scholarship, dissemination of their work in peer-reviewed outlets or their professional equivalents, and substantial investment in scholarship over their academic career. Administrative and public service are considered as contributory.

Procedures for obtaining external references will be the same as those described in the section of promotion to full professor.

Normally, tenure will not be granted if conditions specified at the time of a tenure-track appointment have not been fulfilled.

5 CAREER PLANNING PROCESS

Tenured members at the rank of Professor or Instructor III follow the career planning process outlined in Article 17.2.4 of the Collective Agreement. Every three years, the Director will invite the member to meet for career planning. According to the Collective Agreement, the purpose of the career planning meeting "is to develop the member's goals, recognize the member's achievements, assess the member's performance, and provide feedback on the member's progress towards their career plan." The Associate Director may also be present during this meeting. The career planning meeting shall take place between February 1 and the May 31. The Director will provide the member with at least 30 days' notice for the meeting.

On or before January 31st of the year following the three-year period, the member shall provide to the Director:

- An up-to-date CV;
- A draft career plan for the next three years;
- A copy of the career plan finalized at the previous such meeting, if applicable;
- A letter outlining the member's progress in their career plan, if applicable.

The career plan should clearly set out the member's goals for the next three years in the areas of teaching (e.g., development of new courses, new pedagogical approaches, updates to existing courses, pedagogical training), research (e.g., progress on existing projects, new applications for research grants, publications, partnerships), and administrative service (e.g., committee work, other contributions to collegial governance). In addition, the plan should explain what actions and strategies the member will carry out in order to meet these goals. The career plan is intended to be a practical tool to help the member reach their goals and track progress towards them. The plan should not exceed 4 pages.

At either the Director's or the member's request, the member may undergo the regular performance review process under Article 17.2.2. The deadline for a member to request a regular performance review is September 30th of the review year. The deadline for the Director to inform a member normally subject to the career planning process that they will undergo the regular performance review process is July 1st.

6 SALARY INCREMENTS

6.1 INCREMENTS

An increment will be awarded annually (subject to the ceilings specified in the *Collective Agreement*) in recognition of members meeting the standards for teaching, scholarship, and service appropriate to their rank, level, and assigned duties as outlined above.

It is the member's responsibility to provide appropriate documentation of their contribution. In addition to the teaching materials noted in section 3 above, this documentation may include:

- publications (include offprints);
- list of conference presentations;

- grants and contracts or equivalents;
- applications for external funding;
- equivalent professional activity;
- research plan.

If an increment is not granted, the Director will provide the member with an explanation that will include suggestions for improving performance.

6.2 MERIT

A merit may be granted to members who, given their rank and level, as well as consistently good performance in all areas, clearly exhibit **exceptional service** in one or more of the areas of assigned duty during their review cycle or who have presented evidence of **sustained well-above average** performance in two or more areas of assigned duty.

Members must submit their application for a merit increment to the Performance Review Committee, via the Director's office, by January 31st of the year following the review period for which the merit increment is being sought. The application shall include:

- A letter explaining how the member has met the criteria for exceptional service in one or more areas **or** sustained well-above average performance in two or more areas. The letter shall not exceed two pages;
- An up-to-date curriculum vitae;
- Up to two letters of support for the application (optional).

6.2.1 *Exceptional service*

A member applying for merit on the basis of exceptional service may do so in any year. Examples of exceptional service may include but are not limited to:

- In the area of teaching: receiving a teaching award; outstanding commitment to professional development in the area of teaching; outstanding contribution to course or program development; outstanding pedagogical innovation;
- In the area of research: a publication that receives national or international recognition for its originality, importance, or impact; receiving a research award from a professional association; receipt of a grant of considerable scope, importance, and public profile;
- In the area of administrative service: outstanding contribution to the community at large, for example, the Fransaskois community; outstanding contribution to a campus-wide committee; exemplary leadership at the program or unit level.

6.2.2 *Sustained well-above average performance*

A member applying for merit on the basis of sustained well-above average performance may do so only:

- In years they are being reviewed by the Performance Review Committee, for those in the Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Instructor I and Instructor II ranks.
- During the final year of their three-year career plan, for those in the Professor and Instructor III ranks.
- If it has been at least three years since the member last received a merit increment on the basis of sustained well-above average performance.
- If it has been at least three years since initial appointment, for members who have never received a merit increment.

Applications for merit under this rubric shall take into account the last three years of the member's performance. Examples of sustained well-above average service may include, but are not limited to:

- In the area of teaching: substantial commitment to professional development in the area of teaching; substantial contribution to course or program development; pedagogical innovation;
- In the area of research: a publication that receives recognition for its originality, importance, or impact; receiving a research award; receipt of a grant from a provincial or national funding agency;
- In the area of administrative service: substantial contribution to the community at large, for example, the Fransaskois community; substantial contribution to a unit or campus-wide committee; effective leadership at the program or unit level.

7 SESSIONAL LECTURER REVIEW PROCESS

La Cité universitaire francophone wishes to support the continuous professional development of its Sessional Lecturers. Article 17.23 of the collective agreement outlines a process for the performance review of Sessional Lecturers. A review shall be conducted when:

- Requested in writing by the member;
- Requested in writing by the Associate Director;
- A member has achieved preference and again when a member has achieved priority status at La Cité.

If a member wishes to request a performance review, they must do so in a semester during which they are teaching for La Cité and must provide the Associate Director with written notice by September 15th for the Fall semester; January 15th for the Winter semester; and May 15th for the Spring/Summer semester. If the Associate Director requests that a member be reviewed, the member shall be informed in writing by September 15th, January 15th, or May 15th of the semester during which the Sessional Instructor is teaching a course for La Cité.

Upon achieving preference or priority status at La Cité, members shall be notified by the Associate Director that they will be reviewed in the next semester for which they teach a course for the unit.

Before the end of the semester in question, the Associate Director and the member shall meet to discuss the member's performance. As noted in article 17.23 of the collective agreement, the member "has the right to be accompanied by an academic staff member or Association representative" during the meeting. The member shall be responsible for submitting the following materials at least two weeks before the meeting:

- An up-to-date CV or résumé;
- Samples of course syllabi and other teaching materials;
- If the member wishes to include them, a teaching dossier and/or the report of a peer assessment of teaching.

Student evaluations of teaching, which are collected every semester by La Cité, shall be included in the member's evaluation, as stipulated in article 17.23 of the collective agreement.

Within 30 days of the performance review meeting, the Associate Director will produce a brief report outlining the member's strengths and areas for further development.

APPENDICES

The following supplemental appendices do not form part of the *Criteria for Performance Review* document. They are included for the information of members and for ease of reference.

APPENDIX-A1 GUIDELINES FOR MEMBERS (REGULAR PERFORMANCE REVIEW)

These guidelines are intended to help members prepare the materials sent forward to the Performance Review Committee (PRC) so that a fair and complete assessment of their performance can be made. Recommendations are made on the basis of an assessment of all the material provided. The PRC can ask that more material be provided to it, and has access to information in the member's official file.

1. Ensure that citations of published work are detailed and complete, and include specific page references. Offprints or copies of work published during the period under consideration should accompany the file. In listing published work, place the most recent publications first. Distinguish clearly between refereed and non-refereed publications. If word count is important (for example, in the case of a detailed book review of essay length), mention it. These points become especially important when special consideration (a merit increment or promotion) is sought.
2. If members choose to submit teaching dossiers, the dossiers should be carefully organized and clearly labelled. Section 3.1.3 of the *Criteria for Performance Review* document outlines some of the materials that should be included in teaching dossiers; other relevant material is welcome. In preparing a dossier, remember that judicious selection and careful organization is preferable to submitting reams of material.
3. Student evaluations of teaching should be included in the teaching dossier. If evaluation summaries are included, make clear who (Program support staff, students, oneself) has prepared them. Ensure that original forms are organized and readily available should the PRC wish to see them. Especially when requesting special consideration, members should consider commenting on evaluations in a covering letter or memo, pointing out strengths and addressing concerns noted by students. Bear in mind that student evaluations of teaching are assessed in the broad context of a member's teaching throughout the period under review.
4. It is required that members provide an up-to-date and complete *curriculum vitae* for each performance review.
5. When members make application for a merit increment a letter must be included, stating clearly the grounds on which the application is to be judged. Specific reference to the requirements set out in section 6.2 of the *Criteria for Performance Review* document is essential.
6. Instructors are reviewed on the basis of assigned duties. The onus is on the individual instructor to explain how activities in the period under review, as, for example, scholarship or administrative work, contribute to the performance of teaching and related duties. The PRC is receptive to such explanations.

APPENDIX-A2 GUIDELINES FOR MEMBERS (CAREER PLANNING PROCESS)

These guidelines are intended to help members prepare the materials sent forward to the Director for Career Planning. Members are encouraged to prepare a well-developed and clear Career Plan. This will lay the foundation a fruitful Career Planning meeting.

1. Only submit those materials listed in Section 5 of Criteria Document to the Director for Career Planning.
2. Ensure that citations of published work are detailed and complete, and include specific page references. Offprints or copies of work published during the period under consideration should accompany the file. In listing published work, place the most recent publications first. Distinguish clearly between refereed and non-refereed publications. If word count is important (for example, in the case of a detailed book review of essay length), mention it. These points become especially important when special consideration (a merit increment or promotion) is sought.
3. It is required that members provide an up-to-date and complete *curriculum vitae* for each Career Planning cycle.
4. In stating the member's goals, members are encouraged to consider timelines, achievability, and balance among assigned duties. Members should present a plan that is both reasonably ambitious and achievable.
5. In stating the member's goals, the member should consider how success can be evaluated or measured. The more concrete the goals, the easier it will be to evaluate the relative success of the plan. Clear goals also provide the information needed for the Director to provide meaningful and constructive feedback on the proposed plan.

APPENDIX-A3 GUIDELINES FOR INITIAL REVIEWER

The present guidelines are not meant to be an exhaustive listing of all the factors to be kept in mind by the Initial Reviewer in the evaluation of performance. Their main function is to guide Initial Reviewer to make a fair and complete assessment of academic performance.

1. For the purpose of assessing performance, the relevant review periods are:
 - a. yearly for those in the pre-tenure career phase;
 - b. every three years for tenured members not subject to a career evaluation;
 - c. the full span of the career for those being considered for promotion or tenure.
2. The Initial Reviewer's recommendations should be clearly based on the information available for the period under review. The Initial Reviewer should ensure that members have supplied all pertinent information for the period under review, especially in applications for promotion.
3. In assessments of performance, single-word assessments such as "satisfactory" or "outstanding" are not helpful to the PRC. Several sentences pointing to concrete evidence are, by contrast, most helpful.
4. Recommendations shall bear directly on the performance of the member concerned. In formulating recommendations, the Initial Reviewer shall not use wording that can be interpreted in any way as a comment concerning someone other than the member under review.
5. Recommendations shall not take the form of trade-offs. There shall, for example, be no recommendation that if denied a promotion, a member should be granted tenure. Either one, both, or neither should be recommended.
6. The Initial Reviewer should bear in mind that they can recommend a merit increment for a member who has not applied for one. If this is done, the recommendation is based on the member's performance since the last merit increase, or, if the member has not been awarded merit, since initial appointment. The Initial Reviewer shall draft a letter of no more than two pages to justify their recommendation. The Initial Reviewer should be sure to address directly the grounds on which the nomination is being made. Specific reference to the requirements set out in section 6.2 of the *Criteria for Performance Review* document is essential, and will help the PRC and the Campus Merit committee in its deliberations.
7. It is always useful for the Initial Reviewer to comment on the quality of journals in which the member's work appears, and to situate specific pieces within the member's broader research program.

APPENDIX-A3

GUIDELINES FOR LA CITÉ'S PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The primary tasks of the Performance Review Committee (PRC) are:

- To review the performance assessments and recommendations concerning members on the basis of the information provided to the PRC, and
- To advise the Director with respect to the recommendations by stating its own views and recommendations in writing.

In order to carry out these tasks, the Committee:

- Will review all the material provided by the members under review on their Annual Information Forms and the assessments and recommendations contained in the Performance Review Forms. If the PRC requests more information, the member will be informed of all such requests and responses.
- May solicit comments from the Initial Reviewer in order to clarify the recommendations made by them on the Performance Review Forms, but will not accept new material evidence. If the Initial Reviewer responds, it must be done in writing and the member must be given an opportunity to see and respond in writing to these additional comments.
- May review material contained in a member's official file that is pertinent to the period under review.

In carrying out its function:

- The Committee will maintain strict confidentiality with regard to its review.
- If a member of the Committee has been involved in a prior stage of the review process for any person under review by the Committee, that member will declare this involvement and will recuse herself or himself from the Committee's vote concerning the recommendation for that person.
- If any Committee members (or their partners or family members) are applying for merit, promotion to associate professor, or promotion to full professor, they will recuse themselves from all committee discussions pertaining to the corresponding recognition. So for instance a committee member who has applied for promotion to full professor will not attend any of the meetings at which applications for promotion to full professor are being discussed. Alternate members, if available, will be asked to attend any meetings for which the committee's membership has been temporarily reduced on this account.
- The Committee will be guided in its deliberations by the *Collective Agreement* and by the *Criteria for Performance Review* document of La Cité universitaire francophone.
- The Committee will not consider any information not stated or alluded to in the annual Faculty Information Forms or Performance Review Forms, or not contained in the official file, for the period under review.
- After the Committee has reviewed relevant material, the Initial Reviewer may be called in to meet the Committee for the purpose of clarifying their recommendations. No new material evidence will be considered in this process of clarification.

- The Committee will vote on each recommendation to be made to the Director. The vote will be recorded as yes or no in all cases, other than recusals as provided for above. The Chair shall refrain from voting, except in order to break a tie vote among committee members.
- In addition to providing the Director with the results of its recorded vote, the Committee may provide an account of the reasons for its recommendation, as well as written advice to the member being reviewed.
- The recommendation and any written statement made by the Committee will be entered on the member's Performance Review Form and thus will be available for perusal by the member as outlined in Article 17.14 of the *Collective Agreement*.

After completing the review, the Committee may make recommendations to the Director about matters relevant to the review. It may also propose changes to the *Criteria for Performance Review* document, and its appendices.