

**Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy  
University of Regina Campus**

## **Criteria Document**

**Approved November 15, 2019**

Updated in 2019 to reflect:

- the University of Regina Faculty Association Collective Agreement 2017-2021
- the work of the Criteria Document Committee, 2019
- the comments, corrections and recommendations of faculty members, 2019.

Revised in: November 2019

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREAMBLE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. PURPOSE OF THE CRITERIA DOCUMENT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. PRINCIPLES</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE OF FACULTY COMMITMENTS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.1. Teaching and related duties</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.2. Scholarship, research, and creative or equivalent professional activities</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.3. Service to the school or university</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.4. Contributions to policy debates and public engagement</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.5. Contributions to academic and professional bodies</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4. FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4.1. Promotion and tenure</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1.1. Promotion by rank</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1.1.1. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1.1.2. Promotion from associate professor to full professor</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.1.1.3. Out-of-scope academic administrators who also hold faculty appointments</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.1.2. Tenure</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.2. Renewal of tenure-track appointments</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.3. Increments</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5. PROCEDURES OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix I. Minutes of JSGS Faculty Meeting, University of Regina Campus, [insert date]</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix II. Brief Overview of Procedures of Faculty Performance Review</b>	<b>15</b>

## **PREAMBLE**

In June 2007, the presidents of the University of Regina and University of Saskatchewan signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to create a single graduate school of public policy in Saskatchewan to advance the agenda of research, graduate programming, and outreach in the areas of public policy and public administration. At the institutional level, the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan have expressed continued commitment to overcoming organizational and logistical obstacles to achieve an optimal level of integration in what is a unique collaborative endeavour. The impetus behind the joint school is the conviction that the Province of Saskatchewan deserves an internationally competitive policy school and that we are much more likely to achieve that goal by combining the resources of the province's two universities. Not only does a joint school increase our size and impact, it also merges the complementary strengths of the two institutions. The University of Regina has established strong links to the provincial public service and serves the local community exceptionally well. The University of Saskatchewan draws on a host of policy expertise across a wide range of professional colleges including Law, Agriculture and Bioresources and Medicine.

Since the signing of the MOU, a growing spirit of cooperation and collaboration, coupled with a commitment to balance and equity, has characterized interactions among the component parts of the School: the University of Regina campus, the University of Saskatchewan campus, and Executive Education.

The JSGS conducts its affairs as a single school, with two campuses. While faculty on both campuses are bound by the rules of their home institutions, the School intends to harmonize our standards as much as possible in order to ensure fairness and equity among our faculty at the two campuses.

## **1. PURPOSE OF THE CRITERIA DOCUMENT**

**1.1.** The criteria document supplements, for faculty in the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, the University of Regina URFA Collective Agreement 2017-2021 (the Collective Agreement). It is elaborated, adopted and revised in accordance with the provisions of the Collective Agreement (see Appendix I).

**1.2.** In the context outlined in Article 1.1, the purpose of the criteria document is to:

- a. allow for an (annual) assessment of performance of members of the Faculty Association (URFA) who hold an appointment with the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, in order to recognize faculty members' achievements and areas for development with regard to faculty members' commitments (as defined in Articles 16.1 and 16.2 of the Collective Agreement);
- b. provide a basis for promotion and tenure;
- c. provide a basis for salary increments and merit.

## **2. PRINCIPLES**

### **2.1. Principles of the Collective Agreement**

As per Articles 17.1 of the Collective Agreement, performance reviews are undertaken “to determine whether academic staff members will be granted an increment, merit, promotion, renewal of tenure-track appointments, tenure, and to provide performance guidance to Sessional Lecturers. All involved in the performance review process must undertake their roles seriously and with integrity, ensuring that statements, both verbal and written, refer to aspects of performance, are fair commentary, and are based upon appropriate evaluation of the material specified in Article 17.4.” It is recognized that “the performance review process depends upon honesty, fairness, and confidentiality, and is governed by the principles of natural justice” (Article 17.1).

### **2.2. Scope of the Criteria Document**

The Criteria Document governs those members of URFA who hold an appointment with the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy. It is used to conduct performance reviews.

### **2.3. The Criteria Document serves as a basis for general expectations outside and within the School**

As an academic unit of the University of Regina, the JSGS serves a variety of communities. These communities include: students, the public service, non-profit groups, and society as a whole. In serving the diverse needs of these communities, faculty members are expected to make a variety of contributions. The role that each faculty member should play will depend on how he or she believes he or she can best contribute to the communities served by the JSGS. Even so, JSGS will expect faculty members to contribute to all of the listed areas of faculty commitments (Article 3).

### **2.4. Difference between the notions of ‘Promotion’ and ‘Tenure’**

The notions of ‘promotion’ and ‘tenure’ refer to different processes:

- ‘Promotion’ refers to the action of being raised to a higher position or rank (e.g., being promoted from the rank of assistant professor to the rank of associate professor, or from the rank of associate professor to the rank of professor).
- ‘Tenure’ refers to the granting of an appointment with tenure (e.g., generally, faculty members on a tenure-track apply for tenure and promotion; yet, it is possible to grant an appointment with tenure to a faculty member at a specific rank, without promoting him/her at the same time).

### **2.5. Structure of the Criteria Document**

After a reminder of the history of the JSGS in the Preamble, the first section outlines the purpose of the Criteria Document. Section 2 clarifies the principles of the Criteria Document. Section 3 focuses on a series of faculty commitments that are expected from faculty members in the JSGS. Section 4 details acceptable evidence of faculty commitments that must be used in the Faculty Performance Review (Section 5). Section 6 reminds the procedures applicable to the Faculty Performance Review. Appendix I refers to the Collective Agreement, while Appendix II refers to the formal approval of the Criteria Document by JSGS-UofR Faculty.

### **3. ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE OF FACULTY COMMITMENTS**

As per Article 16.2.1 of the Collective Agreement, the responsibilities of a faculty member shall normally include: teaching and related commitments (see Article 16.2.2 of the Collective Agreement); scholarship, research or equivalent professional commitments (see Article 16.2.3 of the Collective Agreement); and service performed both within the University community and to the external communities (see Article 16.2.4 of the Collective Agreement).

Stemming from these three areas of duties, there are three categories under which a candidate for tenure or promotion is to be evaluated at the JSGS-UofR.

Acceptable evidence for each category of faculty commitments is outlined in this section, and includes acceptable evidence for:

1. teaching and related duties (3.1),
2. scholarship, research and creative or equivalent professional activities (3.2),
3. service:
  - a. service to the school or university (3.3),
  - b. contributions to policy debates and public engagement (3.4), and
  - c. contributions to academic and professional bodies (3.5).

#### **3.1. Teaching and related duties**

3.1.1. The JSGS is a graduate school, which necessitates that all faculty engage effectively in lecturing, leading seminars, research supervision and graduate examination. Participation of faculty in graduate student teaching, supervision, and/or thesis committees is required as part of assigned duties and should be documented and assessed in the teaching dossier. Effective teaching is understood as a set of skills that is developed and established over a faculty member's career.

3.1.2. As per Article 16.2.2 of the Collective Agreement, teaching, instructional activities, and related duties shall include:

- contributing to the creation, content, implementation and delivery of graduate and undergraduate academic courses;
- being accessible to students for consultation and mentorship;
- the teaching component associated with the supervision of students; and
- all other activities in which members engage to prepare, deliver, and support the curriculum.

3.1.3. As per Article 17.18 of the Collective Agreement, student course/instructor evaluations do not constitute unequivocal measures of teaching effectiveness and may only be used as part of a more comprehensive teaching evaluation system which may include other measures of student impact, peer evaluation, and reflective thought from the member.

In this context, acceptable comprehensive evidence of teaching, instructional activities and related duties may include, but is not limited to:

- Evaluation by Peers: peer evaluation will embrace the various aspects of teaching, e.g., classroom performance, the quality of examinations, course outlines and course materials, syllabi, reading materials, reading lists, laboratory manuals, workbooks, and classroom assignments. All peer evaluations will culminate in a written assessment. If senior colleagues make visitations to classrooms as part of the determination of a colleague's delivery, rapport, attentiveness and responsiveness to students, the written assessment will specify the teaching roles being performed.
- Evaluation by Students: as per Article 17.18 of the Collective Agreement, considering that student evaluations do not represent unequivocal methods of teaching effectiveness and may only be used as part of a more comprehensive teaching evaluation system, the following methods of undergraduate and graduate student evaluation will be acceptable:
  - Written appraisals from students, obtained by the Dean (understood in this document as the Executive Director or the Director), for courses taught online and on campus. If based on a specific course, the number of students enrolled in that course will be provided.
  - Official students' evaluations will take place for all the regularly scheduled courses taught by the candidate. Results of the questionnaire will include the enrolment in the course and the number of completed evaluations received. When the information from student course/instructor evaluations is used, it will be in an aggregated or summarized form. Anonymous student comments gathered in the course/instructor evaluation process need not be included in the aggregated or summarized forms. It is the faculty member's choice to provide students' comments, but if they choose to do so, they must provide the complete set of students' comments from the course.
  - Moreover, an academic staff member who does not wish to use the form that is in current use may make a written proposal to the Dean suggesting an alternative method of student course/instructor evaluation.
- Reports of courses taught including online or on campus, enrolments for those courses, learning objectives and contact hours;
- Graduate supervision (as supervisor or committee member);
- Support for students' academic and professional endeavours, including serving as a reference and mentor for student applications for employment, further professional or education opportunities, or scholarships.
- Engagement with teaching and research assistants;
- Instructional videos or electronic teaching tools (e.g., case studies) developed;
- Development of new courses;
- Development of directed readings;
- Development of innovative and original teaching methods (i.e., 'innovative and original' in the sense that the instructor develops and includes teaching methods that are new to her/him);
- Preparation of new teaching materials (e.g., new case studies);
- Evaluations by the Teaching Development Centre (TDC) and evidence of steps taken to improve teaching skills;
- Course outlines, and course examinations;
- Reflective thoughts from the member; and
- Other relevant course materials.

The list above is represented in no particular order and is not meant to prioritize one example over another, with the exception of quantitative student evaluations that must be provided by the faculty member in her/his case file, as per Article 17.18 of the Collective Agreement.

### **3.2. Scholarship, research, and creative or equivalent professional activities**

3.2.1. Research and scholarly work directly related to public policy and/or public and health administration are expected of all faculty members. For the purposes of this document, and for faculty evaluated under this category, research and scholarly work is intellectual work which is in the public realm and which has been subjected to external peer review.

External peer review is normally undertaken at arms-length to the author, the author's close collaborators and research program and the JSGS. There is a wide range of appropriate methods of peer evaluation—candidates should specify the nature of peer review of their work in their case file (e.g. who, how).

Scholarship in the JSGS involves efforts to contribute new knowledge, and to contribute to the scholarly dissemination of knowledge among scholars and professionals. In general, knowledge is expected to be disseminated primarily in an external peer reviewed medium acceptable to the faculty member's area.

Although academic disciplines may differ in the avenues for publication or presentation of scholarly activity, the primary evidence in this category is publication in reputable external peer-reviewed outlets.

3.2.2. Evidence of contribution and/or dissemination of external peer reviewed knowledge includes, but is not limited to:

- books;
- journal articles;
- book chapters;
- encyclopedia chapters;
- textbook chapters;
- edited books or journal issues;
- published conference proceedings;
- presentations at scholarly conferences;
- invited published lectures;
- working papers in established series;
- think tank and other publications;
- commissioned reports for federal and provincial governments;
- case studies.

Superior contributions in this area will be recognized as a factor in assessing faculty members' overall performance. However, contributions of this type cannot on their own provide a basis for renewal of tenure-track appointments, granting a continuing appointment, career growth increments, or promotion.

3.2.3. In addition to external peer reviewed outlets, members of the JSGS may disseminate knowledge via such media as practitioner journals (which often are not peer-reviewed) and reports which are widely disseminated and which demonstrate the application of scholarship.

3.2.4. Application for external research funding is required for tenure or promotion at all levels. Tri-Council, other nationally or internationally peer-reviewed grants, and industrial or government contracts are examples of acceptable research funding.

Nonetheless, at the point of application for promotion to professor, the candidate should normally have been awarded at least one external grant. The candidate should specify in the case file the nature of their attachment, contribution and outputs of all grant(s).

### **3.3. Service to the school or university**

3.3.1. Faculty members are expected to take part in the administrative aspects of the JSGS and University of Regina as a whole. Willingness to accept a fair share of responsibility for administrative and committee work (unless exempted by special written arrangements with the Dean) is a factor regarding promotion and tenure decisions. Superior contributions in this area will be recognized as a factor in assessing a faculty member's overall performance.

3.3.2. Expectations relating to the range, weight, and level of administrative responsibilities to be assumed will increase as the individual progresses through the ranks. Quality of contributions to the academic unit, not merely the number of activities, is the more important factor.

3.3.3. At the point of application for tenure as assistant professor, tenure as or promotion to associate professor, or tenure as or promotion to professor, acceptable evidence of service, including a fair and reasonable contribution at the program or school or university levels, is required. As outlined in Article 4.3.3, it is understood that the expectation of "a fair and reasonable contribution" generally increases as the individual progresses through the ranks.

### **3.4. Contributions to policy debates and public engagement**

3.4.1. All Candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate a willingness to participate in public policy debates in the School, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada and/or globally. It is important that members of the JSGS earn the respect of the communities, professional and otherwise, they serve. This can be done through professional and management service, as well as community service. Faculty members are expected to participate in learned, professional, and/or public/private organizations appropriate to their discipline and capacity.



Public engagement is important for furthering the JSGS and University's mandates. Faculty members' contributions in this area are expected to vary widely, depending upon the particular skills and interests of each member. Activities that involve the extension of scholarly or practical research expertise into public engagement are particularly valuable.

3.4.2. Evidence of policy debates and public engagement may include, but is not limited to:

- Participation on local, provincial, or national committees or governing bodies;
- Engagement with traditional media outlets;
- Promotion of research, and engaging in research-informed commentary using social media;
- Serving on an expert panel or serving as an expert witness;
- Discipline-relevant volunteer work;
- Consulting and policy advising;
- non-peer-reviewed publications, and
- public lectures and public presentations.

### **3.5. Contributions to academic and professional bodies**

3.5.1. As a professional school, it is important for the JSGS faculty to be engaged in the public policy profession.

3.5.2. Expectations vary depending on the rank:

- At the point of application for tenure as associate professor, the candidate must have demonstrated willingness to contribute to the work of appropriate academic or professional bodies (e.g., being engaged in the committee work of an academic or professional body),
- At the point of application for tenure as professor, the candidate shall have contributed to the work of appropriate academic or professional bodies.

3.5.3. Significant involvement in professional and management service may, with written approval of the Dean, reduce expectations regarding scholarly activities.

3.5.4. Service as an external examiner; professional adjudicator or consultant; referee, editor, or advisor of scholarly journals; or referee for SSHRC, CIHR or another major external granting agency will be deemed significant. Such activities may also include leading workshops and clinics organized by our Executive Education unit or by other external organizations.

3.5.6. Superior contributions in this area will be recognized as a factor in assessing faculty members' overall performance. However, contributions of this type cannot on their own provide a basis for renewal of tenure-track appointments, granting a continuing appointment, career growth increments, or promotion.

## 4. FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

As per Article 17.1 of the Collective Agreement, performance review is used to determine whether academic staff members will be granted promotion (4.1.1), tenure (4.1.2), renewal of tenure-track appointments (4.2), and an increment (4.3).

Evaluation of staff involves assessment of contributions in each of these categories.

It is understood that these categories of assessment are not absolute, but rather relative to the rank and career stage in question.

The evaluation of each category will result in one of three measures of performance (summarized in Table 1):

- a. exceeds the standards, i.e., *superior*, which means that commitments exceed normal expectations;
- b. meets the standards, i.e., *commendable*, which means that valued and proficient commitments meet normal expectations;
- c. does not meet the standards, i.e., *unsatisfactory*, which means that performance does not meet expectations; in need of faculty support.

**Table 1. Measures of performance**

<b>Measure of performance</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Exceeds the standards (superior)	Commitments exceed normal expectations.
Meets the standards (commendable)	Valued and proficient commitments meet normal expectations.
Does not meet the standards (unsatisfactory)	Performance does not meet expectations; in need of faculty support.

Academic staff whose duties and workloads are not consistent with institutional norms should have such assignments agreed to in writing by the Dean of the JSGS.

### **Faculty commitments to evaluate**

Each candidate will be evaluated for all categories that are applicable to the candidate's position and to the tenure or promotion decision under consideration.

A candidate for tenure or promotion must meet the standards in each category.

A superior performance in one category does not compensate for failure to meet the standards in another category.

## **Importance of faculty commitments for the granting of tenure**

As outlined in Article 3, a candidate for tenure will be evaluated in each of the five categories:

- teaching and related duties,
- scholarship, research and creative or equivalent professional activities,,
- service:
  - service to the school or university,
  - contributions to policy debates and administration,
  - contributions to academic and professional bodies.

Furthermore, as per Article 18.6 of the Collective Agreement, academic staff members with appointments in the faculty or 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.

## **Evaluation for promotion**

Promotion through the ranks requires a judgement of performance against increasing expectations for effectiveness in teaching, significance of the scholarly work, practice of a profession, and contributions to service within and outside the University community. With respect to teaching, research and scholarly work, candidates for promotion must have maintained and extended their knowledge of the discipline or field.

## **4.1. Promotion and tenure**

As a single School with two campuses, the JSGS is committed to equitable treatment of its faculty. When faculty at JSGS-UofR are being evaluated for tenure or promotion, the JSGS-UofR may appoint one member of the JSGS-UofS faculty as a non-voting member of the tenure or promotion committee.

Normally, the candidate for tenure or promotion must have a PhD or disciplinary equivalent, or in special areas and appointments, there should exist the commitment to complete a doctoral program. The credentials for appointment must be documented in the letter of appointment. The JSGS may accept other equivalent credentials (e.g. J.D. or LL.M), which must be laid out in the letter of appointment of the faculty member.

As per Article 3, there are five categories under which a candidate for tenure or promotion is to be evaluated.

### **4.1.1. Promotion by rank**

#### ***4.1.1.1. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor***

This promotion will normally, but not necessarily, accompany the granting of a tenured appointment (i.e., for the granting of a tenured appointment, the faculty member must also apply for tenure). The granting of

this promotion signals peer affirmation of an assured place in the community of scholars.

The faculty member should receive ‘commendable’ evaluations or better in each of the faculty commitments.

For the award of promotion to associate professor to be recommended, there must be compelling evidence of significant achievement in scholarly activity beyond that demonstrated at appointment and beyond that expected for the rank of Assistant Professor. Candidates will demonstrate through refereed publications or performances or exhibitions that the results of their research, scholarly or artistic work have made a contribution sufficient to be recognized by colleagues in their field in other parts of Canada or internationally. There must also be evidence of a program of research or scholarship, clearly defined and executed by the candidate, and a positive indication that the candidate will maintain activity in research and scholarly work. Application for external research funding is required for tenure or promotion to Associate Professor. Tri-Council, other nationally or internationally peer-reviewed grants, and industrial or government contracts are examples of acceptable research funding.

For promotion to the Associate rank, the candidate will be evaluated by colleagues in the School. As per Article 17.18 of the Collective Agreement, the candidate will provide supporting documentation, and other relevant evidence for the purposes of this assessment.

#### ***4.1.1.2. Promotion from associate professor to full professor***

This promotion represents the crowning achievement of a faculty member within the community of scholars. For this reason, the faculty member’s entire academic career shall be taken into account.

The faculty member should receive ‘commendable’ evaluations or better in each of the faculty commitments.

For the award of promotion to be recommended, there must be compelling evidence of significant achievement in scholarly activity beyond that demonstrated at appointment and beyond that expected for the rank of Associate Professor. Candidates will demonstrate, through publications in reputable, peer reviewed outlets or through peer reviewed performances or exhibitions, that the results of their research have made a contribution to the field of specialization, sufficient for this contribution to be recognized as substantial by authorities in the field in other parts of Canada and other countries as appropriate. There must also be evidence of leadership in the establishment and execution of a clearly defined program of research or scholarship and a positive indication that the candidate will maintain activity in research and scholarly work. Candidates will also have participated in the supervision of graduate students in the School programs.

At the point of application for promotion to professor, the candidate must have been awarded at least one external grant or contract. Tri-Council, other nationally or internationally peer-reviewed grants, and industrial or government contracts are examples of acceptable research funding.

#### ***4.1.1.3. Out-of-scope academic administrators who also hold faculty appointments***

The University of Regina Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Article 100.15 entitled “Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of those in Out-of-Scope Academic Administrative Positions” and the criteria outlined in this Faculty’s criteria document will be applied in consideration of the awarding of promotion, tenure, merit, and CGI to those out-of-scope academic administrators who also hold faculty appointments.

#### **4.1.2. Tenure**

Academic staff members shall be granted tenure when there is evidence of consistent performance that has met the standards for the category and rank of appointment through the probationary period including, in the case of faculty members, professional growth and development. This may be 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, contribute to the field of education and foster reciprocal relationships with local/national/international societies (see Article 18.6).

For tenure (unless tenure is a condition of appointment) and/or promotion, the quality of research, scholarly and/or artistic work will be assessed by at least three senior academics drawn from comparable institutions. The senior academics will be determined as follows: faculty member will submit a list of at least six senior academics, from which at least three will be selected by the Dean.

### **4.2. Renewal of tenure-track appointments**

As per Article 18.5 of the Collective Agreement, tenure-track appointments shall be renewed when academic staff members have performed their duties in a satisfactory manner and it is deemed that they should be given a further opportunity to progress towards a tenured appointment. In this context, ‘satisfactory manner’ means that evidence of commendable performance exists, in accordance with the individual's rank and position, and where it is judged that appropriate progress is being made with respect to any special conditions attached to the appointment.

### **4.3. Increments**

As per Article 18.2 of the Collective Agreement, an increment will be awarded on the basis of commendable performance in keeping with the individual's rank and position. It should also be noted that non-performance (i.e., an ‘unsatisfactory’ evaluation) in any of the four general assessment areas shall constitute grounds for not awarding an increment; it shall also involve increased support for the person ranked in this way.

## **5. PROCEDURES OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

Please see URFA Collective Agreement 2017-2021 for the complete procedures regarding Faculty Performance Review.

## **Appendix I. Minutes of JSGS Faculty Meeting, University of Regina Campus, November 15, 2019.**

The University of Regina Faculty adopted, by an electronic vote the *University of Regina Johnson Shoyama Graduate School Criteria Document* unanimously on November 15, 2019. The Criteria Document will be effective January 1, 2020.

## Appendix II. Brief Overview of Procedures of Faculty Performance Review

### DISCLAIMER

The tables below provide a handy overview of the procedures of faculty performance review. However, they are not exhaustive, as some provisions are omitted. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that faculty members read in its entirety the URFA Collective Agreement 2017-2021 for the complete procedures regarding Faculty Performance Review.

<b>Deadlines</b>	<b>Tenure Track (Article 17)</b>
December 15	Tenure Track members <i>Annual Information Form</i> and supporting documentation due. Review will be based on documentation outlined in Article 17.4
	Initial Reviewer completes the <i>Annual Performance Review Form</i> and makes a recommendation. Initial Reviewer meets with tenure track staff members. The Initial reviewer communicates their recommendation in writing to the staff member. Academic Staff member will sign the APF.
	Academic Staff Member has 7 days to add clarifying information.
	Peer Review Committee meets and makes a recommendation. The committee shall provide a written recommendation on renewal of appointment, the rationale for its recommendation, comments on the member's performance, and suggestions to the member on steps to be taken for progress towards tenure and/or promotion. Peer Review Committee Chair will communicate their recommendation to the Dean.
	The academic staff member shall be given an opportunity to see the performance review form after the Review Committee has made its recommendation.
	Dean shall in writing invite those being reviewed to peruse their forms and invite them to schedule a meeting to discuss their forms and upcoming career progress decision by the Dean. Member has 7 days to respond to the invite.
	Following the initial meeting the member has 7 days for further consultation and to attach a special submission.
March 31	Tenure track academic staff members to be informed concerning renewal of appointment.
	<b>Tenure and Promotion (Article 17)</b>
September 30	Notification in writing to the Dean for applications for Tenure, Promotion. Applicants will supply the names and contact information of at least 3 referees by September 30.
October 31	Supporting documentation for tenure and promotion applications shall be submitted no later than October 31. Tenure and Promotion performance review shall cover the member's entire career. (Article 17.4 and 17.5)
	Faculty Review Process follows as outlined in Article 17.12 to 17.21
	In the matter of Promotion the recommendation of the Campus Promotion Committee shall be communicated in writing to the Dean. The Dean will inform the Academic Staff member of the decision.
	The member will have 7 days following receipt of the Committee's recommendation to submit a response to the Dean.
March 31	Academic staff members to be informed concerning granting of tenure

	<b>Term and Tenured Members (Article 17.7)</b>
January 31	Deadline for academic staff members with term or tenured appointments (other than those in the career planning process), to submit their, <i>Annual Information Form</i> and supporting documentation. Tenured Faculty are reviewed every 3 years, but they must complete the <i>Annual Information Form</i> and submit a CV every year.
	Tenured Faculty are reviewed every 3 years, according to the process outlined in Article 17.12 to 17.21
	<b>Applications for Merit (Article 18.3)</b>
January 31	Deadline for applications for Merit. Applications shall take the form of a letter, maximum two pages, outlining how the member has met the criteria for merit as specified in the relevant Criteria Document. Two letters of support may be submitted (not a requirement). All applications will be accompanied by a current CV. Academic staff members may, in any year, apply for Merit on grounds of <b>exceptional performance as defined in the relevant Criteria Document</b> for the corresponding rank and category. Academic staff members may apply for merit on grounds of sustained well-above average performance only in years in which they are being reviewed. <b>Above average sustained performance as defined in the relevant Criteria Document</b> for the corresponding rank and category.
	Peer Review Committee will review all Merit applications and decide whether or not to recommend the granting of merit to the Campus Merit Committee. The Review Committee will provide the member with a written rationale outlining how the criteria for merit has or has not been met, with a copy to the Dean.
	The Dean will forward to the Campus Merit Committee all Merit applications and nominations along with the accompanying CV and written rationales.
	The Campus Merit Committee will consider all applications and nominations for merit and decide whether or not to grant merit. The Committee will inform Merit applicants and nominees of its decision in writing.
	<b>Career Planning (Article 17.2.4)</b>
Between January 1 and June 30 Every three years	Unless a performance review is requested by either the member or the Dean in accordance with Article 17.2.2, tenured academic staff members holding the rank of Professor shall meet once every three years with their Dean for career planning. The career planning process serves as a replacement for the regular performance review process. The documents to be provided by members in career planning are an updated CV, a draft career plan, career plans finalized at the previous such meeting and a letter outlining the member's progress in their career plan.
<b>June 30</b>	Deadline for academic staff members to be informed about granting of increments, merit, and promotion.

**References:**

URFA Collective Agreement 2017-2021 – Performance Review Articles 16, 17 and 18.  
Appendix D, *TIMELINES* from URFA Collective Agreement 2017-2021.