

GUIDE TO EVALUATION - NEW TENURE REVIEW

Last Updated: March 2019

In the event there is a conflict between the contents of this Guide and a collective agreement provision, the collective agreement provision is the authoritative source for the information.

Article 5A applies to pre-tenure faculty members who are hired on July 1, 2015 or later and pre-tenure faculty members who are hired before July 1, 2015 and who elect prior to April 1, 2017 to have their tenure review conducted under the terms of Article 5A. These faculty members are subject to the “New Tenure Review System” found in Article 5A.10 and 5A.11.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| SECTION 1: PROVISIONS APPLYING TO BOTH THE DEC AND THE FTC | 4 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 4 |
| 1.2 Some Basic Principles | 4 |
| 1.3 Transparency and Fairness | 5 |
| 1.4 Conflict of Interest | 5 |
| 1.5 Confidentiality | 6 |
| 1.6 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion | 6 |
| 1.7 Respect | 7 |
| 1.8 Criteria for Tenure | 8 |
| 1.9 Tenure is not Hiring | 8 |
| 1.10 Tenure is not Promotion | 8 |
| 1.11 Academic Freedom | 9 |
| 1.12 Modifications to a Committee's Composition | 9 |
| 1.13 Responsibilities of the Pre-tenure Faculty Member | 9 |
| SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES AND EXAMPLES | 10 |
| 2.1.1 Teaching (Article 10.12) | 11 |
| 2.1.2 SRC (Article 10.13) | 13 |
| 2.1.3 Service (Article 10.14) | 15 |
| 2.2 Assessments | 16 |
| 2.2.1 Teaching Assessments (Article 5A.5 & 10.12) | 16 |
| 2.2.2 Year-end Assessment Reports (Article 5A.6.A-E) | 18 |
| 2.2.3 Intermediate Review (Article 5.A.9) | 19 |
| 2.2.4 Normal Tenure Review (Article 5A.10) | 20 |
| 2.2.5 Final Tenure Review (Article 5A.10.J) | 24 |

| | |
|---|----|
| SECTION 3: SAMPLE TENURE LETTERS | 25 |
| Sample tenure letter #1: Bill Gates (normal positive) | 25 |
| Sample tenure letter #2: June Callwood (strong positive) | 26 |
| Sample tenure letter #3: Charles Darwin (positive split) | 29 |
| Sample tenure letter #4: Frank Gehry (negative split) | 30 |
| Sample tenure letter #5: Joan Robinson (Positive but Uneven) | 33 |
| Sample tenure letter #6: Florence Nightingale (Negative) | 35 |

SECTION 1: PROVISIONS APPLYING TO BOTH THE DEC AND THE FTC

1.1 Introduction

This guide deals with the responsibilities that departmental and faculty tenure committees have to pre-tenure faculty members, as agreed to by the Ryerson Faculty Association and the Administration.

The Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC) is a department-level committee, while the Faculty Tenure Committee (FTC) is a faculty-level committee.

In their teaching assessments, their annual assessment reports and their intermediate reviews, DEC's provide valuable feedback to pre-tenure faculty members; feedback intended to help them develop the strongest case for tenure that they can. In tenure assessments, DEC's and FTC's exercise critical academic judgment in advising the Administration with respect to what is, after the hiring decision itself, the most important decision that the University makes.

The FTC receives tenure recommendations from the DEC's, and in turn makes tenure recommendations to the Vice-Provost, Faculty Affairs (VPFA). It monitors the recommendations of DEC's to assure that they are fair and that due process has been followed; it ensures that standards within the faculty are roughly comparable, and it assesses the tenure material and makes its own recommendations to the VPFA with respect to tenure.

While there may be disagreements between committee members, between committees, and/or between committees and the Administration, the process is a deeply consultative and cooperative one, in which each person takes his or her responsibilities seriously, and brings to bear his or her best academic judgment. In any case, should a disagreement within any of the committees take place, votes (without names) and an explanation of the disagreement are to be submitted with tenure recommendations.

In order for the process to be valid and defensible, it is important that all the steps in the Collective Agreement be followed, and for the process to be consistent with institutional, faculty, department and discipline-specific expectations.

1.2 Some Basic Principles

The DEC and FTC tenure process should be guided by academic values and assessments and the following principles. It should be fair, transparent and understandable. DEC and FTC members are accountable for their roles in the process.

The transfer to tenure is not automatic and requires significant achievements on the part of the pre-tenure faculty member. Nevertheless, it is the goal of the institution and its members that pre-tenure faculty members be successful and be awarded tenure. The University makes its initial hiring decision with every expectation that the member will have a successful academic career. The University and its members have an obligation to help pre-tenure faculty members on their way to achieving tenure.

The tenure process is outlined in Article 5A of the Collective Agreement and clarified here. This article should be drawn to the attention of every pre-tenure faculty member. Accordingly, DEC and FTC members should familiarize themselves with Article 5A.

When departments and faculties have specific expectations with respect to the tenure process, these expectations must be compatible with Article 5A and must be communicated to the pre-tenure faculty members in a timely manner so that they are able to meet those expectations.

At all stages of a member's probationary period, evaluations should be clear and informative, and should be consistent with previously established expectations.

DEC and FTC members understand that they have a trust from their colleagues and from the University as a whole and that their recommendations are to reflect that trust; accordingly, committee members must make their assessments and recommendations in ways that are objective, fair and equitable. If a committee member feels unable to provide this level of objectivity, s/he should recuse herself or himself from the committee.

Pre-tenure faculty members have the right, provided for in the Collective Agreement, to respond to assessments at any stage.

While the DEC and the FTC make recommendations, not final decisions, with respect to tenure, their recommendations carry significant weight.

1.3 Transparency and Fairness

The tenure review process has clear and comprehensive procedures outlined in Article 5A of the Collective Agreement and clarified here. These procedures should be made available to all pre-tenure faculty members.

When assessing pre-tenure faculty members, the DEC should provide clear and informative written evaluations and communicate any concerns as early in the process as possible.

Article 5A provides pre-tenure faculty members with the opportunity to respond to evaluations. This allows the pre-tenure faculty member to clarify any misunderstanding that s/he perceives and will assist in ensuring that the pre-tenure faculty member has a clear understanding of expectations and is on track in meeting his/her tenure requirements.

1.4 Conflict of Interest

Committee members must disclose if there is a real or perceived conflict of interest with respect to any candidate being considered (see Article 21 of the Collective Agreement). A conflict of interest arises when a member is placed in a situation in which his or her personal or financial interests, or the interests of an immediate family member or of a person with whom there exists, or has recently existed, an intimate relationship, conflict with his or her responsibilities to the University.

Beyond the obvious personal or financial conflicts, examples may include situations where the member has acted as an academic supervisor of the applicant or where the member has collaborated with the applicant on a research project or business venture.

The existence of a conflict does not necessarily preclude the member's participation on the committee.

1.5 Confidentiality

Committee members will have access to a variety of confidential material and must therefore be bound by the requirements of confidentiality necessary for the proper functioning of the committees and for the protection of the interests of the candidates. In particular:

- Committee members will have access to documents in the Performance and Conduct Files (PCFs) of the candidates. This material should only be shared or discussed with other committee members.
- Committee members will become aware of the perceptions, assessments and views of other committee members concerning the candidates. These should only be discussed with other members of the committee, so as to sustain an atmosphere in which free exchange of opinion is possible and the dignity and integrity of colleagues are maintained.

Some discussions, such as defining the committee's mandate and understanding expectations within the department or school, are not deemed to be confidential.

If the need arises, committee members may wish to consult with the Administration, with the Human Resources Management Consultant and/or with the Association. Such consultations are not violations of confidentiality. However, the individuals so consulted are themselves bound by confidentiality.

On occasion, committee deliberations and recommendations may need to be reviewed by the University or by an external body. In such circumstances members should provide all relevant material in their possession including personal notes to the University upon request. To facilitate this, members of DEC's and FTC's should keep these documents for one year after the completion of their term on the committee. For privacy reasons, this material should be disposed of securely after that period unless notified otherwise by the University.

1.6 Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Equity: The University is committed to an environment that respects equity, diversity and inclusion. The University shall hire and make employment and promotion decisions on the basis of qualifications and merit and, within this context, the University shall make proactive efforts to increase the participation from groups that have been historically disadvantaged and marginalized, including First Nations, Metis and Inuit peoples, Indigenous peoples of North America, racialized persons, persons with disabilities, and those who identify as women and/or

2SLGBTQ+. (This is from Ryerson's approved Equity Statement that is displayed on job postings)

When making an appointment to the DEC, the Chair/Director shall take into account the University's equity, diversity and inclusion obligations, including those concerning designated groups, and/or the need to broaden the areas of expertise represented within the Committee.

In addition, the committees are to be aware of equity, diversity and inclusion when making their recommendations.

As examples (and this is far from an exhaustive list) committees may find it appropriate to consider the following:

- Research related to a particular group or community may be most appropriately published in outlets not appropriate for other sorts of research.
- Voice and authority in the classroom may reflect cultural, gender and identity differences.
- Communication styles may vary depending upon culture, gender and other identities.

Accommodation: Accommodation includes and integrates persons with disabilities into employment activities in a manner that respects their dignity, autonomy and self-esteem. The committees are to ensure that pre-tenure faculty members are not disadvantaged because they have sought or require accommodation.

Human Rights (no discrimination): The University is committed to fostering an environment that is free of discrimination and harassment and in which all people are treated with respect and dignity. There shall be no discrimination with respect to the prohibited grounds (race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, record of offences, marital status, family status, disability, same-sex partnership status and gender identity).

It is especially important to remember that a pre-tenure faculty member's access to leaves (such as maternity, parental and sick leave) accorded to them under the Collective Agreement and protected under provincial and federal legislation does not bias the tenure assessment and that pre-tenure faculty members are not expected to continue working while on these leaves.

1.7 Respect

It is critical that when providing feedback and making assessments, the committees be constructive and respectful of the pre-tenure faculty member. Committees should focus on the performance of the members and not on personal traits, characteristics and other personal descriptors including their personality and congeniality.

In the event that a committee must address negative situations and/or be critical, it should do so as constructively and respectfully as possible, staying balanced and objective in its approach.

The committees, as well as the departments and faculties, should promote civility and collegiality, and a positive climate in which pre-tenure faculty members can flourish and achieve tenure.

1.8 Criteria for Tenure

The criteria for transfer to tenure spelled out in the Collective Agreement are as follows:

Pre-tenure faculty members will be assessed for transfer to the tenured faculty in terms of their demonstrated capacity for, achievements in and commitment to the Teaching, SRC and Service components of the duties and responsibilities of faculty members described respectively in Articles 10.12 A, 10.13 and 10.14. They may also be assessed in terms of

- a) their obligations as faculty members under Article 7.3,
- b) their satisfaction of such conditions of probation as were specified in their letter of appointment, and
- c) their progress in overcoming weaknesses identified in their year- end assessments, if any.

Assessment shall be based upon the criteria for tenure stated in clause A above. Any deficiencies shall be identified and explained in specific terms, supported by concrete examples, and conveyed in writing in such a way that the pre-tenure faculty member can formulate a response or rebuttal if he/she desires.

Assessment of the candidate's SRC and teaching will take into account the principles of equity, and the diversity of the academic and professional disciplines, including the diverse career paths, ways of knowing and forms of communicating knowledge.

1.9 Tenure is not Hiring

The Departmental Hiring Committee (DHC) is responsible for the hiring of faculty members. The objective of the tenure review process is solely to determine whether the pre-tenure faculty member meets the expectations of the school/department and University with respect to the granting of tenure. Factors unrelated to the member's performance, such as the academic priorities and financial resources of the school/department, should not be considered.

1.10 Tenure is not Promotion

When untenured Assistant Professors are transferred to the tenured faculty, they are automatically and at the same time promoted to the rank of Associate Professor. Under previous Collective Agreements, tenure and promotion were separate processes, and the criteria for those actions may have differed.

The parties have agreed that this shift (making promotion automatic with tenure) does not by itself change the criteria for tenure. The standards that should be used are those in place for tenure, not those previously in place for promotion.

This does not mean that the standards for tenure are to be unchanged over time. They have evolved gradually (not suddenly) in the past, and may do so in the future.

Nevertheless, if a DEC has set clear criteria for tenure at the time of the Intermediate Review, it may not make the criteria more stringent at the time of Normal and/or Final Tenure Review, even if the members of the committee have changed over that period of time.

There is no longer a separate process in the Collective Agreement for promotion to Associate Professor.

1.11 Academic Freedom

Article 11 of the Collective Agreement provides for the academic freedom of Association members. Members may not be disadvantaged or punished for the expression of their beliefs and views (within some legal limits). Faculty members are entitled to freedom in their teaching and SRC duties and publishing the results thereof.

It follows that DEC and FTC members may not make assessments on the basis of whether they agree with the views of the pre-tenure faculty member, whether the pre-tenure faculty member's views are unpopular, or whether the pre-tenure faculty member is himself or herself unpopular.

In making their assessments of the work of the pre-tenure faculty member in teaching, service and SRC, the committees must use strictly academic standards.

1.12 Modifications to a Committee's Composition

Candidates for tenure have the right to be assessed by committees that are objective, fair and neutral. They do not have the right to have committees that are predisposed in their favour. They do have the right to not have to face committees which are predisposed against them for extraneous, non-academic reasons.

From time to time, candidates express to the Association or to the Administration anxieties about the composition of a committee.

Each such case is considered individually by the Administration and by the Association. A response by both bodies to such anxieties has been to create the second-level committee, the FTC, one of whose responsibilities is to assure that the process at the DEC level is free from prejudice.

1.13 Responsibilities of the Pre-tenure Faculty Member

The pre-tenure faculty member is responsible for carrying out duties and for reporting them to the university in accordance with Articles 5A, 7 and 10 of the Collective Agreement.

The pre-tenure faculty member may request additional teaching assessments to the number specified in the collective agreement if s/he wishes to benefit from additional coaching on classroom/teaching skills.

The pre-tenure faculty member submits an annual report of activities each year as specified in Article 10 of the Collective Agreement. This report is used by the DEC in preparing its year-end assessment of the pre-tenure faculty member. The pre-tenure faculty member also has the opportunity to address the DEC in writing or in person if they wish to respond to the information presented in the DEC's year-end assessment.

In collaboration with the Departmental Chair/School Director, the pre-tenure faculty member prepares documents and supporting material in preparation for the Normal and Final Tenure Reviews. This material is described in Article 5A.8. The pre-tenure faculty member may, at his or her discretion, request to meet with the DEC before it completes the final report, though the DEC does not have the authority to request such a meeting.

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES AND EXAMPLES

“Pre-tenure faculty members will be assessed for transfer to the tenured faculty in terms of their demonstrated capacity for, achievements in and commitment to the Teaching, SRC and Service components of the duties and responsibilities of faculty members described respectively in Articles 10.12 A, 10.13 and 10.14. They may also be assessed in terms of

- a) their obligations as faculty members under Article 7.3,
- b) their satisfaction of such conditions of probation as were specified in their letter of appointment, and
- c) their progress in overcoming weaknesses identified in their year- end assessments, if any.

Assessment shall be based upon the criteria for tenure stated in clause A above. Any deficiencies shall be identified and explained in specific terms, supported by concrete examples, and conveyed in writing in such a way that the pre-tenure faculty member can formulate a response or rebuttal if he/she desires.”

“The assessment of a pre-tenure faculty member’s SRC and teaching will take into account the principles of equity, and the diversity of the academic and professional disciplines, including the diverse career paths, ways of knowing and forms of communicating knowledge.”

This section described the assessment duties of the DEC in terms of their processes, rules, timelines and deliverables. Section 3 describes the contents of these assessments.

Section 2.1 describes the three (3) primary duties of pre-tenure faculty members that will be evaluated during their probation and gives general directions on how to assess these.

Section 2.2 provides guidance, templates, and examples of assessment reports.

Assessment of the candidate’s SRC and teaching will take into account the principles of equity, and the diversity of the academic and professional disciplines, including the diverse career paths, ways of knowing and forms of communicating knowledge, amongst other criteria.

2.1.1 Teaching (Article 10.12)

Teaching encompasses a number of different activities and skills which may include: curriculum development and revision, preparation and presentation of courses, adherence to course management policies, supervision of students, (which includes placement, practicum, field, clinical, thesis and research supervision), student evaluation, academic counseling, supervising teaching and academic assistants, course administration and instructional development. Specific teaching responsibilities are detailed in Article 10.12 of the RFA collective agreement.

Faculty members are entitled to academic freedom in the execution of their teaching functions.

Assessment of Teaching Performance

Teaching effectiveness is assessed in the following ways:

1. Based on a comprehensive teaching dossier;
2. On the basis of teaching assessments of in class performance (or assessments of other modes of delivery, such as practicums) carried out by DEC members or tenured faculty members;

Faculty Course Survey results, as approved under the collective agreement, http://ryerson.ca/teaching/fcs/fcs_instructors/index.html, and modified by Arbitrator [Kaplan's June 2018 award](#), are used to obtain student opinion about student educational experience. The Faculty Course Survey can be found in Appendix F of the Collective Agreement.

Responses to Question 15 should not be included in the pre-tenure faculty member's dossier and should be disregarded if it appears in the dossier. Please note that FCS results cannot be used to assess teaching effectiveness but can be used in assessing student educational experience.

Teaching effectiveness is assessed in the following ways:

1. Based on a comprehensive teaching dossier;
2. On the basis of teaching assessments of in class performance (or assessments of other modes of delivery, such as practicums) carried out by DEC members or tenured faculty members;

Faculty Course Survey results, as approved under the collective agreement, http://ryerson.ca/teaching/fcs/fcs_instructors/index.html, and modified by Arbitrator [Kaplan's June 2018 award](#), are only used to obtain student opinion about student educational experience. The Faculty Course Survey can be found in Appendix F of the Collective Agreement.

The frequency distribution of the responses to all 14 questions of the Faculty Course Survey are submitted to the DEC and FTC. However these responses can only be used to review student opinions about their own student educational experience. In the pre-tenure faculty member's tenure dossier, they may use the FCS results as it relates to student experience only and not with respect to teaching effectiveness. DEC and FTC are instructed to review the pre-tenure faculty member's FCS submission only in the context of student experience and to disregard any references to teaching effectiveness. This applies to all materials contained in the tenure dossier including materials submitted by the pre-tenure faculty member, as well as the text of earlier annual assessments by the DEC.

With respect to educating faculty members about his award, Arbitrated Kaplan provided the following:

“With proper contextualization and consideration of the possibility of bias (e.g. where questions are subjective in nature), FCS results may be used to assess the following aspects:

- Student Educational Experience
- Whether students were treated with fairness and respect (Article 7.3.B) [See also Question 9 and Article 7.3B “Consistent with Article 11 (Academic Freedom), faculty members shall make every attempt to create an equitable, diverse and inclusive atmosphere of mutual respect in which students may learn. Faculty members shall make every effort to stimulate intellectual curiosity and enthusiasm for learning.”
- Whether the class met as scheduled and on time (Article 10.12.A.4 and FCS Question 10)
- Whether faculty were available during office hours (Article 10.12.A.3 and FCS Question 12)
- Whether the Course Management Policy was adhered to with respect to providing feedback in response to student work (Article 7.3.F, FCS Questions 5 & 7)

2.1.2 SRC (Article 10.13)

Tenure stream faculty members are expected to undertake Scholarly, Research and Creative Activities (SRC). Beyond applying for grants and other forms of support from appropriate public and private agencies, it is understood that peer review of SRC activities constitutes a cornerstone of academic scholarship. In those disciplines where peer refereed publications is not the norm, the results of such works shall be accessible to and recognized through impartial assessment by the relevant scholarly community.

SRC activities include but are not limited to:

1. Research projects/investigations or works conducted individually or in cooperation with others, so that the results or products/creations are (i) published in academic and professional journals, public reports, conference proceedings, or as patents or (ii) presented/exhibited at conferences, seminars or showings and are available for peer review;
2. Studies, works or writings that are published as books, chapters in books, or disseminated by other suitable means in a manner which makes them available for peer review;

3. Experimentation with classroom, laboratory, studio and fieldwork techniques and formats, creative works and processes, etc., provided the results are made available for peer review.
4. Other scholarly, research or creative activities as recommended by a Department/School and approved by the Dean.

Assessment of SRC Performance

DECs must assess whether pre-tenure faculty members demonstrate a capacity for, achievement in and commitment to their SRC duties.

1. The SRC component of a tenure assessment should be an assessment of the overall SRC performance of the pre-tenure faculty member. This performance can be evaluated in different ways, which will vary between departments and disciplines. Part of the assessment may be quantitative in nature: for example, how many articles have been published in refereed journals, how many conference presentations have been made, etc. The assessment should take into consideration the quality of the SRC which can be determined in a variety of ways, depending on the discipline and nature of the SRC. One way of doing this could be to read, view or listen to at least some of the work, in order to make judgments about quality, impact on the field, etc.
2. Letters of evaluation will be solicited from three external referees who are tenure faculty members and/or experts in the pre-tenure faculty member's discipline. These external referees will assess the pre-tenure faculty member based on the SRC component of their tenure dossier. The external referee reports will be provided to the DEC for their evaluation of the pre-tenure faculty member's file.
3. DECs will want to see that a pre-tenure faculty member's SRC has been peer-reviewed. Normally, "blind" peer reviews have the highest level of credibility. It is understood, however, that in some creative fields, blind peer review is not possible.
4. A pre-tenure faculty member's SRC may include work that is not peer reviewed. In some cases, it may be presented in outlets that are not subject to peer review; in other cases the work may still be in progress, not yet sent out for peer review. Such work should be considered by the DEC.
5. DECs may assess the quality of the SRC, but they may not make judgments related to the topics or areas chosen by the pre-tenure faculty member. Faculty members have academic freedom to choose their own subjects and research methodology.

6. There are many different ways of creating SRC. Some is done individually, while some is done jointly. Of the latter, many variations exist, including close collaboration, working separately on different parts of the project and coming together only at the end, collaboration between a professor and his or her graduate students in which case mentorship and the development of highly qualified personnel is part of the outcome, and other modes.
7. The Collective Agreement defines SRC and states that the creation of SRC is one of the responsibilities of a faculty member. It does not set overall standards. Standards and criteria are set in individual disciplines and fields. Nevertheless, one of the functions of the Faculty Tenure Committees is to see that the standards applied in individual disciplines and fields are roughly comparable between disciplines in a given faculty.

2.1.3 Service (Article 10.14)

Service Duties

Article 10.14 of the Collective Agreement specifies that the service work that tenure-stream faculty are expected to undertake may be in two forms: service to the University and service to the Profession and Community. Service work is generally understood to be activities other than teaching or SRC that accrue benefits to a constituency beyond the faculty member who engages in them; it can incorporate a variety of tasks and activities. Participating in the governance of the Department or Faculty by active membership in committees is service to the University, as is participation in the Senate or Senate committees, the Board of Governors and the Ryerson Faculty Association. Participating in the work of professional associations, learned societies, and union/labour organizations, reviewing grant applications, refereeing publications, and serving on a board are all examples of service to the profession and community.

It should be noted that even if course releases are granted, or stipends paid, for performing certain activities, the performance of those activities may still be regarded as eligible service work, excepting for the duties specified in an administrative contract such as Chair of Department, or Director of a Centre.

Service work is an essential component of the responsibilities of faculty members, and pre-tenure faculty members are expected to demonstrate their capacity for and commitment to service. However, the DEC should recognize that they cannot participate as fully as tenured faculty members because of their lack of experience and their need to establish their SRC presence and to develop teaching competence. This said, the DEC also needs to recognize when a pre-tenure faculty member is performing above expectations in terms of service, and this should be noted in the year-end assessments and tenure review.

Assessment of Service Performance

This assessment is based on the information supplied in the pre-tenure faculty member's faculty's Annual Report(s) and tenure dossiers.

DEC members, who are typically senior members of the department/school, may assess the quality of the pre-tenure faculty member's service in the department/school.

2.2 Assessments

2.2.1 Teaching Assessments (ARTICLE 5A.5 & 10.12)

A teaching assessment is a report prepared by a faculty member that assesses the teaching performance observed during an in class assessment. In order to assist the pre-tenure faculty member in meeting acceptable teaching standards, it is important to provide an honest and accurate assessment of their abilities and areas for improvement.

Material that may be used to prepare teaching assessments

Teaching assessments are based solely on what was observed during the in-class assessments. Faculty members who prepare this report shall use exclusively the material available to the students during the class visit. For example notes taken and handouts provided by the instructor (paper or electronic). As with all other assessments, the assessors shall not use hearsay (e.g., discussions with students) in their evaluations.

Conducting Teaching Assessments

Faculty members conducting teaching assessments are observers and should not disrupt the class. Assessors should arrive on time, sit in an inconspicuous location, refrain from participating and commenting during the session, and leave at the end of class or during a suitable break. If any issues need to be discussed with the faculty member, this must be done after the class. Students are not to be consulted at any time during this process, even after the assessed class.

Teaching assessments are solely concerned with the assessment of teaching competence as demonstrated in the classroom, lab, studio, practicum setting, etc.

Teaching assessments should refer to the pre-tenure faculty member's performance and should not be used to comment on issues over which the instructor has no control, such as the choice of room, state of the facilities, student absenteeism, etc. except as these relate to the pre-tenure faculty member's performance.

Suggested contents of a teaching assessment

Introductory information

- Name and Department/School of faculty member being assessed

- Name and course number of course observed
- Date and time of class observed
- Location of class
- Type of class (e.g. lecture, lab, etc.)
- Focus or title of class observed
- Number of students present
- Date of report
- Name and Department of assessor

Body of Report—Introduction

- Brief description of class observed
- Review of any discussion between pre-tenure faculty member and assessor before class, including any areas where instructor specifically requested feedback
- Any resources used by the assessor before or after the class to prepare the report

Body of Report--Feedback

- Communication skills
- Relationship with students
- Demonstrated knowledge and expertise of subject matter
- Methods of Presentation

Suggestions for improvement/additional remarks

- Specific changes assessor would recommend
- Any mitigating factors impacting instructor's performance
- Recommendation of resources such as seminars in Learning & Teaching, potential mentors with teaching expertise in faculty/department and/or written resources

Overall Assessment

- Summary of key findings and recommendations
- Final rating such as “unacceptable” “needs improvement” “good” “very good” “excellent”

2.2.2 Year-end Assessment Reports (Article 5A.6.A-E)

Year-end assessment reviews should communicate a substantive analysis of the member's performance in the previous year in each area of responsibility: teaching, SRC, and service. The DEC should make a clear assessment at the end of each report to ensure that the pre-tenure faculty member has an understanding of how s/he are performing and what, if any, specific changes s/he should make in the upcoming year. In order to assist the member in obtaining tenure, the DEC should, to the extent possible, communicate clear expectations for the upcoming year. Any deficiencies shall be identified and explained in specific terms, supported by concrete examples, and conveyed in writing in such a way that the pre-tenure faculty member can formulate a response or rebuttal if he/she desires.

Contents of a year-end assessment report

The year-end assessment report for the pre-tenure faculty member should contain the following:

- Expectations
 - List or refer to (if previously provided) the expectations in the areas of SRC, teaching and service.
 - These expectations should be qualitative and substantive rather than numerical and formulaic.
- Assessment
 - Provide a review of the year(s) covered by the annual report(s) since the last year-end assessment (a review of multiple annual reports may only occur when a member has been on leave).
 - Provide an overall assessment of the pre-tenure faculty member's progress during the year.
 - Acknowledge areas in which progress has been made, including progress towards fulfillment of terms and conditions of probation stated in the letter of appointment.
 - Provide a clear and substantive analysis of how the pre-tenure faculty member is performing against the stated expectations in each area of responsibility.
 - Identify areas where the pre-tenure faculty member is on-track.
 - Identify areas that should be improved, pinpointing areas of critical deficiencies.
 - Reassess areas of concern identified in previous assessments, if applicable.

2.2.3 Intermediate Review (ARTICLE 5.A.9)

The intermediate review is a substantive assessment of the pre-tenure faculty member's performance during the probationary period to date and provides the member with constructive feedback on how they are progressing towards satisfying the criteria for tenure. The intermediate review report is prepared by the DEC. The review is completed in the same manner as the year end assessment report. It shall include an assessment of their third year as well as an overall assessment of their performance over the first three years.

The purpose of this intermediate review is to provide clear and constructive feedback to pre-tenure faculty members on their progress towards tenure in a timely enough fashion so that pre-tenure faculty members can make final adjustments to their performance in the remaining terms before tenure. For this reason, the intermediate tenure review report should make a clear statement as to whether the member is on track for tenure and should also describe clearly areas of concern with recommendations for how they should be addressed.

Suggested contents of an intermediate review

(Note: The review is completed in the same manner as the year end assessment report. It shall include an assessment of their third year as well as an overall assessment of their performance over the first three years).

The intermediate review for the pre-tenure faculty member should address the following:

- Expectations
 - Confirm the final tenure expectations in the areas of SRC, teaching and service.
 - These expectations should be qualitative and substantive rather than numerical and formulaic
- Assessment
 - Provide a review of the first 3 years.
 - Provide an overall assessment of the pre-tenure faculty member's progress to date.
 - Provide a clear and substantive review of how the pre-tenure faculty member is performing against the stated expectations in each area of responsibility.
 - State whether the pre-tenure faculty member is on track for achieving tenure.
 - Identify remaining areas of concern, if applicable.

2.2.4 Normal Tenure Review (Article 5A.10)

A normal tenure review is an assessment prepared by the DEC of the overall performance of a pre-tenure faculty member during his/her probationary period which results in a recommendation with regards to transfer to the tenured status. The DEC will review the pre-tenure faculty member for tenure commencing May 1st of the fifth probationary year of the six year probationary period. The DEC is required to conduct the normal tenure review at the end of the first term of the final probationary year after the teaching assessments have been completed.

The member can elect a five year probationary period and be reviewed for tenure commencing May 1st of the fourth probationary year. Such request shall be in writing to the Dean by no later than March 31st of the fourth probationary year.

By May 1st the pre-tenure faculty member should consult with the Chair/Director (or the Chair's designate – who must be a member of the DEC) to ensure his/her tenure dossier is as complete as possible.

By May 17 the pre-tenure faculty member shall submit the SRC portion of his/her dossier, including the names of five potential external referees, as specified in Article 5A.8, to the DEC. All other portions of the candidate's tenure dossier, including the year-end assessment for the year just completed, as well as any responses to that assessment, shall be submitted by the member by August 1st. Please note that the pre-tenure faculty member's submission ought to include their Intermediate Review. If the Intermediate Review is not provided to the DEC, the DEC may find this document in the member's PCF. The DEC can find any missing documents that are not included in the pre-tenure faculty member's dossier submission in the member's Performance and Conduct File. The DEC which holds office on September 1, following the submission of the tenure dossier, is responsible for the evaluation of the candidate's tenure dossier, including the reviews from the external assessors.

In their tenure dossier, the pre-tenure faculty member shall include the names of five potential external referees who are tenured faculty members and/or experts in the pre-tenure faculty member's discipline. After consultation with the DEC that holds office at the time that the pre-tenure member submits the SRC portion of their dossier, the Dean shall choose at least two external referees from this list. Evaluative letters will be solicited from three external referees. If the third referee is not from the candidate's list, in consultation with the DEC, the Dean will provide the candidate with an additional list of potential referees that the Dean will choose from. The candidate will have the opportunity to review this list and make an objection in writing, which the Dean will consider. The referees will be asked to evaluate the only the pre-tenure faculty member's performance in SRC and their letters will be included in the tenure file.

The pre-tenure faculty member has the right to address the DEC concerning his/her record of employment prior to the DEC conducting its normal tenure review, but this is an entirely voluntary process that should be initiated by the pre-tenure faculty member and not the DEC.

The DEC shall assess the faculty member using the following criteria: demonstrated capacity for, achievements in and commitment to these components of the duties and responsibilities described in Article 10.12 A, 10.13 and 10.14 of the RFA Collective Agreement:

- Teaching
- SRC
- Service

In addition, and as appropriate, the DEC may assess:

- The faculty member's obligations as per Article 7.3 of the RFA Collective Agreement.
- Satisfaction of conditions of probation as specified in the faculty member's letter of appointment.
- The faculty member's process in overcoming weaknesses identified in their year-end assessments and intermediate review.

Any deficiencies shall be identified and explained in specific terms, supported by concrete examples, and conveyed in writing in such a way that the pre-tenure faculty member can formulate a response or rebuttal if he/she desires.

[Contents of a normal tenure review](#)

The normal tenure review for the pre-tenure faculty member should address the following:

- Expectations
 - Reiterate the tenure expectations in the areas of SRC, teaching and service that were finalized at the intermediate review.
- Assessment
 - Provide a review of the entire probationary period.
 - Provide a clear and substantive analysis of how the pre-tenure faculty member has performed against the stated expectations in each area of responsibility. The FTC and the Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs will be most interested in this analysis, argument and assessment made by the DEC.
 - State whether the pre-tenure faculty member has met the criteria for achieving tenure.

- o Identify remaining areas of concern, if applicable.

Summary and Recommendations - Based on the assessment above, the DEC will make one of the following recommendations:

- o Transfer to the tenured faculty
 - o A two year extension to the probationary period If the DEC believes that the candidate does not presently meet the criteria for transfer to the tenured faculty, but that there is a good expectation that with additional time he or she would do so.
 - o In the case where a pre-tenure faculty member is being considered before the normal six-year term because the member's letter of appointment specified a shorter probationary period, and the DEC concludes that the pre-tenure faculty member does not presently meet the criteria for transfer to the tenured faculty, the DEC may recommend to the Dean (not the FTC) that the pre-tenure faculty member revert to a regular six year tenure period. If this recommendation is accepted, the next tenure review will be considered a "normal" tenure review. Refer to article 5A.10.J for details.
 - o That employment be terminated.
- The DEC is expected to make a tentative recommendation in writing to the faculty member for comments by September 30th. This will include anonymized copies of the external referee reports. The DEC is expected to provide a detailed rationale of its recommendation. If there is disagreement within the DEC, they will provide the votes (excluding names) and an explanation of the disagreement.
 - If the member wishes to respond they shall provide their comments in writing within two weeks of receipt of the DEC's recommendation. The DEC may modify its letter after taking into account the member's comments. It may change its comments on matters contained in its original draft, and it may respond to issues raised in the pre-tenure faculty member's response, but it may not introduce completely new issues. Within two weeks of receiving the member's comments the DEC shall provide their final recommendation to the Dean and the FTC. The member has two weeks to comment, in writing, on the DEC's final recommendation to the Dean.
 - Within two weeks of receiving the member's comments the DEC will provide its final recommendation to the Dean and the FTC, including the pre-tenure faculty member's full dossier, including anonymized copies of the external referee reports, and any other relevant material, with a copy to the pre-tenure faculty member.
 - The member has two weeks to comment, in writing, on the DEC's final recommendation to the Dean.

- The FTC may ask questions of the DEC, in writing, within three weeks of receiving the pre-tenure faculty member's comments on the DEC's final recommendation. The DEC will respond, in writing, within two weeks of receiving the questions. The DEC's response will be added to the tenure file and copied to the candidate. The candidate will have two weeks to respond to the DEC's response.
- The FTC will make its own recommendation to the VPFA within 2 weeks of the DEC's recommendation or the pre-tenure faculty member's response, whichever is later.
- The FTC recommendation will be prepared by the FTC and signed by all members confirming their views are reflected. The letter will be provided to the pre-tenure faculty member, and the DEC and each will have an opportunity to provide written comments to the Vice-Provost Faculty Affairs within two weeks of receipt of the FTC's recommendation. Requests for extensions will not be unreasonably denied.
- If the DEC has recommended immediate transfer to tenure or an extension, the FTC can recommend:
 - That an extension be granted, or
 - That the member be transferred to the tenured faculty
- If the DEC has recommended that tenure be denied and that the member's employment be terminated, the FTC can recommend:
 - That the member be transferred to the tenured faculty, or
 - That an extension of two years be granted, or
 - That employment be terminated.
- If the VPFA does not require additional information before making a decision he/she shall make a final decision and advise the pre-tenure candidate in writing within four weeks of receipt of the DEC's or the candidate's response to the FTC recommendation, or the lapsing of such time.
- If the VPFA requires additional information before making a decision they will write to the DEC, the FTC, or the member, within four weeks of receipt of the DEC or the candidate's response to the FTC recommendation. The DEC and/or the FTC and the member shall have two weeks to provide a response. The member shall have two weeks to respond to the DEC and/or FTC response. THE VPFA shall make a final decision within two weeks of receipt of the last written response from the DEC, the FTC, or the member.
- If the DEC and FTC have both recommended termination, the VPFA may:
 - Terminate the faculty member's employment, or

- o Transfer the faculty member to the tenured faculty, or
 - o Extend the probationary period for two years
- In every other scenario, the VPFA may,
 - o Transfer the faculty member to the tenured faculty, or
 - o Extend the probationary period for two years

2.2.5 Final Tenure Review (Article 5A.10.J)

A final tenure review applies when a faculty member has been extended as a result of his/her normal tenure review. It is an assessment prepared by the DEC of the performance of the faculty member towards addressing the concerns raised in the normal tenure review.

If the VPFA, on the recommendation of the DEC, has determined teaching is satisfactory and not the cause of the extension, the requirement for additional teaching assessments may be waived. Otherwise, the DEC will conduct one or two teaching assessments in each semester of the extension.

The process for consideration by the DEC, FTC and VPFA is the same as in the Normal Tenure Review, except as noted below:

- o The DEC and the FTC may not recommend an extension of employment, and the VPFA may not grant an extension.
- o The DEC and the FTC may recommend either transfer to tenure or termination of employment, and the VPFA may decide upon either.

SECTION 3: SAMPLE TENURE LETTERS

Sample tenure letter #1: Bill Gates (normal positive)

Dear Dean AAA,

The Departmental Evaluation Committee in Entrepreneurship and Strategy, by a vote of 4-1, recommends to you and to the Faculty Tenure Committee that Dr. Bill Gates be transferred to the tenured faculty.

Dr. Gates was appointed as an Assistant Professor in 2008; prior to that he had been a part-time instructor in the department for three years. He received his Ph.D. from the Schulich School at York University in 2009.

We view this as a straightforward case: his records in the three areas of teaching, service and SRC are satisfactory to support the recommendation.

He has taught successfully at all levels of our program: introductory courses, advanced courses and MBA courses. From the statement of teaching philosophy in his tenure dossier, you will see that he tries his best to adapt the content of his courses to the differing needs and interests of his students. Consequently he develops a large body of pedagogical materials, which you will find in the thicker of the two binders he has submitted. The students respond well to his courses, at all levels; we can discern no significant difference in response at the different levels. His student survey responses are good with respect to student experience - he arrives to class on time and follows the course outline. The peer classroom assessments support this; for the most part they talk about his teaching as being clear, supportive, engaging and challenging.

We should also note the initiatives that Dr. Gates has taken in student activities and student clubs. Along with several other members of the department, he is largely responsible for encouraging such activities, to the extent that the students have won several competitive prizes.

In the area of service, Dr. Gates is noteworthy for his willingness to volunteer for almost any task. In fact, the more senior members of the department have had to shield him from this impulse, thinking it more important that during his probationary years he not take on tasks that would divert him from his primary roles as teacher and researcher. Nevertheless he has made significant contributions: to student activities (as noted above) and to a group investigating alternative ways of teaching. We expect that when Dr. Gates is tenured, he will become one of the leaders in the department.

His SRC is centered on innovation in digital industries. He has six articles in peer-reviewed business journals (four published, one in press, one accepted). The central question in his research is why digital innovation has occurred at some times and in some places, and not others. His most cited article (“Where is the Frontier?”) is based largely on interviews and surveys done among Silicon Valley entrepreneurs. In it, he develops the argument that the extraordinary achievements in Silicon Valley resulted from a culture that was at one and the same time secretive and proprietary, but also cooperative and interactive, and that it was the tension between these two seemingly incompatible tendencies that released such a torrent of creativity. In the view of the DEC members, this is a valuable contribution to the scholarly literature on entrepreneurship. Some concerns were raised about Dr. Gates’s ability to apply for grants throughout his probationary period, but a strong majority of the DEC is reasonably satisfied that this did not impact negatively on the quality of his research.

In sum, Dr. Gates has met or exceeded the expectations we had of him when he was hired, and we are happy to recommend that he be invited to join the permanent faculty.

Sincerely,

Sample tenure letter #2: June Callwood (strong positive)

Dear Dean BBB,

The Departmental Evaluation Committee in the Journalism School is unanimous and enthusiastic in recommending to you and to the Faculty Tenure Committee in FCAD that Dr. June Callwood be transferred to the tenured faculty.

Dr. Callwood joined the faculty as an Assistant Professor in 2008. Prior to that time she had a 20-year career as a newspaper and television news journalist, with the Globe and Mail and with the CBC. She earned a B.A. in English from Queen's in 1986, and a Ph.D. in Communications from the University of Western Ontario in 2001, with a dissertation which eventually became a well-known book, *The Making of Television News, Dispatches from the Sausage Factory* (Knopf, 2004).

We base our recommendation for tenure not on her prior career, however, but on the success with which she has changed gears and become an exceptionally successful academic.

Her teaching record is very strong. In her first year and a half or so, she had some difficulty in developing ways of engaging the students and assessing their work. To her credit, she understood this problem in short order, sought assistance from her colleagues and from the Teaching and Learning Office, and was successful in reorganizing her courses so that they became interactive experiences for the students, even in her largest courses. You can see the results both in the teaching assessments of her colleagues who visited her courses and in her comprehensive teaching dossier. Both instruments were always positive, but at the beginning somewhat mixed, particularly in the area of student engagement, while in the past three years they have been consistently excellent.

Her contributions in the area of service should be divided into internal and external. Internally, within the School, she has taken the lead in curriculum revision. She has been a member of the curriculum committee since first joining the School, and its chair in two of those years. Largely as a result of her leadership, the array of elective courses in second and third year has been rationalized and made more coherent, so that students can begin to identify professional pathways more easily than before.

Externally, Dr. Callwood's most important, although not sole, contribution has been to serve on the national advisory committee for the CBC, helping it to make what are frequently difficult decisions in a period of budgetary stringency and some skepticism from the federal government about the role of the institution. We think it a very good sign for the School and for Ryerson generally, that one of our members has been selected for this important role and has discharged her responsibilities so well.

In the area of SRC, Dr. Callwood has been very active. Her curriculum vitae lists five articles in refereed scholarly journals since her arrival at Ryerson, fifteen articles in non-refereed outlets, and twenty presentations at conferences and other public venues. In addition, she has produced a series of TV programs for the CBC.

The scholarly articles focus on questions of bias and objectivity in the news (not only TV, but also radio and to a lesser extent print news as well). Dr. Callwood is influenced by the “post-modern” critiques of objectivity that are current today in the humanities, but not completely convinced by them. She is developing a complex argument, in which media journalists strive for objectivity, but at the same time understand that complete objectivity is unobtainable, that the process of making choices itself creates a point of view. Her argument leads her, therefore, to a sort of “ethics” of journalism, a requirement that journalists be responsible for their selections and choices as they “create” (her term) the news. She stakes out a difficult and elusive position, somewhere between the poles of those who think objectivity is a simple matter and those who think it is so impossible that it should not even be pursued.

She has developed these ideas in a series of articles each of which explores a different area of the news, from the invasion of Iraq and the economic downturn to the most recent municipal election in Toronto. She subjects a variety of radio and television treatments of these subjects to a series of theoretical critiques, finding in each case at least one example which meets her demanding standards of responsibility.

The members of the DEC do not always agree with her conclusions, nor is there any reason why we should. We can say, however, that her contributions have been original, intelligent and provocative, and have begun to elicit a series of responses in the journals, some of which extend her ideas, others of which refute them. We would not be surprised if her scholarly work to date turns out to be seminal.

We should say a word about her non-refereed pieces. They are equally if not more important. Some of them appear in very well-known outlets, among them MacLean’s Magazine, The New York Review of Books and The New York Times Magazine. Dr. Callwood is deepening her contribution as a public intellectual, one whose views are sought and respected, if not always endorsed.

Her program series for the CBC, on the history of television news in Canada, is informed by her theoretical perspective, and has received strong positive reviews from the national press; see in particular the reviews from *The Globe and Mail* and *The Ottawa Citizen* that are enclosed in the tenure dossier.

We have no doubt that her research productivity will continue. She has a draft manuscript of a book (see the second volume of the dossier) which we expect will find a good publisher.

Dr. Callwood is making a very important contribution to the School of Journalism and to Ryerson University, and we are unanimous in our recommendation that she be transferred to the tenured faculty.

Sincerely,

Sample tenure letter #3: Charles Darwin (positive split)

Dear Dean CCC,

The Departmental Evaluation Committee in Chemistry and Biology recommends to you and to the Faculty Tenure Committee in Science, by a 3-2 vote, that Dr. Charles Darwin be transferred to the tenured faculty.

Dr. Darwin was appointed as an Assistant Professor in 2006. He did his doctoral work in Biology at McMaster University. When he was appointed, it was expected that he would have completed that work by the summer of 2006. Unfortunately he was not able to meet this timeline and he continued working on his dissertation. He received his Ph.D. in the fall of 2008. When he was reviewed for tenure in the 2011-2012 academic year, therefore, he had had only two full years following his degree to develop a dossier of achievements in SRC. Following a mixed recommendation from the Department, in February 2011, you extended his probationary period, requiring him to turn in a new tenure dossier in May, 2013. This is the dossier the DEC is responding to now, and in spite of long discussions among the committee members, we have to report that we are still mixed in our recommendation.

His records in teaching and in service are satisfactory.

The in-class assessments of his teaching are generally fairly good. The individual assessments are available in the dossier for you to read. On the whole, his colleagues report that his presentations are complete and rigorous, and that they are pitched at the appropriate level, that is to say, that they are accessible to the students but at the same time challenging. Some of the assessors report, however, that the classes lack excitement, the students does not seem to be very engaged, and they do not ask questions. This pattern was drawn to Dr. Darwin's attention in the second and subsequent DEC year-end assessments, but the pattern does not seem to have changed over the years. The DEC members agree, therefore, that his teaching is satisfactory; that he is holding up his teaching obligations to his students and to the program, but that it is not outstanding.

In the area of service, the Department has purposefully not asked much of him. As soon as it was seen that his doctorate was going to be delayed, it was clear that he needed to concentrate as much of his time as possible on his research, so his senior colleagues thought it best not to ask a great deal of him in terms of service. Nevertheless, we can report that he has been a conscientious member of the curriculum committee, attending meetings regularly and making useful contributions. Again, the DEC has agreed that his record of service is satisfactory.

In research funding, Dr. Darwin received a standard start-up grant, and several internal grants. He has not been successful to date in securing NSERC funding, but he has participated in two large, multi-researcher grants whose principal investigator, Dr. Banting, is at St. Michael's Hospital. As a consequence of the relatively low level of funding, he has supervised just three masters' students and no doctoral students, a comparatively low level of research supervision in

the department. Despite this, he has published four papers in refereed journals, and has two currently under consideration.

The majority of the DEC agrees with the minority that this level of research productivity is below what they would like to have seen. Nevertheless, they see in Dr. Darwin a person who is strongly committed to his research, and who has significant potential for future productivity. He is working in a difficult and important area, namely the evolutionary development of viruses that can be fatal to humans, in particular the different mutations of the AIDS virus. All of his published papers deal with assessments of the laboratory techniques that are used to identify mutations. His achievements to date lie just around the edges of the problem, nothing that could be characterized as a breakthrough. Still, that is the state of most of the research in the field.

The majority, therefore, sees his work as satisfactory in all three areas—teaching, service and SRC—and believes that he has met the test for tenure.

The minority do not believe that his SRC is at a satisfactory standard. No doubt he was hampered by the delay in his Ph.D., but the extension in his probationary period of a year and half should have been sufficient to compensate for this, and it has not. His failure to secure NSERC funding is indicative that his professional peers do not hold his research in high regard, and do not foresee that it will be important. He has only four published papers at this point, and we would like to have seen several more. In the absence of numbers, we would like to have seen evidence of quality, and influence in the field, and we do not. His research accomplishments to date are marginal, and it is unlikely that they will lead to breakthroughs in this very competitive field. His level of graduate student supervision is below what is expected in the department.

The minority therefore believe that his SRC record is unsatisfactory, and that his records in teaching and service, while satisfactory, are not sufficient to compensate for the deficiency in SRC.

The DEC is therefore divided, 3-2 in favour of transfer to tenure.

Sincerely

Sample tenure letter #4: Frank Gehry (negative split)

Dear Dean DDD,

The Departmental Evaluation Committee in Architectural Science, by a vote of 3-2, recommends to you and to the Faculty Tenure Committee in FEAS that Professor Frank Gehry not be transferred to the tenured faculty, and that his employment in the Department of Architectural Science cease on July 31.

Mr. Gehry joined the faculty in 2008 as an untenured Associate Professor. He has a B.A. in Art History from the University of Toronto, 1979, and an M.Arch from the University of Waterloo, 1984. Between graduating from Waterloo and taking up his academic role at Ryerson, he was a practicing architect, based in Toronto.

The view of the majority is that he has not made a successful transition to an academic career. In fact, they believe he has not made a transition at all, and is still essentially a practicing architect.

Mr. Gehry's Faculty Course Surveys results with respect to student experience are average or better, and it appears from student comments that they appreciate his guidance. However, FCS responses over the last several years indicate that Mr. Gehry is not available for consultation.

The department values office hours or consultation time almost as much as class time. As noted in his second and fourth year-end assessments, the department's Chair had several meetings with Mr. Gehry during his probationary period to review his FCS results and student feedback, including a student petition complaining about his unavailability. In these meetings the Chair stressed that Mr. Gehry should make himself available for students.

Mr. Gehry's response to the year-end assessments was that, due to his busy external schedule he is unable to spend more than one or two days a week on campus, in which he mainly teaches his studio classes and that unfortunately he needs to cancel consultations from time to time due to his other architectural assignments. Indeed his faculty course survey results on question 12 indicate that Mr. Gehry continues to disregard his responsibilities on this matter. Given the emphasis placed by the department on the value of consultation, the majority of the DEC finds this unacceptable. The majority of the DEC cannot, therefore, assess his teaching as satisfactory.

The majority has essentially the same criticism of his service. Mr. Gehry has not responded to the DEC's call on him to increase his levels of service in his year-end assessments from 2010 until now. In 2009 the department formulated guidelines on appropriate internal and external service levels that were circulated to all members of the department. It is clear that Mr. Gehry has ignored these guidelines as he has not reported any internal service on his annual reports.

To the majority of the DEC members, Mr. Gehry's SRC record is unsatisfactory. Typically the Department of Architectural Science assesses the full range of SRC activities of its members,

that is scholarly, research and creative activity. And indeed Mr. Gehry has accomplishments that can be seen as falling into all categories, but in neither case does the majority judge them as being satisfactory.

During the period of his employment at Ryerson, he has published five articles and a book. None of them, however, have been peer-reviewed according to the normal scholarly process. The articles have all been solicited by commercial architectural magazines, and for the most part they feature discussions of his buildings. The book, *Building for the Future*, is an expensive coffee-table production that consists mostly of glossy photographs and a minimal amount of explanatory text. The majority is not convinced, therefore, that there is any genuinely academic merit.

Perhaps Mr. Gehry should be judged, however, by his creativity, not his scholarly activity. He was a successful architect long before coming to Ryerson, and he has continued with this career, perhaps at a slightly slower rate of productivity. But if we take this view, we find ourselves with no way of assessing the value of the creativity. During the period that he has been at Ryerson, his architectural designs have won no prizes, nor to our knowledge have there been any independent assessments of them. If we are mistaken on this last point, at least we can say that none are included in the tenure dossier.

The department is certainly open to assessing architectural and artistic creativity as part of the tenure process. Creativity must, however, be judged by some kind of arm's length process, and none has been attempted or even proposed in this case.

The majority concludes therefore, that Mr. Gehry's performance in all three areas of teaching, service and SRC is unsatisfactory and that he should not be transferred to the tenured faculty.

Minority Position

The minority position is that the majority is taking a very narrow perspective in their assessment of Mr. Gehry's contribution to the department. Granted his contribution is different from that of the other members, and granted the department could not function if everyone took the position that he does.

However, the fact is that Mr. Gehry is exceptionally valuable to the department and to the students. Of all the members of the department, he is actually the most successful professional architect. Since almost all our students have the ambition of becoming professional architects, the guidance and mentorship that he can and does provide them are invaluable.

Beginning with the assessment of his teaching, the majority concedes that the assessment of his teaching is strong, that the students appreciate his courses and find them valuable. Therefore it does not make sense to dismiss his teaching as unsatisfactory. Mr. Gehry interacts with the students productively in their studio classes and not in his office hours: a pattern different from many of the faculty members but not necessarily worse. What matters is the value

he provides to the students, and by the students' own collective testimony this is more than satisfactory.

When it comes to the assessment of SRC, the majority have the situation completely wrong; granted that Mr. Gehry does not write for the narrowly academic journals that most of us submit our work to and that no one besides an occasional academic professional reads. He writes for people who care about architecture, and his success in doing so is indicated by the fact that the editors of several architectural magazines keep asking him for new contributions. It is a different test from the normal academic test, but an equally if not more rigorous test.

Similarly with his actual architectural work: he keeps being asked to work on important projects because he is well known as an excellent architect. His work brings credit to Ryerson, and it makes him exactly the sort of resource that our students most need, someone who is actively engaged, even over-engaged, in the field.

Furthermore, we are concerned with the very narrow evaluation of Mr. Gehry's SRC contributions during his probationary period. The majority's dismissal of his book *Building for the Future* as an "expensive coffee-table production that consists mostly of glossy photographs and a minimal amount of explanatory text" which does not contain any "genuinely scholarly research" totally misses the mark. This book was never intended to be a piece of scholarly research, nor was it ever presented as such in Mr. Gehry's tenure dossier. This book is a work of art co-authored with the notable architectural photographer Julius Shulman (who did not write any text for the book). Mr. Gehry's contributions to this book included architectural sketches of the buildings being photographed, some explanations of the design of these buildings, personal reflections on the future of architecture and design, and the overall design of the book which contains, in addition to the all of the items already mentioned, some inspirational poetry and quotations.

If Mr. Gehry's employment is terminated, we fear the loss will be entirely that of Ryerson University and its students. Indeed the fact that the DEC is recommending termination may by itself be enough to sever the relationship, even if the Administration takes the correct action. We deeply regret the position of the majority.

Sincerely,

Sample tenure letter #5: Joan Robinson (Positive but Uneven)

Dear Dean EEE,

The Departmental Evaluation Committee in Economics unanimously recommends to you and to the Faculty Tenure Committee in Arts that Dr. Joan Robinson be transferred to the tenured faculty.

We do so because of her outstanding achievements to date and promise for the future in research, and in spite of our concerns about her uneven work in the areas of teaching and service.

Dr. Robinson joined the Economics Department as an Assistant Professor in 2008, the year in which she completed her Ph.D. at the University of Toronto.

She wrote an outstanding Ph.D. dissertation at Toronto, under the supervision of Professor Maynard Keynes. We say “supervision,” because in a formal sense it was a supervisory relationship, but we know from conversations with Dr. Keynes that it was actually a collaborative relationship in which Ms. Robinson had most of the original ideas. The topic of the dissertation was “imperfect competition,” and it outlined an innovative theory of the firm, different from the standard, purely competitive theory. When integrated into broader market and macro perspectives, her theory of the imperfectly competitive firm produces strikingly different results, results which may help to explain the recent sharp downturn in the economy.

While at Ryerson, she has converted the dissertation into a book, published by Harvard University Press (2011), which has received outstanding reviews in the principal Canadian, American and British economics journals (see the dossier for the reviews). Members of the DEC compared the dissertation to the book, and were gratified to see that the latter was considerably different, that Dr. Robinson’s views on the subject had advanced and at the same time become clearer.

She has also published three papers on related topics in refereed economics journals, all of them at the reputational level of *The Canadian Journal of Economics* or higher. The papers explore the micro foundations of macroeconomics, dealing, in order, with (1) the effect of collective bargaining on the flexibility and equilibrating function of wages, (2) the likelihood of irrational expectations of inflation and (3) the macroeconomic effects of price controls in selected markets. While these might seem to be widely diverse topics, the theme that pulls them together is the investigation of how deviations from purely competitive markets affect income, employment and economic growth. In her journal articles, more than in her book, Dr. Robinson displays a sophisticated understanding of modern mathematical techniques in the formulation of economic theory.

As a result of her research to date, we are convinced that we have a first-rate economic theorist in Dr. Robinson, one who we expect will continue to thrive and who will likely bring strong positive reputational value to the Ryerson Economics Department.

We wish we could be as positive about her teaching. It is satisfactory, but seems somewhat uninspired. The peer assessments of her teaching at the undergraduate level are fairly positive, while the Faculty Course Surveys are weak on questions related to the student experience in most courses. The reports from her graduate courses are much stronger. The in class teaching assessments reveal problems with her undergraduate courses which seem to have mostly to do with her method of presentation. She generally sits at a desk and lectures in a rather monotone voice, while showing a series of power-point slides. During peer assessment some of her colleagues report that she does not seem to be receptive to questions, treating them as a diversion from the presentation. Also, generally speaking, her peer assessments indicate that concepts are not clearly explained with appropriate use of examples.

In her graduate courses, in contrast, the in class assessments are very positive, reporting that she is very knowledgeable about the material which she presents with enthusiasm, and she stimulates their interest in the subject.

The DEC has drawn these pedagogical problems with her undergraduate courses to Dr. Robinson's attention in each year-end response, but we have not seen any significant change.

In the area of service, we can report that Dr. Robinson attends most department meetings, and made a contribution in 2011-12 on the space allocation committee, but has not taken a leadership role in the department. For the most part we think this is appropriate for a probationary member, and we look forward to working more closely with her in the affairs of the department once she has tenure.

In summary, we see in Dr. Robinson an outstanding economic theorist who is beginning to achieve an international reputation in the profession. She is only a satisfactory teacher at the undergraduate level. We would like her to work to enhance her undergraduate teaching.

The picture is somewhat uneven, therefore, but in the end there is no question but that an economist of her stature and promise deserves tenure, and that our department will benefit hugely from her continued association with us.

Sincerely,

Sample tenure letter #6: Florence Nightingale (Negative)

Dear Dean FFF,

I am sorry to report that the Departmental Evaluation Committee in the Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing unanimously recommends to you and to the Faculty Tenure Committee that Dr. Florence Nightingale not be transferred to the tenured faculty, and that her employment with Ryerson University cease as of the coming July 31.

Dr. Nightingale came to Ryerson in 2006 after a 15-year career as a nurse in the Canadian Forces. Following a three-year assignment in Afghanistan, she embarked upon doctoral studies at McGill, receiving her Ph.D. in 2008 with a dissertation on battlefield triage. She would normally have been reviewed for tenure in 2010-2011, but on account of a leave for health reasons, an MOU was signed extending her probationary period for two years.

Her record in SRC is not at the level needed for transfer to the tenured faculty. She has only one short chapter in a book entitled *Old and New Frontiers in Nursing*, published by the Canadian Nurses Association in 2010. The editor of the book is her doctoral supervisor, and the DEC has been unsuccessful, after three attempts, in finding out from her what the process of review was for inclusion in the book.

In any case, the chapter, "A Triage Nurse in Afghanistan," is brief, just four pages, and does not really represent research. It is more in the form of a memoir, reflections on the experience of being a healer on a battlefield. It is an interesting piece, but it does not qualify as peer-reviewed SRC.

In terms of service, she has been relatively absent from the School during most of her period of employment, turning up only occasionally at School meetings, and never volunteering to take on tasks. She was assigned to the curriculum committee in 2009-2010, but made no contribution to it.

Her record as a teacher is mediocre. The classroom reviews made by her peers are on the whole positive, while the student survey results with respect to the student experience give her the worst marks in the School. The DEC has several times encouraged her to make use of the services of the Learning and Teaching Office, but we have seen no trend in the student survey results.

We conclude, with regret, that she has not met the standard in teaching, service and SRC for transfer to the tenured faculty.

Sincerely,