

To: University of the Fraser Valley Community

From: Wendy Burton, Virginia Cooke, Eric Davis, Scott Fast, Diane Griffiths, Dan Ryan, Rhonda Snow

Date: November 18, 2009

Subject: **Report of the Joint Committee on Rank and Tenure**

PREAMBLE

The Joint Committee on Rank and Tenure has been meeting since November, 2008. In January, 2009 we circulated a statement of “principles guiding the discussion of rank and tenure at UFV”, and in March we published an update. Both these documents are appended to this report.

In addition to our meetings, some of the FSA representatives on the committee have met with a number of faculty groups and departments in order to hear concerns and answer questions. Discussions have also occurred at the department and faculty council levels. The joint committee has had access to notes from these meetings when they were supplied. We have also received and reviewed submissions from many departments, the Research Advisory Committee, and several individuals. These submissions have been posted on the “Ranks and Tenure” group on MyUFV in order to generate ideas and discussion.

Committee members are Diane Griffiths, Dianne Common (through May, 2009), Eric Davis, Dan Ryan, Virginia Cooke, Scott Fast, Rhonda Snow, and Wendy Burton. Because of the committee members’ complex schedules and the interruption over summer, there were no meetings between June 28 and October 20, 2009. We have, however, engaged in open and intense discussion, and even though numerous issues require more attention and development, we believe we should now issue a report and some recommendations. The university community can then take up the conversation about whether these recommendations offer a base on which to build systems of tenure, titles, and promotions.

Among the guiding principles were the primary importance of teaching, the wide range of our programs, and the need for flexibility. In attempting to be inclusive and flexible, we have drafted recommendations that apply to all faculty at UFV whose current jobs consist primarily of offering credit courses to students. As noted in the “Update” sent to faculty, “we are all in agreement that teaching must be paramount, and that the other elements of scholarship and service must

be related to teaching. . . adequate criteria and systems of evaluation need to be in place for all these.”

The initial focus of our discussions regarding a model for Rank and Tenure was faculty who are primarily responsible for the academic content and delivery of academic programs and courses. We recognize that this does not cover all our faculty and plan to continue the discussion regarding other groups.

In particular, we received thoughtful submissions from librarians, counsellors, educational advisors, and the Writing Centre, outlining, among other things, the essential teaching and research components of their work. Even though this initial report does not include recommended systems or titles for these groups, we are not precluding parallel systems of rank and tenure. There are several examples in Canadian universities of parallel systems of promotion and titles working effectively in the same institution. Most universities have a ranking system for librarians; a few have ranks for counsellors or other groups whose functions are vital to student education but who are not teaching courses. The Joint Committee equally recognizes that this initial focus on the model for faculty who teach credit courses should not discourage submissions from non-teaching faculty and Educational Advisors, which clarify what those particular groups consider teaching, service and scholarship. These submissions will provide important equivalencies for later inclusion, or as the foundation of separate models. Also, we have not addressed the issue of Lab Instructors, who are not usually included in a ranking system.

Some individuals and departments argued strongly that faculty interests would not be served by any system of ranking and merit-based promotion, and that tenure was unnecessary, as our current job security is adequate. The committee agreed from the outset to explore systems of rank and tenure in a positive light, though we were certainly open to arguments to the contrary. For those faculty who have proven (or will prove) their competence and their teaching excellence, a secure job is a clear expectation. But to seek *promotion* is a choice, not forced on anyone. For many of our faculty, the opportunity for that choice is important, either for practical professional reasons of outside recognition by colleagues, granting agencies, etc., or for reasons of personal satisfaction and professional goals and benchmarks. We agreed that they should not be denied that choice.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Tenure

The Joint Committee on Rank and Tenure agrees that at most Canadian universities, tenure is an effective safeguard of academic freedom. Tenure allows faculty members the freedom of independent inquiry and criticism, participation in the development and implementation of academic policies and engagement in

the honest and unfettered pursuit of knowledge. Tenure also confirms acceptance by a faculty member of agreement to perform conscientiously as a teacher, scholar and member of the academic community.

The committee wants to stress that bringing in tenure to our university will not result in the creation of large numbers of “non-tenure-stream” positions. We envision tenured faculty positions as the norm, just as permanent faculty are currently the norm.

Recommendation 1: UFV adopt a Tenure System which allows newly hired faculty a maximum period of 6 years to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship and service.

Recommendation 2: Tenure be granted to all current permanent UFV faculty who have successfully passed probation. Probationary permanent faculty will complete the probationary appointment process in place at the time of their initial appointment, and if successful, will be granted tenure.

B. Titles and Ranks

In our update, we noted that most faculty members expressed the desire to adopt the traditional nomenclature for titles. What will characterize these titles and reflect the non-traditional nature of our own university will be the criteria we establish, at the departmental and institutional level balancing our own history and values with national standards for these ranks.

Recommendation 3: UFV adopt the following titles for tenure-track faculty positions:

- a. Lecturer (reserved for the few cases in which faculty are hired while still completing the terminal credential in that field);
- b. Assistant Professor;
- c. Associate Professor;
- d. Full Professor.

Recommendation 4: On implementation of ranks, UFV faculty already appointed to a permanent position, and those still on probation, will be granted titles (or ranks) as follows:

- a. Lecturer
No Faculty will be assigned the rank of Lecturer.
- b. Assistant Professor
Existing probationary faculty and faculty who have completed probation, but have not yet finished two full evaluation cycles will be granted this rank.

- c. Associate Professor
Existing non-probationary faculty who have completed two successful post-probation evaluation cycles — in other words, most of our existing permanent faculty.
- d. Professor
No faculty will be assigned the rank of Professor. To gain the title of Professor, faculty would have to apply once the criteria have been established and approved by Senate.

Once appointed to an initial rank, existing faculty will be promoted through the promotion procedures for all faculty.

C. Tenure Decisions at UFV

The Joint Committee believes the procedures for tenure and promotion decisions at UFV should be clear and documented, developed and carried out by at least two levels of university committees.

Tenure and promotion decisions are separate decisions, although the same committee(s) may be mandated to make each decision. Ultimately, a university-wide committee will make the final recommendation to the President for the granting of tenure and promotion to faculty.

The Joint Committee has considered both two and three levels of committee review.

- a. Three levels would include:
 - i. a department committee (or cognate departments if the department is small),
 - ii. a faculty-level committee with input from the department and
 - iii. a university-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee, which would be a subcommittee of the Senate.
- b. A two-level committee would eliminate department level committees.

Recommendation 5: To ensure effective departmental participation in rank and tenure decisions, the committee recommends three levels of committees to consider the applications of faculty applying for tenure and for promotion.

D. Tenure Criteria

Faculty workloads at UFV, as at other universities and colleges, are comprised chiefly of teaching, service (institutional and community), and scholarship. All faculty to be considered for tenure and promotion would be expected to demonstrate competence in the areas of service and scholarship, and superior skills in teaching.

The committee looked at some models which divided faculty into streams (as most recently adopted at TRU and previously at Ryerson) with substantially different teaching loads. Those with less teaching (5 courses at both TRU and Ryerson) are expected to engage in much more research—not unlike faculty at “traditional” universities. Those with higher teaching loads (8 courses at TRU and 50 hours at Ryerson) are exempt from research. We decided to commit ourselves to retaining one faculty stream, although this is made challenging by the great diversity of our work and our programs. We believe that teaching, service and scholarship are interrelated, and are essential to the work of *all* university faculty, regardless of their program areas, though the nature of this work, especially scholarly activity, varies widely.

Recommendation 6: UFV adopt a single Faculty stream based on teaching, service and scholarship with considerable flexibility in the weighting of these criteria, as requested by the faculty member. For service and scholarship, the minimum weighting would be ten percent for each. For teaching, the minimum would be sixty percent.

Recommendation 7: UFV continue to embrace a broad definition of scholarship (such as is currently outlined in our collective agreement), and that the University develops appropriate evaluation criteria for all those forms of scholarship, including creative work and the scholarship of pedagogy and service.

Recommendation 8: The committee recommends that UFV seek more resources to support faculty scholarship in its broadest definition.

E. Evaluation Procedure for Tenure

In all the investigation that the committee did, we found that five or six years is the normal period allowed for someone to be granted tenure. Arguably, this amount of time allows a person to build a strong portfolio, with a clear record of teaching competence, and potential for teaching excellence, and an appropriate record of service and scholarship. Thus, this time would allow for the best shot at a successful application.

Recommendation 9: UFV adopt an open and transparent Tenure process which ensures that Tenure-Track faculty are aware of what is expected of them to achieve Tenure, and whether they are “on-track” to achieve Tenure. Tenure-Track faculty who are not performing adequately must be aware of this early in the process and be aware that a denial of tenure is likely, unless corrective action is taken. The committee recommends the Tenure process consist of two complementary but separate elements: a) mentoring, and b) performance review.

Recommendation 10: New faculty undergo an annual performance review; and new faculty be provided formal mentoring throughout the Tenure process. The Teaching and Learning Centre will provide leadership in training departments in best practices, and in offering workshops and courses to supplement the one-on-one mentorship role that individual senior department members agree to provide.

Proposed steps:

Year I: The faculty member is normally hired at the Assistant Professor level. At the end of year I, the Dean, the department head and the new faculty member discuss the performance review, and a written report is prepared which becomes part of the tenure file.

Year II: As above.

Year III: The Department reviews the performance and tenure file, and makes a recommendation to the dean regarding the progress of the new faculty member towards fulfilling the requirements for Tenure. The dean makes a decision whether to renew or release the new faculty member.

Year IV: Same as Year II The faculty member would receive feedback from the Department and Dean.

Year V: The faculty member may now apply for tenure.

Year VI: The faculty member must apply for tenure by this time. Assuming positive reviews and progress in the previous 5 years, reflecting satisfactory development and demonstration of teaching, scholarship and service worthy of Tenure, the Faculty member would be granted Tenure.

F. Promotions

Usually, upon application for tenure, a faculty member would also apply for promotion to Associate Professor; however, these are not inextricably linked. The application to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor could come as early as Year IV.

Recommendation 11: Promotion and Tenure not be necessarily linked.

G. Development of Promotion Criteria

Recommendation 12: Criteria for successful promotion to each rank be developed at three levels:

- a. by departments, with attention to the particular components of teaching, service and scholarship appropriate to that department and discipline at a national level.
- b. by faculties, with attention to the particularities of areas, but ensuring equity of standards between departments in the faculty and the disciplines at the national level.
- c. university-wide with some elements that are universal to all areas, ensuring consistent standards throughout the institution, but recognizing that there will be diversity in specific criteria as developed by departments and faculties.

All these criteria will be approved by Senate. Criteria should be clear and transparent so that committees judging faculty applications could apply them objectively.

H. Promotion Committees

Recommendation 13: UFV adopt a process for promotion that reflects the process for Tenure with three levels of committees:

- a. Departmental - Recommendation made to the Dean
- b. Faculty Level - Recommendation made to University Promotion and Tenure Committee
- c. University Promotion and Tenure Committee - Recommendation made to the President and to the Board for final approval

I. Salary

Recommendation 14: Salary is not tied to faculty rank.

J. Summary

The request for a system of rank and tenure has come from faculty who feel strongly that their professional roles will be best supported through ranks. The committee recognizes that the recommendations above do not encompass all groups on campus who have made requests of the committee, but it is a good start. We hope to get feedback from everyone on the proposed model, and work with you to refine the above model, and develop further recommendations to address outstanding issues.

We look forward to working with you to create a credible system of Rank and Tenure here at UFV that reflects the wide diversity of our programs and our commitment to teaching, service and scholarship.

Appendix A

1. Promotions

Upon application for tenure, a faculty member may also apply for promotion to Associate Professor; however, these are not inextricably linked. The application for the rank of Associate Professor could come as early as Year IV.

2. Evaluations

Excluding the rank of lecturer, Faculty are normally expected to demonstrate successful performance at each rank for a minimum of two evaluation periods before applying for the next rank.

3. Weighting

Faculty workloads at UFV, as at other universities and colleges, are comprised chiefly of teaching, scholarship, service (discipline, institutional and community). All Faculty considered for tenure and promotion would be expected to demonstrate competence in service and scholarship, and mastery of their discipline and skills in teaching.

We believe that teaching, service and scholarship are both inter-related and essential to the work of *all* university Faculty, regardless of their program areas, though the nature of this work, especially scholarly activity, varies widely. However, we also recognize that each faculty member should have the freedom to define their own contribution to the University and discipline within reasonable limits. For these reasons, faculty should be able to choose weightings which reflect their own contributions to the university, own desires and interests, with the following prescribed minimums.

Minimum Weights:

Teaching	60%
Scholarship	10%
Service	10%

Thus individuals who do not meet minimal requirements will not be eligible for promotion or tenure.

We believe this weighting system is an effective way to accommodate both diversity of faculty interests and the changes in focus that may naturally occur over the course of an academic career. For example, given the requirement for mastery of teaching we propose, it is possible a new young faculty member may decide to choose a weighting structure that concentrates on teaching,

accompanied by scholarship and service weightings best suited to them at this point in their career. Alternatively, an experienced teacher and scholar may choose a much higher concentration in scholarship as an appropriate weighting.

We believe the weighting that faculty choose should be open to change over time, and that post-tenure changes in weightings should normally be linked to the regular faculty performance review cycle.

4. Definitions

Teaching

Teaching is a scholarly and dynamic endeavour that covers a broad range of activities with a commitment to creating the best possible learning situation for students and to fostering students' independence in critical inquiry and scholarship. Teaching involves attention to course work, course design, program design, discipline specific mentoring of individual students, methods of teaching, curriculum development and other instructional related activities.

Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as research, scholarly and/or artistic work which is creative and intellectual. At UFV, scholarship is broad in scope, and includes, for example, the study and development of pedagogy, the creation of training manuals, inventing or enhancing a piece of equipment, translating scholarly material, in addition to writing and publishing more conventional books and articles. Such work can occur through discovery, integration, teaching and learning, or application of knowledge and must be disseminated within learned societies and the public realm.

Service

Service is active participation in the corporate life of the University community, the Member's discipline and/or profession, and in the community-at-large. Participation on University and Faculty Association committees, assistance and leadership in departmental administration, and contributions to the intellectual and cultural life of the campus are part of such service. Service is also demonstrated through contributions to professional or learned societies, through participation in local, provincial, national and international organizations and programs related to the Member's discipline; consulting work; and contributions in a professional capacity to the community-at-large and to cultural, community and service organizations, particularly in the Fraser Valley.

5. Ranks

Lecturer

This rank is transitory. An individual appointed to the rank of lecturer would possess attributes equivalent to those of someone appointed as Assistant Professor; however, the lecturer would be in the process of completing the terminal credentials appropriate to his or her discipline and program. Upon completion of the credentials, the lecturer would be granted the rank of Assistant Professor. Continued employment and successful application for tenure would be dependent on this completion.

Assistant Professor

Criteria for the appointment at the level of Assistant Professor:

- a. normally possess a doctorate or accepted equivalent terminal credential for the discipline;
- b. Teaching: Demonstrated strong potential for effective and imaginative teaching;
- c. Scholarship: Demonstrated potential for productive scholarship, creative or professional work;
- d. Service: Commitment to active service which contributes to the welfare of the University, Discipline/Profession, or Community.

Associate Professor

Criteria for promotion, or appointment, at the level of Associate Professor:

- a. normally possess a doctorate or accepted equivalent terminal credential for the discipline;
- b. Teaching: Evidence of sustained mastery of the discipline and skills involved in teaching, and of development of curriculum.
- c. Scholarship: Evidence of consistent accomplishment in the discipline supported by internal and external recognition.
- d. Service: Evidence of sustained commitment to active service which contributes to the welfare of the University, Discipline/Profession, or Community supported by internal and external recognition.
- e. normally two successful evaluation periods at the rank of assistant professor.

Professor

Criteria for promotion to, or appointment at, the level of Associate Professor:

- a. normally possess a doctorate or accepted equivalent terminal credential for the discipline;
- b. Teaching: Evidence of sustained outstanding performance in teaching as supported by both internal and external recognition;
- c. Scholarship: Evidence of a strong record of sustained scholarly activity as supported by the dissemination of their work to learned societies and in the public realm and by internal and external recognition.
- d. Service: Evidence of outstanding contributions to the welfare of the University; Discipline/Profession, or Community supported by internal and external recognition;
- e. Normally two successful evaluation periods at the rank of associate professor