

Department of Curriculum & Instruction

Evaluation Policy

1. Introduction

This document will serve as a supplement to the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy for evaluation of academic work within the Department of Curriculum and Instruction by describing the specific performance standards and minimum acceptable level of performance to meet department expectations. It is subsidiary to the Faculty and Librarian Collective Agreement, and the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy. In case of contradiction between the current document and the Collective Agreement the latter will be the reference document.

2. Biennial Salary Review

2.1 Recommendations

2.1.1 In accordance with section 2.1.1 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, the Department will use a Merit Committee as an advisory body to assist the Chair in making recommendations for salary adjustments to the Faculty Salary Committee.

2.1.2 The Merit Committee of the Department will consist of the Chair, and four faculty members selected from the following area groupings: 1) Art, Music, and Drama, 2) Language and Literacy, 3) Math, Science, Environmental Education, and Educational Technology, and 4) Social Studies, Cultural Foundations, Curriculum Studies, and Indigenous Education.

2.2 Documentation Required for biennial evaluation

2.2.1 Section 2.5.1 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy specifies documents that must be submitted as part of the biennial review process, as well as specifications for those documents.

2.2.2 In addition to the Faculty level criteria, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction has department level specifications and criteria.

1. The updated CV for the years of review should include only Sections 5, 7, 9, and 10 of the standard University of Victoria format CV.
2. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction does not require supporting documentation to be submitted with the biennial evaluation package. However, if the Merit committee is unclear about anything in the submission, further documentation may be requested.
3. The Teaching Dossier should follow the template referred to as the Teaching Activity Report provided by the Learning and Teaching Centre. In addition, it should follow some department specific guidelines.

- i. The Summary of Teaching responsibilities should include courses taught and work with graduate and/or practicum students. The report should include a list of graduate students who have completed during each year of the review period and a listing of all graduate students currently supervised in the most recent year along with a designation of supervisory role (supervisor, committee member, chair of oral, external examiner). (See Appendix A: Reporting template 1 – Graduate supervision).
 - ii. The Assessment of Teaching should include: A summary of all courses taught (information from Section 8 of full CV) during the period of review along with the class enrolment and the numerical scores for *Overall the instructor was effective in this course* and *Overall the course offered an effective learning experience* from the *Course Experience Survey*. (See Appendix A: Reporting template 2 – Teaching). Peer evaluations and self-evaluations may also be included.
 - iii. The Teaching template (see ii. above) should be included as part of the 4-page Teaching Dossier. The Graduate supervision reporting template (see i. above) may be included as an appendix to the Teaching Dossier.
4. In addition to the documents specified in the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, the following must also be submitted:
 1. **Conflict of Interest and External Professional Activities form**
<http://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/resources/forms/index.php>
 2. **Full UVic CV (electronic copy)**

2.3 Career Progress Increment (CPI) Recommendations

2.3.1 Satisfactory performance for awarding of a CPI is defined in Section 2.3.6 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy. All department members who submit the required documentation for the biennial review and meet the minimum criteria will be recommended for a CPI.

2.4 Merit Increment (MI) Recommendations

2.4.1 Recommendations regarding MIs shall adhere to the procedures specified in the Collective Agreement (Article 63 and §19.25-19.29) and the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy (Section 2.4).

2.4.2 The application of the procedures requires an ordinal ranking of cases and so it is necessary to differentiate levels of achievement within each of the following applicable categories. In the case of tenure-track faculty members the areas for consideration are: **Teaching, Scholarly and Professional contributions, and Other Contributions**. The typical distribution of weightings for these areas is 40%, 40% and 20% respectively. An alternative ratio (as per Collective Agreement Section 19.26) may be approved in advance for a fixed period. The ratings

for Assistant Teaching Professors are based only on **Teaching** (80%) and **Other Contributions** (20%). Assistant Teaching Professors contributions to scholarship related to teaching are considered as evidence in the evaluation of teaching (Collective Agreement 19.5.5).

2.4.3 The procedure for determining the rankings involves each member of the Merit Committee independently evaluating and applying the department rubric to each salary package submitted. These independent ratings are then compared and the committee collectively resolves discrepancies and a consensus ranking is prepared. The distribution of merit increments that have been allocated to the department is then determined.

2.4.4 The rubric describes the whole values within each of the areas that are considered. Each of the categories of contribution is rated on a 0–5 scale with increments of 0.5; that is: 0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0...4.0, 4.5, 5.0. See Appendix B for the rubric.

3. Tenure and Promotion

3.1 Reappointment, Tenure, Continuing Appointments, and Promotion

3.1.1 The standards for reappointment, tenure, continuing appointments and promotion are defined within the collective agreement (sections 23 and 25) and elaborated by the department in Section 4 of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Evaluation Policy.

3.1.2 Documents faculty must submit for the purposes of re-appointment, tenure, continuing appointments, and promotion are specified in Section 3.2 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy. Additional department specifications are listed in Section 4 of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Evaluation Policy.

3.1.3 Performance indicators for the Faculty of Education are defined in Section 4 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy. Charts 1-3 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy summarize the performance indicators for Teaching, Scholarly and Professional Contributions, and Other Contributions.

4. Department Performance Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, Continuing Appointments and Promotion

4.1 Standards for Teaching

For a description of the criteria that delineate teaching effectiveness in the Faculty of Education, faculty members are asked to consult Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy 4.2 Teaching Performance and Chart 2: Indicators for teaching performance. Evidence of attention to the development and maintenance of teaching excellence should be present; for example, the documentation in the teaching dossier should show an analytically reflective approach to

teaching and its improvement. The documentation should reflect the criteria listed in the Faculty Evaluation Policy 4.2 and Chart 2.

This being a Faculty of Education where teaching effectiveness is expected, the Department recommends tenure or promotion for those individuals whose overall teaching interactions with students demonstrates successful learning outcomes (e.g. course evaluations, graduate student supervision, unsolicited messages of support, etc.).

4.1.1 For Reappointment as Assistant Teaching Professor

4.1.1.1 Supporting documentation submitted as part of the reappointment process (Section 3.2 Faculty of Education Policy) must include:

- A current Teaching Dossier as per Section 3.2, Faculty of Education Policy;
- Evidence of effective teaching (see Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, Chart 2 for performance indicators);
- All course evaluations (comments are optional, but if included must include all comments for a given section);
- A minimum of 2 peer reviews;
- Other documentation consistent with Collective Agreement 19.5.5 and 19.7, and Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy Chart 2.

4.1.1.2 An Assistant Teaching Professor under consideration for reappointment must demonstrate superior teaching effectiveness (Collective Agreement 22.7). The minimum acceptable average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness across all courses taught is normally 3.5.

4.1.2 For Reappointment as Assistant Professor

4.1.2.1 Supporting documentation submitted as part of the reappointment process (Section 3.2 Faculty of Education Policy) must include:

- A current Teaching Dossier as per Section 3.2, Faculty of Education Policy;
- Evidence of effective teaching (see Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, Chart 2 for performance indicators);
- All course evaluations (comments are optional, but if included must include all comments for a given section);
- One or more peer reviews;
- Other documentation consistent with Collective Agreement 19.7.

4.1.2.2 As per Collective Agreement 22.2.1, an Assistant Professor is evaluated for reappointment on the basis of teaching effectiveness since being appointed to the university. The minimum acceptable average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness across all courses taught is normally 3.5.

4.1.3 For Appointment as Assistant Teaching Professor with a Continuing Appointment (22.10, *Collective Agreement, 2015; Section 3, 4, 4.2 and Chart 2 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy 2015*)

4.1.3.1 Documented teaching excellence as demonstrated through submission of a current Teaching Dossier which includes all course evaluations, and two or more recent peer reviews of teaching in addition to those submitted for reappointment, and other documentation as outlined in the Collective Agreement and in the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy;

4.1.3.2 Teaching effectiveness will normally include assessments (such as CES and peer reviews) carried out during an Assistant Teaching Professor or equivalent position at the University of Victoria; and normally have been undertaken as part of the current appointment in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction. The minimum acceptable average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness across all courses taught is normally 3.5.

4.1.4 For a Continuing Appointment and Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor (Sections 22.10, 25.5.1, and 25.5.2, *Collective Agreement, 2015; Section 3, 4, 4.2 and Chart 2 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy 2015*)

4.1.4.1 Documented teaching excellence as demonstrated through submission of a current Teaching Dossier which includes all course evaluations, and two or more recent peer reviews of teaching in addition to those submitted for reappointment, and other documentation as outlined in the Collective Agreement and in the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy;

4.1.4.2 Evidence of initiative in the development or delivery of the academic programs of the Department (25.5.2, *Collective Agreement*).

4.1.4.3 Teaching effectiveness will normally include assessments (such as CES and peer reviews) carried out during an Assistant Teaching Professor or equivalent position at the University of Victoria; and normally have been undertaken as part of the current appointment in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction. The minimum acceptable average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness across all courses taught is normally 3.5.

4.1.5 For Appointment as Assistant Professor with Tenure (23.15.1, *Collective Agreement, 2015, Section 3, 4, 4.2 and Chart 2 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy 2015*)

4.1.5.1 Documented teaching effectiveness as demonstrated through a current teaching dossier which includes all course evaluations, and normally one or more peer reviews, and other documentation as outlined in the Collective Agreement and the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy.

4.1.5.2 Continued development with regard to teaching effectiveness as indicated by:

- a demonstrated commitment to the importance of excellence in teaching as indicated by evidence consistent with Chart 2 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, and
- normally a minimum average CES rating of teacher effectiveness of 3.5 across all courses taught.

4.1.5.3 The capacity to attain the standards to become a tenured Associate Professor (Collective Agreement Section 23.15.2).

4.1.6 For Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor (23.17, *Collective Agreement, 2015, Section 3, 4, 4.2 and Chart 2 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy 2015*)

4.1.6.1 Submission of a current Teaching Dossier which includes all course evaluations, and one or more peer reviews in addition to those submitted for reappointment, and other documentation as outlined in the Collective Agreement and the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy;

4.1.6.2 Documented evidence in teaching effectiveness as demonstrated by evidence consistent with Chart 2 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy. The minimum acceptable average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness across all courses taught is normally 3.5.

4.1.6.3 Teaching effectiveness will normally include assessments (such as CES and peer reviews) carried out during a tenure track or equivalent position at the University of Victoria; and normally have been undertaken as part of the current appointment in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction.

4.1.7 For Promotion to Tenured Professor

4.1.7.1 Submission of a current Teaching Dossier which includes all course evaluations, and other documentation as outlined in the Collective Agreement and the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy. One or more peer reviews in addition to those submitted for promotion to Associate Professor must be included for those choosing to go forward for promotion based on outstanding achievement in teaching (see Section 4.1.7.3).

4.1.7.2 Documented evidence of continuing teaching effectiveness as demonstrated by evidence consistent with Chart 2 of the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy. The minimum acceptable average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness across all courses taught is normally 3.5. (Collective Agreement, Section 23.18).

4.1.7.3 Documented evidence of outstanding achievements with regard to either teaching or scholarship that has attained recognition at a national or international level (Collective Agreement, Section 23.18).

4.1.8 For Promotion to Teaching Professor

4.1.8.1 Meeting the above criteria for a continuing appointment as Associate Teaching Professor,

4.1.8.2 Documented record of outstanding achievement in teaching (Collective Agreement, Section 25.7.1).

4.2 Standards for Scholarly and Professional Contributions

Given the diverse range of scholarly and creative pursuits within the Department, the Department encourages and acknowledges the value of creative work insofar as it directly informs educational thought and practice in recognized publication, presentation and dissemination. For Reappointment as Assistant Professor or for Tenure, evaluation of scholarly and professional contributions is based on work done since beginning an appointment in the Department of

Curriculum and Instruction. For Promotion, evaluation of scholarly and professional contributions is based on the entire academic career of the individual.

4.2.1 For Reappointment or Continuing Appointment as Assistant Teaching Professor, or Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor (*19.5.5, Collective Agreement, 2015*)

Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors are not evaluated on the basis of their research and scholarship, but there is an expectation that they will keep abreast of current developments in their respective fields, and they may be evaluated on the basis of contributions to scholarship related to teaching, which is included in the definition of teaching performance in Section 4.1. Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors may also report activities listed for tenure/tenure track faculty members under Standards for Scholarly and Professional Contributions (Chart 1, Faculty of Education Policy) inasmuch as they relate to the scholarship of teaching.

4.2.2 For Reappointment as Assistant Professor

4.2.2.1 At least 2 publications should be completed or in press;

4.2.2.2 Research/creative activities in an area of scholarship related to candidate's initial appointment (e.g. funding application, research agenda, continuation of doctoral research, etc.); and

4.2.2.3 Two or more scholarly/professional performances/presentations at least at the regional level (e.g. school professional development, conducting, conference paper, etc.)

4.2.3 For Appointment as Assistant Professor with Tenure (*19.9 and 23.15, Collective Agreement, 2015; 4.1 and Chart 1, Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy*)

4.2.3.1 A consistent record (i.e. steady rate of output) of scholarly and professional performance documented in accord with the Faculty Evaluation Policy Chart 1 Indicators and the Collective Agreement;

4.2.3.2 Evidence of continued development where teaching effectiveness and scholarly achievements have paramount importance (Collective Agreement section 23.15.1);

4.2.3.3 Scholarly or creative achievements of high quality (Collective Agreement Section 23.15.1) that normally includes a minimum of 6 peer-reviewed publications or equivalent juried presentations. Publications in Press will be considered for works in the final stage of publication (i.e. no further edits of any kind are needed) and for which confirming documentation from the publisher is provided. If the minimum number (6) has not been met, the scholarly and professional contributions synthesizing statement (see Section 3.2 Faculty of Education Policy) must contain an explanation for why the minimum has not been met and the scholarly record must contain evidence of equivalent alternative activities; and

4.2.3.4 The capacity to attain the standards to become a tenured Associate Professor. (Collective Agreement Section 23.15.2).

4.2.4 For Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor

4.2.4.1 Meeting all criteria for appointment as Assistant Professor with Tenure;

4.2.4.2 An established research program of scholarly/creative work discussed in the synthesizing statement of scholarly and professional contributions (see Section 3.2 Faculty of Education Policy) and evident in the supporting documentation (see Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, Chart 1, for Performance Indicators);

4.2.4.2 Scholarly or creative achievements of high quality (Collective Agreement Section 23.15.1) that normally includes a minimum of 6 peer-reviewed publications or equivalent juried presentations since beginning of appointment in the Department. Publications in Press will be considered for works in the final stage of publication (i.e. no further edits of any kind are needed) and for which confirming documentation from the publisher is provided. If the minimum number of peer-reviewed publications has not been met, the scholarly and professional contributions synthesizing statement (see Section 3.2 Faculty of Education Policy) must contain an explanation for why the minimum has not been met and the scholarly record must contain evidence of equivalent alternative activities;

4.2.4.3 Scholarly/professional/creative presentations at the regional, national and international levels; and

4.2.4.4 Documented substantial contribution to an academic discipline (23.17, Collective Agreement, 2015) (e.g. citations, letters from peers, external assessment, membership on editorial board, reviewing for major funding agencies, etc.).

4.2.5 For Promotion to Tenured Professor

4.2.5.1 Meeting criteria for tenured associate professor;

4.2.5.2 Documented scholarship, including peer-reviewed publications/scholarly or creative activities (refereed publications or comparable), including significant contributions additional to those presented for promotion to Associate Professor, that has made a substantial contribution to the academic discipline (Collective Agreement, Section 23.18).

4.2.5.3 Documented evidence of outstanding achievements with regard to either teaching or scholarship that has attained recognition at a national or international level (Collective Agreement, Section 23.18).

4.2.6 For Promotion to Teaching Professor

4.2.6.1 Either scholarship related to teaching that has attained national or international recognition, or substantial leadership in the improvement of teaching in the Department or in the University (Collective Agreement, Section 25.7.2).

4.3 Standards for Other Contributions

4.3.1 For Reappointment as Assistant Teaching Professor

4.3.1.1 Regular attendance at Department and Faculty meetings as documented through official minutes of the meetings;

4.3.1.2 Participation on Department or Faculty committees.

4.3.2 For Reappointment as Assistant Professor

4.3.2.1 Regular attendance at department and faculty meetings as documented through official minutes of the meetings;

4.3.2.2 Participation on Department or Faculty committees.

4.3.3 For Appointment as Assistant Teaching Professor with a Continuing Appointment (19.11 and 22.10, Collective Agreement, 2015; Section 4.3 and Chart 3, Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, 2015)

4.3.3.1 Service on department, faculty or university committees OR department leadership roles such as undergraduate advisor, grad advisor, faculty mentor, active section membership/chair, etc.

4.3.3.2 Documentation of any additional relevant contributions consistent with the Performance Indicators in the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, Chart 3.

4.3.4 For a Continuing Appointment with Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor (19.11 and 22.10, Collective Agreement, 2015; Section 4.3 and Chart 3, Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, 2015)

4.3.4.1 Service on department, faculty or university committees OR department leadership roles such as undergraduate advisor, grad advisor, faculty mentor, active section membership/chair, etc.;

4.3.4.2 Documented relevant school/community involvement (e.g. UVic Speakers Bureau, academic/community boards or organizations, moderating educational debate, adjudication, etc.); and

4.3.4.3 Documentation of any additional relevant contributions consistent with the Performance Indicators in the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, Chart 3.

4.3.5 For Appointment as Assistant Professor with Tenure (19.11 and 23.15, Collective Agreement, 2015; Section 4.3 and Chart 3, Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, 2015)

4.3.5.1 Service on department, faculty or university committees OR department leadership roles such as undergraduate advisor, grad advisor, faculty mentor, active section membership/chair, etc.;

4.3.5.2 Documentation of any additional relevant contributions consistent with the Performance Indicators in the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, Chart 3;

4.3.5.3 Service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline Collective Agreement, Section 23.15.1); and

4.3.5.4 The capacity to attain the standards to become a tenured Associate Professor Collective Agreement, Section 23.15.2).

4.3.6 For Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor

4.3.6.1 Service on department, faculty or university committees OR department leadership roles such as undergraduate advisor, grad advisor, faculty mentor, active section membership/chair, etc.

4.3.6.2 Documented relevant school/community involvement (e.g. UVic Speakers Bureau, academic/community boards or organizations, moderating educational debate, adjudication, etc.); or

4.3.6.3 Documentation of any additional relevant contributions consistent with the Performance Indicators in the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy, Chart 3; and

4.3.6.4 Service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline (Collective Agreement, Section 23.15.1).

4.3.7 For Promotion to Tenured Professor

4.3.7.1 Meeting criteria for tenured Associate Professor;

4.3.7.2 A consistent record of service and professional activities showing ongoing commitment to activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline (Collective Agreement, Section 22.18).

4.3.8 For Promotion to Teaching Professor

4.3.8.1 Meeting the criteria for a continuing appointment as Associate Teaching Professor,

4.3.8.2 A consistent record of service and professional activities showing ongoing commitment to activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline. (Collective Agreement, Section 25.7.3).

C&I Templates to use in the Teaching Dossier to report Graduate Supervision and Summary of Teaching/CES. Department members may expand/reduce templates as needed.

[illegible]

Template #2 – Summary of Teaching

[illegible]

Appendix B: Rubric for Biennial Salary Evaluation

Teaching

The Faculty Evaluation Policy specifies that the rating of teaching effectiveness is **not** to be based solely on CES ratings, but should reflect a variety of performance indicators as presented in the Teaching Dossier.

0.0—

- No evidence submitted or a record of unacceptable performance.

1.0—

- Less than 7.5 units with **no approved release time or reduction**
- Very poor/incomplete teaching dossier
- No graduate work
- Little evidence of efforts to enhance teaching (e.g. peer reviews, program and course development/revisions, participation in workshops to enhance teaching, etc.)
- Average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness below 3.5.

2.0—

- Weak teaching dossier
- Little graduate work
- Limited efforts to enhance teaching (e.g. peer reviews, program and course development/revisions, participation in workshops to enhance teaching, etc.)
- Average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness below departmental range for courses assigned, but satisfactory assessments by students and peers.

3.0—

- Satisfactory teaching dossier
- Satisfactory graduate work
- Satisfactory efforts to enhance teaching (e.g. peer reviews, program and course development/revisions, participation in workshops to enhance teaching, etc.)
- Average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness below departmental range for courses assigned, but satisfactory assessments by peers.

4.0—

- Very good teaching dossier
- Substantial graduate work (supervision, program involvement)
- Very clear efforts to enhance teaching (e.g. peer reviews, program and course development/revisions, participation in workshops to enhance teaching, etc.)
- Average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness at the upper end of departmental range for courses assigned

5.0—

- Excellent teaching dossier
- Exceeds expectations for graduate work (supervision, program involvement)
- Substantial efforts to enhance teaching (e.g. peer reviews, program and course development/revisions, participation in workshops to enhance teaching, etc.)

- Average CES ratings of teacher effectiveness at the top end of departmental range for courses assigned

Note: *Assessments of the teaching dossier, quantitative student evaluations and peer reviews within the departmental range for courses assigned shall be established in the 'calibration meeting of the salary committee' annually. These assessments will consider the type, undergraduate or graduate level, and history of the courses under consideration and will represent a range of ratings rather than a single rating. The Chair will provide the committee guidance on the trends in student ratings based on a summary of the preceding terms.*

Scholarship/Professional Contributions

0.0—

- Little evidence of scholarship/professional contributions, significantly below expectations for rank and years of eligible evidence.

1.0—

- Some evidence of professional or scholarly contributions, but well below expectations appropriate for rank and years of eligible evidence.

2.0—

- Scholarly publications and professional contributions evident, but below expectations appropriate for rank and years of eligible evidence
- Little evidence of awards and/or funding as appropriate for rank and years of eligible evidence and area of research.

3.0—

- Evidence of on going peer-reviewed scholarly/professional contributions that meet the range of expectations.
- Evidence in more than one category¹: peer-reviewed publications, professional contributions, conference papers, professional involvement
- Award or funding, as appropriate for rank and years of eligible evidence and area of research.

4.0—

- Exceeds expectations for scholarship/professional contributions
- Evidence of professional leadership
- Additional scholarly/professional products¹
- Major work or funding
- Evidence of more highly recognized journals, performances, conferences, and involvement (editorial board, etc.) as appropriate for rank and years of eligible evidence.

5.0—

- Significantly exceeds expectations for scholarship/professional contributions
- Outstanding number and quality of contributions
- Evidence in several categories¹
- Major works or significant funding
- Recognition from peers
- Evidence of more highly recognized journals, performances, conferences, and involvement (editor, guest editor, associate editor, etc.) as appropriate for rank and years of eligible evidence.

Note: *Expectation is defined by level 3.0 as sustained productivity in scholarship and professional contributions specified by the Faculty of Education Evaluation Policy.*

¹ The Faculty Evaluation Policy (2015) includes a comprehensive list of performance indicators to be considered.

Other Contributions

0.0—

- No evidence of contributions to governance at department, faculty, university, community or profession levels.

1.0—

- Significantly below expectations for rank and career development, with little evidence of contributions to governance of the department, faculty, university, community or profession.

2.0—

- Below expectations for other contributions considering rank and career development, with some evidence of contributions to the governance of at least one of the department, faculty, university, community or profession.

3.0—

- Meets expectations for rank and career development with contributions in more than one area of the governance of the department, faculty, university, community and profession.

4.0—

- Exceeds expectations for rank and career development in several areas of governance: department, faculty, university, community and profession.

5.0—

- Significantly exceeds expectations for rank and career development with contributions in most categories of governance and service-- department, faculty, university, community and profession. Including service at the level of committee chair, or association executive, or activity on a high status committee—e.g., Senate, Board of Governors, association president, executive committee, etc.

or

- Outstanding service beyond department, faculty and university but has satisfactory contributions to the department, faculty and university.