

Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management Guidelines for Supporting Evidence for Promotion and Tenure

Teaching, research and scholarship, and service are the primary areas of responsibility in FKRM.¹ This document is divided into two distinct sections:

1. Definitions of the primary areas of responsibility and general factors for evaluating contributions in each, which are consistent with Articles 19 and 20 of the [UMFA Collective Agreement](#) (2016-17); and
2. Guidelines for annual reporting and supporting evidence in applications for tenure, continuing appointment and promotion.

1. Definitions of Primary Areas and General Factors for Evaluation

a. Teaching

Pertains to the act/practice of fostering learning and knowledge transfer through planning, delivering, and assessing undergraduate and graduate students in assigned courses (as well as directed/individual/independent study courses). Supervision of graduate students also involves formal and informal interactions that fit within this broad conceptualization of teaching/instruction. Factors for evaluation in this area might include: course work and all related activities; supervision of graduate students; participation in graduate student committees; participation in seminars and colloquia; innovative methods of teaching; recognition for expertise in curriculum development, evaluation, and implementation.

b. Research and Scholarship

Research includes work, conducted alone or in collaboration with others, that pushes boundaries of basic and applied knowledge, enhances theoretical knowledge and contributes to knowledge construction in general, leads to innovations in professional practice, influences public policy, and promotes the broader mission of the Faculty and University as a catalyst for knowledge generation and transfer. Scholarship, while integrally linked to the research enterprise, is an overarching concept that pertains to the recognition attained in one's scholarly community, normally a national community of scholars who share the faculty member's area of expertise.² Thus, peer review of one's scholarly ideas and contributions is a critical component of evaluation. The Collective Agreement highlights a number of factors for evaluating achievements in research/scholarship: publication of books, monographs, and chapters in edited books; papers in both refereed and non-refereed journals; papers delivered at professional meetings; invited presentations, participation in panels; unpublished research including current work in progress; editorial and refereeing duties; creative works and performances. Additionally, the quality, originality, and impact—not simply the quantity—of published and unpublished works shall be evaluated.

¹ Coaching is included in a separate document, please see *FKRM Specific Criteria for the Promotion of Coaches within the Instructor Rank*.

c. Service

Service includes internal and external activities that pertain to the research and teaching mandate of the University. Activities to be factored into evaluation in this area include: membership on Faculty and University committees and bodies; voluntary work done for learned societies, associations, agencies, professional organizations, and the faculty association; participating as an examiner, assessor or referee for the Faculty, the University, other Faculties, other Universities; serving as an editor, associate editor or reviewer for scholarly or professional journals, granting agencies or other academic or professional bodies; writing letters of reference for, or providing course/career guidance to students; and providing research, education, or professional expertise to organizations at the local, provincial, national or international levels. Beyond the University context, “Community service is that work within the community at large that enhances the reputation of the University because the individual faculty member makes an essentially non-remunerative contribution by virtue of special academic competence” (Article 19, Collective Agreement).

2. Supporting Evidence for Tenure, Continuing Appointment and Promotion

Besides the standardized application forms required for tenure, continuing appointment, and/or promotion, supporting documentation is left to the discretion of the candidate or the promotion committee (Article 20.A.3.3). Committees in FKRM typically expect supporting information, such as: a current curriculum vitae, copies of published and unpublished writings, student evaluations, reports on ongoing and future research, and letters of support internal and external to the University (e.g., from colleagues, professional service organizations). In recent years, candidates have started to include teaching dossiers and, in some cases, these have been expanded to include statements of research and service responsibilities as well.

Given that it is the responsibility of each individual faculty member to advance the merits of their application it is recommended that supporting evidence of performance in relation to all assigned duties accompany submissions for tenure, continuing appointment, and promotion. The purpose of this recommendation is to afford every candidate the opportunity to fully present their case and to provide context essential for an objective and fair assessment of their accomplishments. According to the Collective Agreement, supporting documentation must be made accessible only to elected and appointed members of the promotion committee (Article 20.C) and must be factored into tenure and promotion proceedings (Article 20.A.3.3).

The following subsections contain examples of information that could be included as supporting documentation.

a. Teaching

i. Elements to be Evaluated

An extensive body of research is devoted to university-based teaching and its four inter-related core elements: knowledge, organization, communication, and evaluation (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1998)³.

³ Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T.(1998). Studying college students in the 21st Century: Meeting New Challenges. *Review of Higher Education*, 21, 2, 151-165.

- *Knowledge* refers to the individual's base of knowledge in the teaching area, including factors such as the currency and breadth of course materials and information. Higher order intellectual skills such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation are also critical to learning (Bloom, 1956)⁴, and should be incorporated into the learning process.
- *Organization* pertains to the systematic preparation and delivery of information/knowledge (e.g., quality of materials and lessons; defined instruction/learning objectives; structure and coherency of presentation).
- *Communication* refers to the interactions between professor/instructor and student that foster learning and skill development, within the classroom and beyond.
- *Evaluation* refers to the methods of assessing student knowledge and skill development.

ii. Supporting Evidence of Teaching Performance

I. Evidence and Materials Provided by the Candidate

Teaching Dossier

A teaching dossier that highlights achievements in the core areas noted above is encouraged as a way of providing information sufficient for accurately and fairly assessing quality of instruction. Teaching dossiers, while highly individualized, typically include two types of information:

- a. *Student evaluations*: Summative information provided by the SEEQ may be useful as a broad-based assessment of organization and communication functions implicit in quality teaching. Additionally, the SEEQ (items 30 through 32 respectively) enables a comparative rating of teaching skill in relation to other instructors within the faculty and University-wide. Submission of summary reports of the SEEQ results for each course, therefore, is encouraged.

Note: Pursuant to Article 11 of the Collective Agreement, no anonymous material may be used in tenure and promotion proceedings, which means that the SEEQ forms of individual students and, in particular, the open-ended commentary that may be included in these forms cannot be used in evaluating teaching performance. As such, *only the SEEQ summary statistical form may be included in the teaching dossier.*

The teaching dossier may also include written comments by students or former students, but only when the communication is clearly identified as being written by the student. Permission must be obtained from the student before using this information in a dossier. All materials must be handled in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA) (e.g., verify identification, do not share files electronically, protect privacy (redact email addresses and sensitive information)).

- b. *Materials for peer review*: While student course evaluations are one useful source of information, they typically do not provide a strong, pedagogically well-grounded assessment of teaching effectiveness. To address this issue, and to mesh with the four core elements of teaching, a dossier might include:

⁴ Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook 1: Cognitive domain*, New York David McKay.

Knowledge: Research suggests that this is the most difficult element of teaching to assess—especially in interdisciplinary faculties like FCRM. Evidence in this area could address the currency, breadth and depth of course materials, as well as the extent to which students are intellectually challenged and are required to analyze, synthesize and evaluate information (through, for example, course assignments, assessments and in-class activities). To aid in the evaluation of knowledge and its transmission, the following materials could be included in the teaching dossier by the candidate:

- Evidence of production, selection and use of teaching materials such as textbooks, course readings, videos, lab manuals, course notes, models and computer simulations to enhance learning;
- Specific examples of how current research and relevant new research findings are incorporated into course materials;
- Detailed description of the textbook(s) used, including publication dates and documented reasons that particular texts were chosen, including plans to retain, change or update textbooks if applicable;
- Description and examples of problem solving exercises done in class (e.g., case studies);
- In a laboratory course, a copy of the lab manual with all of the lab assignments, description of grading for the lab assignments, as well as copies of evaluation tools used in labs such as midterm exams or weekly quizzes;
- Evidence of design of new courses, such as advanced undergraduate or graduate courses in the candidate's field of study.

Involvement/use of [The Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning](#) sponsored services and supports (e.g., Peer Consultation program) also may provide an indication of knowledge and a commitment to quality teaching. Including evidence of this nature in the dossier may be useful, for example:

- Attendance by the candidate at CATL lectures related to teaching improvement.
- Teaching innovations made by the candidate to improve teaching quality.

Organization: The course syllabus is often a useful means for assessing organization of a course—its structure, cohesion, etc. Examples that demonstrate effectiveness in this area could be included in the dossier:

- A copy of the course syllabus with a calendar of the topics to be covered in order, assigned texts/readings, evaluation methods, evaluation procedures, objectives of the course, assignments and assignment timelines;
- Description of course objectives how these are met by the materials presented in the course;
- Evidence of adherence to procedures established by the University for the responsible conduct of a course; e.g., scheduled exams (where applicable), grading schemes, non-cancellation of classes, limited use of substitute instructors, adherence to published course timelines;
- Evidence of the use, if appropriate, of technology to aid in course organization (e.g., UM Learn, iClicker, etc.).

Communication: Indications of excellence in this area might include a positive attitude towards your teaching, an enthusiasm for the topic/subject matter, clarity of presentation. A statement of teaching philosophy is one concrete way of

demonstrating/communicating skills in this area. Other examples that might be included to support excellence in communication:

- Evidence of the candidate's ability to communicate in class and to facilitate appropriate feedback from students (the evaluation of teaching performance by students, colleagues and administrators is discussed below);
- Examples of innovative methods in teaching;
- Examples of challenging in-class group exercises used to promote interaction between the students in the course;

Evaluation: According to research, the standard for high quality evaluation rests on whether it is: fair, accurate, and consistent. Additionally, evidence suggests that multiple modes (different approaches/techniques) and points (formative and summative) of assessment are best. Instructor feedback on assignments and evaluations (depth/degree) is another useful indicator of quality evaluation practices. Evidence to support excellence in evaluation might include:

- Detailed description of the evaluation techniques used in the course, including the type and number of exams, written assignments, laboratory assignments, term papers and other assignments. Copies of exams and quizzes should be included;
- Description and rationale of grading mechanism used in each course

II. Evidence Based on Formative and Summative Teaching Reviews

Teaching evaluation should be multi-faceted and include both formative and summative reviews. Formative evaluation is intended to foster development and improvement, and is used to provide helpful feedback to instructors, for example by peer or administrative evaluation. Summative evaluation is used to assess whether results meet the stated goals (efficacy) and may be qualitative and/or quantitative, for example the use of SEEQ evaluations in tenure and promotion decisions.

Compulsory Evaluation

Administrative Review of Teaching/Student Supervision

Administrative reviews of teaching provide an important perspective and will include both formative and summative elements. This review will be conducted by the Associate Dean (Undergraduate Education). An administrative teaching review will be required before application for tenure or, in the case of Instructors, before the granting of continuing appointment status. This review will include observation of teaching.

Optional Evaluation

Peer Review of Teaching

Student evaluations cannot provide a complete or pedagogically grounded assessment of teaching effectiveness, nor provide helpful feedback. Formative peer reviews can provide insight into strengths and weaknesses, encourage reflection about teaching, and facilitate scholarship in teaching and learning. "Besides the need for peer review as a validating agent of effective teaching, peer review is also essential in the improvement of teaching. The help of a peer in seeing ourselves teach 'from the outside' is imperative when trying to improve teaching".

Peer review can be conducted in several ways:

- Reciprocal visits and observations
- Teaching and learning circles
- Peer review of the teaching dossier (portfolio)
- Team teaching
- Collaborative inquiry
- Assessment by colleagues of seminar and colloquia presentations

III. Evidence Based on Undergraduate Student Research Supervision

Teaching effectiveness may also be demonstrated by the successful supervision of students undertaking undergraduate research projects and theses.

IV. Evidence Based on Graduate Student Supervision

The successful mentoring of graduate students is another indicator of teaching involvement and effectiveness. Both qualitative information and quantitative outcomes may be used to demonstrate successful performance in this area. A statement of graduate training philosophy, together with a written description of experience supervising graduate students, will provide context to assist in the evaluation. Although student privacy must be protected, it will be important to convey any special circumstances that may have impacted graduate student outcomes or negatively affected student progress. Letters of support from graduate students and colleagues, including co-advisors of graduate students and fellow members of student thesis committees, may also be submitted.

Additional outcomes that could be considered, among others, include:

- Successful graduate student thesis research supervision (list students who have graduated and their thesis titles)
- Membership on graduate student committees
- Training opportunities provided to graduate students
- Time to completion and completion rate of graduate students
- Graduate student publications and presentations (quality and number)
- Numbers of graduate students receiving awards
- Evidence of effective graduate student teaching, both in formal courses and informally (if not included elsewhere as evidence of teaching performance)

b. Research and Scholarship

To provide a strong foundation for demonstrating quality of research and scholarly work, a research dossier could be submitted. This document could be used to demonstrate continuity and ongoing commitment to high quality research and scholarly activities. To achieve this aim, the following might be useful guidelines:

i. Elements to be Evaluated

Demonstrated achievement in four central elements of the research process can be included here. Evidence of:

- Disciplinary expertise and knowledge
- Progressive and on-going development as a scholar
- Dissemination and knowledge translation
- Recognition

ii. Supporting Evidence of Research Performance

I. Evidence and Materials Provided by the Candidate

Disciplinary expertise and knowledge

- a focused research agenda;
- clear goals or purpose of work
- significance/importance of the issues in the discipline of study
- knowledge of existing work in the discipline

Progressive and on-going development as a scholar

- cumulative contributions/growth in research
- grant proposals (those that are funded as well as those applied for)
- grant funding and other sources of support (e.g., foundations)
- networking/collaborations

Dissemination and knowledge translation

- refereed publications (books, chapters in books or proceedings, articles in academic or professional journals, abstracts)
- book reviews, encyclopedia entries, comments in journals
- non-refereed publications (books, chapters in books or proceedings, publications in non-refereed periodicals)
- conference presentations/symposia participation
- research reports
- technical and professional reports
- creative works (commissions, exhibitions or concerts)
- presentations/workshops/panel contributions
- contributions via popular media (e.g., radio, television, etc.)
- in addition to publications, dissemination to a significant scholarly community or other relevant communities also provides a measure of scholarship.
- application of knowledge and utilization of research evidence to support change or beneficial outcomes (putting knowledge into action, for example by working with policy makers, practitioners and other users of knowledge)

Recognition

- awards, honours, acknowledgements
- external reviewing of programs; national granting bodies

c. Service

Contributions in this area also could be documented via a statement of service or as a distinct component within a dossier that includes descriptions specific to overall workload assignment. This statement could be supplemented with letters of support pertaining to one's service involvement. Participation in service activities can occur within the University and Faculty, as well as within the community.

Providing course/career guidance to students, reviewing for scholarly or professional journals and granting agencies, and serving as an assessor or referee for the Faculty, the University or other faculties or universities are examples of service contributions. Examples of activities where one's expertise (research, education, or professional) is shared with local, provincial, national and international organizations also could be presented as evidence of excellence in this area. This could include leadership or membership on committees and boards, and on

conference and workshop organizing committees. Participation on task forces and steering committees are further examples.

d. Annual Reports

Annual reports are the standard mechanism used for annual performance evaluations in FKRM. As per the Collective Agreement (Article 35), this formative approach to evaluation is intended to promote ongoing development of individual faculty members; and is recognized as particularly important in early career stages (e.g., pre-tenure). Annual progress evaluations will be referenced according to assigned workload weightings and the standards set forth for measuring contributions in teaching, research/scholarship, and service (Articles 19 and 34).

All faculty members are required to provide an individual annual report, which conforms to the requirements provided by the Dean's Office each year. The contents of this report will vary according to assigned responsibilities, but as a general principle should include sufficient detail for evaluating progress in each assigned area over the past year. The Dean will meet individually with each faculty member to discuss their annual report and to provide a subsequent written evaluation of progress in relation to assigned duties.

e. Letters of Support

Written opinions of students and/or fellow faculty members could be sought as one mechanism for evaluation in this area.

The written opinions of students and/or fellow faculty members must be signed (no anonymous submissions may be accepted) and are confidential to the evaluation proceeding for which they were solicited. The subject of the submission (i.e., the faculty member) shall receive a copy of these submissions once information that could identify the author has been removed (Collective Agreement articles 11 and 20).