

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

Final Report

31 October 2007

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

Dr Dave Marshall
President, Mount Royal College
and Chair, University Implementation Committee

Dear Dr Marshall,

The members of the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force are pleased to present their Final Report. Ours has been a highly effective collegial process, starting with the initiative to have the Provost and Vice-President Academic and President of the Mount Royal Faculty Association as co-chairs, and extending to a broad committee membership that represented faculty, administration, the Board of Governors and students. We have consulted widely through discussion, surveys and three well-attended community consultations over the past eighteen months. The process has allowed us to reconcile a variety of thoughtful and principled views related to our mandate. We believe that we have captured the current state of thinking at Mount Royal, and we have developed a made-at-Mount-Royal solution to the complex relationship between what faculty do, how they are evaluated, and how their achievements are recognized. We also believe that, by engaging in the process, we have advanced discussion and awareness and brought the community further than we could have anticipated at the beginning of our work.

As we complete our work, we pass it on with confidence in the collegial processes through which faculty roles and responsibilities will be formalized and implemented in negotiations and in the Faculty Councils.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Fisher, Co-Chair

David Hyttenrauch, Co-Chair

Linda Black

John Blomme

Brenda Hendrickson

Janne Holmgren

Paul Johnston

Margy MacMillan

Elaine Mullen

Mardy Roberts

Peter Seto

Kori Street

Executive Summary

As Mount Royal evolves as an institution, we believe that it is necessary to re-examine and change faculty roles and responsibilities. To that end the Task Force on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities was established by the Transition Steering Committee, now named the University Implementation Committee. In this report, the Task Force makes a number of recommendations on faculty roles, the evaluation of faculty responsibilities and the establishment of academic rank at Mount Royal. In making these recommendations, the Task Force understands that it is advisory to the negotiating teams for the Board of Governors and the Mount Royal Faculty Association.

Principles

The Task force bases its recommendations on the five principles of:

1. The primacy of teaching
2. Equivalence of scholarly activities
3. Choice
4. Flexibility
5. Devolution.

Definitions and values

The Task Force then provides distinctly Mount Royal definitions and values for:

1. Teaching
2. Scholarship
3. Service.

Evaluation model

The Task Force then recommends that faculty be evaluated on the basis of either a 60-30-10 (teaching, scholarship and service) pattern or a 90-10 (teaching and service) pattern, with the nature of the patterns and the evaluation priorities informed by the principles, definitions and values.

Academic rank

The Task Force recommends the establishment of academic rank at Mount Royal with the traditional titles of Instructor, Assistant, Associate and Full Professor but with somewhat less traditional expectations of performance within rank. There are different expectations within (and for promotion to) rank for those in the teaching and scholarship pattern and those in the primarily teaching pattern, though the expectations do converge somewhat at the level of Full Professor.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

Tenure

The Task force recommends lengthening the time to tenure to enable faculty to establish a record of scholarly achievement. Faculty could apply after three to five years of tenureable service.

Evaluation

The Task force recommends a system of evaluation every year prior to tenure and every three years after tenure. The process of evaluation would begin with the evaluation of a faculty member's annual report(s) at the department and chair level before going on to the Dean. Evaluation for promotion would be through a similar process. The Task Force further recommends that the criteria for evaluation and promotion be established at the Faculty level and approved by Academic Council.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force **Final Report**

31 October 2007

Introduction

Mount Royal is making the transition from College to undergraduate, degree-granting University level institution. This transition is the clear objective of the Mount Royal Academic Plan and it has been the focus of a great deal of institutional thought and work over the last several years. While retaining many of the defining features that have been its strength in the past, Mount Royal will be a different institution at the end of the current five-year planning phase. The report of Mount Royal's Academic Planning committee indicates that: "We wish to add baccalaureate degrees to the range of credentials that we offer and we expect that a majority of Mount Royal students will be registered in these programs." With the recent launch of Mount Royal's first baccalaureate degree and the anticipated approval of several others, much of the transition work is well advanced. Since any post secondary institution is largely defined by the work done by its faculty, it is to be expected that, as the nature of the institution changes, the nature of faculty roles and responsibilities at Mount Royal will also change. To refer again to the Academic Plan: "Teaching and learning will remain the primary role of faculty, but we will add scholarship and research to their assigned responsibilities."¹ This emphasis on the primacy of teaching must continue to be the core of our institutional activity as faculty roles are broadened. Non-instructional activities have been recognized in the faculty job description in relation to workload adjustments in the 2006-2008 Collective Agreement. Based on Mount Royal's traditional four categories for the assessment of tenure, these currently include professional qualifications and competence, performance of teaching-related duties and responsibilities, professional commitment and activities, and commitment to the college and collegial activity. We are, therefore, moving from a past where the assigned and formally acknowledged faculty responsibility was almost entirely teaching to a future where faculty roles for many colleagues will involve teaching, scholarship and service.

Many colleagues at Mount Royal recognize the need to articulate a different set of faculty roles and responsibilities as we move towards being a university level institution. They recognize that if we are to be seen as university, we need to function more like a university. We have already recognized that there are elements besides teaching in the faculty job description and we understand that the role of scholarship needs to be enhanced as we move forward. These changes are also a requirement of the provincial and national bodies that either already have evaluated, or will evaluate, Mount Royal's capacity and readiness to be a baccalaureate institution. The Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC) Organizational Assessment Standards require that: "The organization has policies and procedures in place to support and facilitate engagement by academic

¹ Mount Royal, Academic Planning Committee Report, November 2006, p.5.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

staff in scholarship and, where appropriate, research or creative activity.”² The report of the Campus Alberta Quality Council institutional review team on Mount Royal makes it clear that we will have to introduce a substantial element of scholarship into the responsibilities of faculty if we are to become a degree-granting institution.³ In Canada, membership in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) is the national recognition of university status and it is a requirement of AUCC membership that an institution “has a proven record of scholarship, academic inquiry and research, expects its academic staff to be engaged in externally peer reviewed research and to publish in externally disseminated sources, and provides appropriate time and institutional resources for them to do so.”⁴ It is also understood at Mount Royal that service is an ethical obligation that underpins academic freedom, and both CAQC and AUCC have requirements on academic governance which in turn require service from faculty members to be effective. Appropriate external service may create valuable opportunities for professional practice; demonstrate the commitment and expertise of Mount Royal faculty; and create important and responsive links among faculty, the institution, its local and regional communities, and academic and professional organizations. There are significant external pressures to meet provincial, national and even international standards of what it means to be a university.

At the same time, Mount Royal is clear that it wants to be a university with a difference in the Canadian context. The balance of faculty roles and responsibilities at Mount Royal will be different from the widely understood norm of “40-40-20” (scholarship, teaching and service) at most Canadian universities. At Mount Royal we are determined to maintain our traditional emphasis on teaching and learning, and the nature of scholarship may also be somewhat distinctive with a particular emphasis on the connection between scholarship and instruction and the recognition that scholarship will take a variety of forms given the diversity of our faculty. These points have already been recognized in the Report of the Task Force on Research at Mount Royal.⁵ Maintaining a balance between system-wide norms of faculty roles and a distinctive culture at Mount Royal will require creativity, commitment and determination.

Changing faculty roles and responsibilities in a post-secondary institution is always a bold and challenging task but, at Mount Royal at this time, it is also a necessary one. Under its charter, the Task Force on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities will make recommendations on these changes. The implementation of these recommendations will occur through the usual processes of institutional governance involving Faculties, Academic Council, the Board of Governors and the process of collective bargaining that leads to the Collective Agreement.

² Campus Alberta Quality Council, Organizational Assessment Standards.

³ CAQC review team report - Organizational Evaluation Report to Campus Alberta Quality Council, Mount Royal College, 11-13 June 2006, pp. 5-6 and 10-11.

⁴ AUCC. Criteria to Become an Institutional Member of AUCC.
http://www.aucc.ca/about_us/membership/criteria_e.html

⁵ Mount Royal, Report of the Task Force on Research, November 2006.

Task Force Mandate, Membership and Process

The Task Force on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities was chartered in October 2005 by the Transition Steering Committee (subsequently renamed the University Implementation Committee). It was charged with considering the “appropriate balance between teaching, research and service for faculty members along with overall guidelines for allocating faculty time to these assignments” and establishing “the gap between current and future roles and responsibilities” along with strategies to address this gap.

The Task Force is advisory in the first instance to the President and to the University Implementation Committee. The Task Force recognizes that, in accordance with both its Charter and a Memorandum of Understanding in the 2006-2008 Collective Agreement, it is also advisory to the negotiating teams for the Board of Governors and the Mount Royal Faculty Association (MRFA), and that its work will be presented jointly to the teams for consideration in the bargaining process. It is also clear, based on a principle of devolution, that many of the evaluation criteria and implementation details referred to in these proposals are best developed at the faculty level.

To reflect the scope of its work and its critical place in the academic life of the institution, from its inception the task force has been jointly chaired by the Provost and Vice-President Academic, Robin Fisher, and the President of the MRFA, David Hyttenrauch, and has been broadly representative of the institution. Debbie Edghill and Linda Black have represented the Board of Governors. Adam Boechler and John Blomme have represented the Students’ Association of Mount Royal College. Brenda Hendrickson served as the Deans’ Council representative, and Peter Seto represented the Office of Institutional Analysis and Planning. Faculty representatives have included David Clemis, Jane Drover and Kori Street for Academic Council, Mardy Roberts for the MRFA Executive, Margy MacMillan and Elaine Mullen as elected faculty representatives, and Janne Holmgren and Paul Johnston designated by the co-Chairs.

During its deliberations from February 2006 onward, the Task Force

- reviewed relevant literature and institutional structures elsewhere;
- met jointly with the Task Force on Research to establish common ground on definitions of scholarship and ensure the work of the two committees was congruent;
- considered the recommendations emerging out of consultations related to the Academic Plan, and out of the final draft of the Plan itself;
- met with the negotiating committees for the MRFA and Board of Governors to clarify the scope of the faculty roles work and articulate the relationship between the Task Force report and the negotiations process;
- conducted an informal survey on attitudes to faculty rank;
- received written and other feedback related to its proposals from individual faculty members and departments;
- received feedback from the President as the proposals developed;
- received feedback from the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Governors;

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

- perhaps most importantly, conducted open community consultations in August 2006, January 2007 and August 2007 .

This Final Report of the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force develops and responds to ideas generated following this extensive consultation process.

Principles

Early in its work on faculty roles and responsibilities, the task force recognized five core principles that would guide its thinking. These five principles are:

1. Primacy of Teaching

The Mount Royal Academic Plan is very clear that instruction and the quality of the student experience are central to the primary mission of the institution. We are determined to create a culture where teaching and learning are the primary activities supported by scholarship and service, and where those who are primarily engaged in teaching are recognized for making a vital and equal contribution to Mount Royal. Leadership in professional development is part of the essence of the culture of teaching and learning.

2. Equivalence of Scholarly Activities

It is also important to recognize that scholarship may take many forms and that all forms of research, scholarly, and artistic activity will be equally valued, just as the Task Force on Research did “not recommend privileging any particular forms of RSA activity.”⁶ Professional activity which meets requisite tests of peer review and appropriate dissemination is an extension of this understanding of the equivalence of forms of scholarship. Indeed, each component of faculty members’ work is integral to their overall contributions and to the success of Mount Royal.

3. Choice

Individual full-time faculty will be able to choose whether they operate under a primarily teaching pattern or a teaching and scholarship pattern of responsibilities. It should also be possible for colleagues to move from one pattern to the other at different times in their career. Individual choice does have to be balanced with institutional planning and the delivery of programs, and this would be achieved with some stability of choice, say, over a three-year cycle.

⁶ Mount Royal, Report of the Task Force on Research, November 2006, p. 2.

4. Flexibility

A rigid template will not work, either for individuals or for the institution, as Mount Royal is making the transition from one set of faculty responsibilities to another. There needs, therefore, to be some variation around the margins of any model allocation of faculty responsibilities to accommodate the needs of individual faculty and the institution. Mount Royal is already moving in this direction with the allocation of increasing funding for teaching release time so that faculty can engage in scholarship or institutional service. As noted, the 2006-2008 Collective Agreement has listed relevant non-instructional activities among those recognized as part of a faculty member's range of activities.

5. Devolution

While the general principles for faculty evaluation will be set at the institutional level, primarily by Academic Council,⁷ individual Faculties should determine the expectations around teaching, scholarship and service based on practice within disciplines. Criteria documents should be approved at Faculty Councils and then reviewed at the institutional level for fit with the general principles. Evaluation should start at the lowest appropriate level consistent with collegial processes and effective decision-making, although there does need to be a process that goes beyond the Department level to ensure broad institutional fairness and consistency.

Faculty responsibilities

Definitions and Values

1. Teaching:

Teaching is a learning relationship between students and faculty. Teaching is Mount Royal's primary mission, the single most important focal point for faculty activity and for students' relationship to the institution, and our unique and distinctive competitive advantage. Teaching contributes to and shapes others' learning, their understanding of the world, their discipline knowledge, the skills they need to succeed, and their roles as citizens in their communities. Teaching develops learners' ability to connect concepts, make inferences, expand awareness, and engage in creative, imaginative, and critical thinking. Teaching encompasses, but is not limited to, classroom instruction as well as instruction in other synchronous and asynchronous venues; individual and group consultation and advice; practicum and field supervision; Honours-level or other major project supervision; curriculum and course development; pedagogical design and preparation; materials development; and assessment design and implementation. Teaching at its best is student-centered and

⁷ This assumes adoption of a new bicameral governance model where faculty are in the majority at Academic Council.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

learner-centered, thoughtful, reflective, and innovative; it connects discipline knowledge to the most effective pedagogy to the needs of students and the community.

Also important in the context of Mount Royal's distinct culture of teaching is professional development in various forms: the maintenance of academic and professional currency; the development, identification and communication of best practices in teaching; the promotion of evidence-based practice in professional and pedagogical environments; the distribution of effective teaching and learning resources and strategies; the creation and extension of resources or programs that support faculty in the teaching mission; the sharing of expertise by Mount Royal and its faculty externally; and significant leadership in teaching excellence with scope beyond the institution.

2. Scholarship:

Scholarship involves peer-to-peer communication of knowledge. It serves teaching and, more generally, the production and dissemination of knowledge. Scholarship is an essential means of maintaining academic and professional currency and locating faculty in the wider academic community. Peer review is the touchstone for defining and evaluating scholarship and so, whatever the form that scholarship takes, there needs to be evidence of peer review. Scholarship engages faculty in a common enterprise with students, namely generating, learning and communicating knowledge. Scholarship encompasses research along with contributions to scholarly, professional and artistic work such as publishing; presenting at, participating in and coordinating conferences; collaborating with and reviewing and editing the work of peers; developing primary and secondary texts and materials for use beyond a particular class; and providing scholarly opportunities for students. For a further elaboration of the nature and role of Scholarship at Mount Royal we refer to the Report of the Task Force on Research.⁸

Any of these forms is valuable to Mount Royal's teaching environment as faculty participate in (and communicate a sense of) vibrant and critical academic debate and discovery, especially as students move on to other career and academic experiences. Scholarship of teaching and learning has a particular value in a student-centered environment because it builds on existing strengths and reinforces the institutional emphasis on students and teaching. All of these constitute a positive assertion of our values and priorities.

3. Service:

Service is the essential ethical obligation and responsibility attached to collegial governance; it is the underpinning of academic freedom and autonomy. Service encompasses participation at the department, faculty and institutional level in academic decision-making processes; selection, support, development and evaluation

⁸ Mount Royal, Report of the Task Force on Research, November 2006.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

of colleagues; appropriate student support including academic advising, development and application of academic policies and other contributions to student success; creation, development, evaluation and revision of academic programs; administrative work; liaison, partnership and leadership work with other relevant disciplines, organizations and communities. Service addresses the academic and organizational needs of students, builds networks within and outside the institution, and brings the skills, disciplinary expertise, perspectives and leadership of faculty to their communities. Service to the profession, discipline or community that relies on the professional or academic expertise of faculty is a contribution Mount Royal values as one element of faculty service, and should be considered alongside institutional service.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities: Evaluation Model

Roles Ratio:

Teaching / Scholarship Pattern	60-30-10		
Teaching-Intensive Pattern	90-10		
Teaching		Scholarship	Service
Flexibility ----->		<-----	<-----

The faculty roles evaluation model, as diagrammed above, represents visually the application of a number of the guiding principles already outlined. Of first importance, this is not primarily a workload model, which is properly the subject of collective bargaining, but an evaluation model predicated on the differing responsibilities and workload assignments faculty will assume as teaching, scholarship and service are integrated. Still, this model is also predicated on the assumption that teaching responsibilities will be based on the three- credit course and its equivalent and that teaching loads will be lighter in the Teaching/Scholarship pattern. For example, based on the 2006-2008 Collective Agreement workload provisions, and for faculty teaching only three-credit lecture courses, those selecting the teaching/scholarship pattern would teach six (three-credit) courses or equivalent and those selecting the teaching-intensive pattern would teach eight (three-credit) courses or equivalent.

The evaluation model derives from the five guiding principles, and each of these has a number of implications.

1. Primacy of Teaching: These ratios indicate the weighting of roles and responsibilities to be used in the evaluation of faculty. These ratios are intended to reflect relative priorities, so that (for example) faculty in the Teaching/Scholarship pattern should expect that teaching contributions (60%) are weighted twice as heavily as scholarly activities (30%), while at the same time all faculty should expect to be evaluated (10%) on their contribution to institutional service. These priorities are a necessary assumption to ensure that the flexibility espoused

here does not become a license to erode the primacy of teaching in favour of scholarship. While these models are for evaluation purposes, we expect that most faculty in the 90-10 stream would be teaching 8 (3 credit) courses and in the 60-30-10 stream teaching 6 (3 credit) courses.

Offering a teaching-intensive stream sets Mount Royal apart from the traditional understanding of the work of university faculty; balancing the internal recognition of teaching excellence with the traditional external measures of scholarly performance creates a difficulty in how Mount Royal understands and presents faculty in the teaching-intensive pattern. At the same time, we can take comfort from the Smith report that, in 1991, noted that “Universities are believed to be institutions of teaching and learning” and went on to urge those institutions to rethink the balance between teaching and scholarship.⁹ It is for this reason that the Task Force recommends including some forms of leadership in professional development in the broad definition of teaching, and further recommends that faculty in either pattern who wish to demonstrate professional and pedagogical excellence engage formally in professional development activities that meet the two criteria of peer review and dissemination. This is not to say that all faculty would be required to engage in research or the generation of knowledge through scholarship, but that teaching should not exist in isolation from the wider conversation with colleagues, peers, and the teaching, scholarly and professional community. It will be crucial for Mount Royal’s credibility not just to practice teaching excellence, but to communicate and foster that excellence with a variety of audiences.

2. Equivalence of Scholarly Activities: Both the Task Force on Research and the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force have emphasized a distinctive definition of scholarship for Mount Royal. The teaching / scholarship pattern should not be construed as requiring only traditional research. In Mount Royal’s evolving understanding of the nature of scholarship and its relationship to teaching, it is absolutely clear that faculty want to maintain teaching excellence as a core value, while many also seek more and better opportunities to engage with scholarly and professional communities. The Task Force recognizes that the principles of primacy of teaching and equivalence of scholarly activities have the potential to make the institution appear markedly different from most universities: this can be both an advantage and a vulnerability.
3. Choice: Faculty may choose between two work and evaluation patterns: a teaching/scholarship stream or a teaching-intensive stream. The choice of pattern could be reviewed every three years. There will undoubtedly be various competing priorities including department or faculty interest in developing a scholarly profile, strategic recruiting, possible challenges with allocation of faculty to courses, and some adjustment to budget processes to reflect faculty choice. Nevertheless, the Task Force recommends that all tenurable and tenured faculty have the right to choose freely between the streams. Departments might

⁹ Stuart L. Smith, Report: Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education, Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1991, p.41.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

hire specifically to either stream, but after the initial three-year period, faculty would have the option to change streams.

4. **Flexibility:** Faculty responsibilities will always vary considerably depending on individual career choices and opportunities, the instructional needs of departments, and institutional initiatives and priorities. The Task Force recommends that, where the pattern of a faculty member's work varies from the model, evaluation weights be adjusted by agreement between the faculty member and the Dean. This is essential to encourage faculty to take on leadership roles and otherwise support their own careers and the institution's needs, and to prevent such activities from becoming a barrier to career development. For example, The teaching responsibilities of librarians and counselors will be calculated to be equivalent where appropriate and the ratios adjusted accordingly. Chairs, faculty seconded for other duties, or those taking on significant service leadership responsibility would similarly adjust their ratios to reflect their actual responsibilities, weighting service more heavily. For faculty engaged in scholarship, there will be some flexibility at the boundaries as internal or external funding in support of scholarship becomes available.
5. **Devolution:** Just as no single evaluation or responsibilities model would be appropriate for the whole institution, no single set of evaluation criteria or expectations of achievement could address the diverse academic and professional backgrounds of Mount Royal faculty. While the Task Force has had extensive discussions of appropriate activities and evaluation standards related to teaching, scholarship and service, only colleagues at the level of individual faculties have the discipline-based and professional knowledge to define more precise standards and expectations for themselves and their colleagues. For this reason the Task Force has included descriptors of key faculty activities and a brief note on teaching excellence in Appendix A, but the implementation of a new faculty roles model will require processes and decisions in the faculties.

Academic Rank at Mount Royal

After wide discussion and debate, the Task Force recommends that Mount Royal institute a system of faculty rank. There are several decisive factors behind this recommendation. First, as many faculty indicated, the current Instructor title does not serve faculty attempting to gain credibility in the external, and scholarly, communities. Academic credibility must be based on individual achievement, but also on an expectation that Mount Royal applies a rigorous institutional standard before awarding the title of Professor. Second, we are in an increasingly competitive recruitment market where potential new faculty, and our own faculty who are more and more often actively approached by other institutions, will likely have more employment opportunities. Quality of life, encompassing recognition and sense of professional achievement, can be a critical advantage, but to compete we will require a cultural change. And third, the preponderance of faculty and other voices we have heard in our consultations has been in

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

favour of introducing rank. Having listened reflectively to the institutional conversation, the Task Force has drafted a rank proposal designed to preserve the strengths of the existing institutional culture while allowing faculty roles and recognition to evolve.

Mount Royal's collegial culture is one of the institution's greatest accomplishments and distinguishing features. Over and over, the Task Force has heard how highly members of this community value consultative processes, an egalitarian ideal, and the active cooperation of colleagues from widely diverse areas in shaping a common set of values around teaching excellence and student satisfaction. As a community, we often see ourselves in binary opposition to less collegial institutions and less hospitable environments, characterized by competition and lack of attention to the primary task of educating undergraduates.

The transition process, to attempt to become both like and unlike traditional universities, is clearly a challenging one. Mount Royal has a long history of developing and defending unique formative processes that support the professional growth and development of faculty, and that ensure the preservation of the institutional culture despite substantial growth and changes in program base. Applying the same spirit going forward is the best breakwater against the erosion of the strengths of the existing culture. Communicating our distinctiveness externally, and validating our decisions and models, is another.

The model of rank proposed offers recognition of accomplishment to faculty in both streams. The general structure proposed is that of Assistant, Associate and Full Professors. The three roles, Teaching, Scholarship and Service, will, for consideration of rank, have the same definitions and values as have already been described under faculty responsibilities. Academic or professional qualifications in the first instance, and rank attained at another institution, would determine the initial rank of appointment at Mount Royal. Ongoing evaluation in a particular rank would be based on the criteria outlined in this document. Promotion would then depend on merit, based on a progressive scale of performance expectations at each higher rank. There is no possibility of reduction in rank if there are performance difficulties; only the steps in the evaluation process outlined below would apply. Assessment for promotion would be based on achievement in the period under review, in relation to the relevant evaluation criteria. This might, for example, create difficulties for a faculty member who had changed streams in the period under review – but only to the point of having to demonstrate appropriate accomplishments in both streams. In keeping with the principles of flexibility and choice, choosing and changing streams would not be an absolute barrier to promotion.

The Task Force considers that restricting the access of any full-time faculty to the full range of ranks would immediately undermine the primacy of teaching. Still, there is a difficulty here. To the external academic community, the rank of (Full) Professor is traditionally measured by a rigorous standard of achievement in research (as distinct from Mount Royal's more inclusive definition of scholarship). It should be noted that there are two separate paths to appointment or promotion at the Assistant and Associate level, but that the paths do converge to some extent at the level of Full Professor. To achieve the

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

rank of Full Professor, a faculty member would need to show evidence of significant achievements in scholarship - whether in a discipline or in teaching and learning. This is intended to maintain the principle, widely held at Mount Royal, that a colleague in the primarily teaching stream should be able to make the highest rank, while also making it clear externally that at Mount Royal a Full Professor is involved in scholarship.

The Task Force does not support any system of quotas on access to rank, whether at the institutional, faculty or department levels. Quotas may be used at other institutions to ensure the bar for promotion is set sufficiently high (with roughly 10% of faculty achieving the highest rank), or to manage budget pressures, but we believe both are better managed in other ways. Criteria for appointment or promotion must be rigorous, and applied with some degree of equity across the institution, but all faculty who can achieve the highest professional standard should have the opportunity to be recognized.

Finally, the Task Force believes that ranks should be established with graduated and overlapping salary scales at each rank.

Expectations: Appointment and Promotion to Rank

Initial Appointment:

- Those without a graduate qualification would be appointed at the rank of Instructor, and could be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor on completion of an appropriate graduate credential and provision of evidence of the potential to meet the expectations for evaluation within that rank
- Those with Academic or Professional qualification at the graduate level, and with evidence of the potential to meet the expectations for evaluation within the rank, would normally be appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor
- Faculty appointed with rank at other universities, and with evidence of the potential to meet the expectations for evaluation within the rank, can be appointed at a similar level at Mount Royal

Assistant Professor: Expectations for Evaluation within Rank

Teaching intensive stream (90-10)

- Evidence of very good teaching
- Evidence of service to the institution, profession and, if appropriate, community

Scholarship/teaching stream (60-30-10)

- Evidence of very good teaching
- Evidence of service to the institution, profession and, if appropriate, community
- Evidence of potential for good and sustained scholarship

Associate Professor: Expectations for Evaluation within and Promotion to Rank

Teaching intensive stream (90-10)

- Evidence of excellent teaching
- Evidence of sustained service to the institution, profession and, if appropriate, community

Scholarship/teaching stream (60-30-10)

- Evidence of excellent teaching
- Evidence of sustained service to the institution, profession and, if appropriate, community
- Evidence of a sustained level of high quality scholarship

(Full) Professor: Expectations for Evaluation within and Promotion to Rank

Teaching intensive stream (90-10)

- Evidence of leadership and recognition in excellent teaching
- Evidence of a significant contribution to the scholarship of teaching
- Evidence of leadership in service to the institution, discipline and, if appropriate, community

Scholarship/teaching stream (60-30-10)

- Evidence of leadership and recognition in excellent teaching
- Evidence of excellent scholarship leading to a national or international reputation
- Evidence of leadership in service to the institution, discipline and, if appropriate, community

Tenure at Mount Royal

In terms of its formal place at Mount Royal, tenure marks the completion of a probationary period of full-time faculty employment. Mount Royal has excellent collegial processes for assessing the suitability of new colleagues, their commitment to the institution and its instructional and collegial values, their professional achievements, and their potential contributions to the future of the department, its programs, and the institution. More traditionally, tenure is the university's guarantee of academic freedom. Nothing in the recommendations of the Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force encroaches on tenure.

The task force does recommend that the probationary tenure period cover a range of three to five years, with applicants eligible to apply for tenure after the third, fourth or fifth

year of tenurable service. This is to accommodate the increased complexity of establishing a record of scholarly achievement for faculty in the teaching and scholarship stream. The existing institutional tenure process would be retained, and would be distinct from the post-tenure evaluation and promotion process.

Evaluation of Faculty Responsibilities

Introduction:

As Mount Royal moves to a set of faculty roles and responsibilities that include teaching, scholarship and service, there will be the need for evaluation of performance in these three areas. Evaluation is important to enable colleagues to reflect and improve upon the work that they are doing and it is also necessary for the accountability of individuals to the institution and of Mount Royal to its stakeholders. Collegial evaluation of all faculty, both pre and post-tenure, should be on a regular basis, rather than only taking place when problems are perceived. It should, that is to say, be a regular part of faculty roles and responsibilities for all colleagues. Evaluation of faculty roles and responsibilities is also a requirement of both the Campus Alberta Quality Council and AUCC, which is as it should be since ongoing evaluation of faculty is also a normal part of university life.

Thorough and reflective evaluation has long been a feature of the tenure process at Mount Royal. For example, the existing annual departmental, Chairs' and Deans' evaluations of tenure-track faculty emphasize constructive and formative reviews, and the Instructional Support Program provides access to a variety of supports and resources to assist with the development of pedagogical skills. The existing post-tenure peer collaboration program encourages faculty with diverse academic backgrounds and levels of experience to engage in meaningful discussion about pedagogy, and in peer observation and evaluation, with a view to enhancing teaching for tenured and untenured faculty throughout the institution. These highly collegial processes are a critical factor in developing and assuring Mount Royal's excellence in instruction, and the maintenance of its strong and collaborative faculty culture that builds strong connections across disciplines and faculties. The Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force encourages the protection of instructional excellence and collegiality and, in recommending a more meaningful post-tenure review process, encourages the extension of the constructive and formative principles of the tenure review process to the review and evaluation of tenured faculty as well.

Criteria:

The basis for the evaluation will be the overall institutional description of teaching, scholarship and service as outlined in this report, supplemented by a more detailed

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

criteria document developed at the Faculty level.¹⁰ Faculty criteria documents will describe expectations for colleagues in the three areas of faculty roles and responsibilities. A Faculty led by its Dean¹¹ is the best level to develop evaluation criteria documents that will recognize disciplinary differences yet provide for a degree of consistency. The Faculty criteria documents should be approved as policies of Academic Council through the normal routes for the approval of such policies. Approval beyond the Faculty level is based on the need for overall institutional standards.

In the event that a Faculty cannot agree on a criteria document, the Vice-President Academic will convene and chair a sub-committee of Dean's Council to develop a criteria document for that Faculty which would then require the approval of Dean's Council.

Faculty criteria documents should be reviewed through the same process every five years.

Process

The following evaluation process will apply to all faculty members both before and after they are granted tenure. This process to determine satisfactory performance, will be primarily for formative purposes.

The performance evaluation of the faculty members will be based on an annual report submitted by all faculty members to their Chair and Dean.¹² Tenurable faculty members will be evaluated every year prior to tenure. After gaining tenure each faculty member will be evaluated every third year. In the year of evaluation, faculty members will supplement the annual reports by also providing other relevant documentation including teaching evaluations and other teaching material; copies of publications, papers and documentation of other forms of scholarship as appropriate; and evidence of relevant service to the institution, discipline, profession or community. This documentation should cover the three year period under review and the evaluation will be based on this material.

The initial level of evaluation will be the Department represented by the Chair who will take advice from a committee of colleagues in the Department. The Chair will review the documentation and make an assessment of the faculty member's performance in the individual faculty member's areas of responsibility. The Chair's evaluation will be based on the annual reports of the faculty member and the criteria documents developed by the Faculty. Chairs will recognize that this evaluation is, firstly, a formative process to enable the faculty member to receive feedback on work over the three-year period. The Chair will sign a written report to the Dean and the faculty member may provide a response to the Chair's evaluation. The Dean will chair an elected faculty review committee that will review all the documents and make a final evaluation of each individual's performance.

¹⁰ The word "Faculty" is being used generically here and should be seen to refer to Faculty, Centre, School or Library.

¹¹ Or Director

¹² The annual report may also be used to gather institutional information.

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

The assessment documents will be separate from the annual report document. While the final decision rests with the Dean, Deans' Council will review the Faculty process, criteria and the Dean's recommendations, particularly where they are not straightforward, with a view to assuring due process and achieving as much consistency across the institution as possible. Deans' Council shall be advisory to the individual Deans.

In the event that a faculty member does not meet the criteria in any one of the assigned areas (teaching, scholarship or service), the Dean will meet with that faculty member and, with the advice of the Chair, they will develop a program to address the issues that have arisen. This program will be put in writing and signed off by the Dean and the faculty member. Again, it should be understood by all parties that the purpose of this process is to assist the faculty member to improve performance and meet the requirements of the Faculty criteria document. The faculty member would then be reviewed again the following year, and if there has been insufficient improvement in performance, the Extraordinary Review of Performance procedures would apply.¹³ Since that Policy explicitly allows faculty access to the grievance procedure outlined in the Collective Agreement, faculty have an inherent right of representation and appeal.

Evaluation for Promotion

The process for evaluation for promotion deliberately echoes the performance evaluation process and structure, with the exception of assuming a summative structure and allowing a different process for appeals.

Criteria:

The basis for the consideration for promotion will be the overall institutional description of teaching, scholarship and service as outlined in this report, supplemented by the more specific expectations of the criteria for promotion as outlined in a detailed promotion criteria document developed at the Faculty level.¹⁴ Faculty criteria documents will describe expectations for colleagues in the three areas of faculty roles and responsibilities as appropriate. A Faculty led by its Dean¹⁵ is the best level to develop evaluation criteria documents that will recognize disciplinary differences yet provide for a degree of consistency. The Faculty criteria documents should be approved as policies of Academic Council through the normal routes for the approval of such policies. Approval beyond the Faculty level is based on the need for overall institutional standards.

In the event that a Faculty cannot agree on a promotion criteria document, the Vice-President Academic will convene and chair a sub-committee of Dean's Council to develop a criteria document for that Faculty which would then require the approval of Dean's Council.

¹³ Mount Royal College. Policy 930-4.2: Extraordinary Review of Performance: Faculty Members. September 2005.

¹⁴ The word "Faculty" is being used generically here and should be seen to refer to Faculty, Centre, School or Library.

¹⁵ Or Director

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

Faculty promotion criteria documents should be reviewed through the same process every five years.

Process

The following process for consideration of promotion will apply to all faculty members both before and after they are granted tenure. Unlike the process to determine satisfactory performance, this is primarily a summative process. Faculty are eligible to request consideration for promotion in any year, although it is expected that in most instances it will take some time to achieve the expected standard for promotion to the next rank.

Consideration for promotion of faculty members will be based on the annual report submitted by all faculty members to their Chair and Dean.¹⁶ Faculty members will supplement the annual reports by also providing other relevant documentation including teaching evaluations and other teaching material; copies of publications, papers and documentation of other forms of scholarship as appropriate; and evidence of relevant service to the institution, discipline, profession or community. Where required by the criteria, evidence of an external reputation or of significant external contributions should be submitted as well. This documentation should cover the period under review and the evaluation will be based on this material.

The initial level of evaluation will be the Department represented by the Chair who will take advice from a committee of colleagues in the Department. The Chair will review the documentation and make an assessment of the faculty member's performance in the individual faculty member's areas of responsibility. The Chair's evaluation will be based on the annual reports of the faculty member and the criteria documents developed by the Faculty. The Chair will sign a written report to the Dean and the faculty member may provide a response to the Chair's evaluation. The Dean will chair an elected faculty promotions committee that will review all the documents and produce a summative evaluation of each individual's performance. The promotion documents will be separate from the annual report document and from the annual review process. While the decision on promotion rests with the Dean, Deans' Council will review the Faculty process, criteria and the Dean's recommendations, particularly where they are not straightforward, with a view to assuring due process and achieving as much consistency across the institution as possible. Deans' Council shall be advisory to the individual Deans.

In the event that a faculty member does not meet the criteria for promotion, and in the spirit of formative feedback, the faculty member may meet with the Dean and, with the advice of the Chair, they can discuss any areas for development. Faculty members would also have access to an elected institutional promotions appeal committee, chaired by the Provost and Vice-President Academic, and to the grievance procedure outlined in the Collective Agreement.

¹⁶ The annual report may also be used to gather institutional information.

Appendix A Faculty Activities

Teaching

Key Activities

- Classroom instruction
- Individual and group consultation and advice
- Practicum and field supervision
- Major project supervision
- Curriculum and course development
- Pedagogical design and preparation
- Materials development
- Assessment design and implementation
- Maintenance of academic and professional currency
- Development, identification and communication of best practices
- Promotion of evidence-based practice, professional and pedagogical
- Distribution of effective teaching and learning resources and strategies
- Creation and extension of resources or programs to support teaching
- Sharing teaching expertise externally
- Significant leadership in teaching excellence beyond the institution

Some Characteristics of Teaching Excellence

- Student-centered and learner-centered
- Thoughtful and Reflective
- Innovative
- Connects discipline knowledge to effective pedagogy
- Pedagogy is appropriate to the needs of students and community

Scholarship

Key Activities (must be peer-reviewed)

- Research
- Scholarly and artistic work
- Professional work
- Scholarship of teaching and learning
- Publishing
- Presenting at, participating in and coordinating conferences
- Collaborating with, and reviewing and editing the work of, peers
- Developing primary and secondary texts and learning materials
- Providing scholarly opportunities for students

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Task Force

Service

Key Activities

- Participation in department, faculty and institutional governance
- Selection, support, development and evaluation of colleagues
- Appropriate student support including advising
- Development and application of academic policies
- Creation, development, evaluation and revision of academic programs
- Liaison, partnership and leadership work with disciplines, organizations and communities relevant to academic or professional expertise