

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Unit Standards for Tenure and Promotion

Approved by the department May 27, 2011

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 2 |
| 2 | Advancement to Candidacy | 2 |
| 3 | Tenure and Promotion Procedures | 3 |
| 3.1 | Adjudicating Committee | 3 |
| 3.1.1 | Constitution..... | 3 |
| 3.1.2 | Duties | 4 |
| 3.2 | File Preparation Committee | 5 |
| 3.2.1 | Constitution..... | 5 |
| 3.2.2 | Duties | 7 |
| 4 | Adjudication Criteria | 9 |
| 4.1 | Professorial Stream: Associate Professor | 9 |
| 4.1.1 | Introduction..... | 9 |
| 4.1.2 | Professional Contribution and Standing | 9 |
| 4.1.3 | Teaching..... | 11 |
| 4.1.4 | Service..... | 13 |
| 4.2 | Professorial Stream: Full Professor | 14 |
| 4.2.1 | Introduction..... | 14 |
| 4.2.2 | Required Minimum in Professional Contribution and Standing..... | 15 |
| 4.2.3 | Required Minimum in Teaching..... | 15 |
| 4.2.4 | Required Minimum in Service..... | 15 |
| 4.2.5 | Eminence in Professional Contribution and Standing | 15 |
| 4.2.6 | Eminence in Teaching..... | 16 |
| 4.2.7 | Eminence in Service | 16 |
| 4.3 | Alternate Stream: Associate Lecturer | 16 |
| 4.3.1 | Introduction..... | 16 |
| 4.3.2 | Teaching..... | 17 |
| 4.3.3 | Service..... | 18 |
| 4.4 | Alternate Stream: Senior Lecturer | 19 |
| 4.4.1 | Introduction..... | 19 |

1 Introduction

Tenure and promotion at York University are governed by the Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures (hereafter the Senate T&P Policy), the Alternate Stream Document (hereafter the Alternate Stream), and Procedures Governing Decisions on Advancement to Candidacy (hereafter the Procedures), approved by Senate 21 March 2002, amended 27 November 2003, 24 May 2007 and 28 June 2007. This document offers unit-level standards and guidelines, in accord with University criteria and procedures, to provide clarity to candidates, referees and adjudicating and review committees.

This document replaces and supersedes earlier unit standards of the Department of Computer Science and Engineering. Following the principle of ‘Temporal Equity’ (Senate T&P Policy H) faculty members hired before the approval date of this standards document may choose to proceed under those documents that were in place at the time of hire.

2 Advancement to Candidacy

“Most initial appointments at York are probationary. The purpose of the probationary appointment is to provide the University and the candidate an opportunity for mutual appraisal. Probation does not imply that tenure and promotion will be granted, but it does imply that the University gives serious consideration to such an appointment during that period.” (Senate T&P Policy D.2.)

It is the responsibility of the Department and its academic leaders to mentor untenured faculty. To this end every untenured faculty member is required to meet informally with the chair of the Adjudicating Committee (AC) each year to review their progress towards tenure. The objective of these meetings is to provide guidance and to identify as early as possible potential difficulties that might arise at advancement to candidacy and tenure stages in the Tenure and Promotions process.

“The decision to advance a pre-candidate to Candidacy shall be based on an assessment of the pre-candidate’s progress in teaching, professional contribution and standing and service. The evidence to be assessed by the Adjudicating Committee shall include as a minimum:

- a curriculum vitae which documents clearly the candidate’s current record in each of the three areas noted above;
- available course evaluations (from York and/or previous institution);
- a candidate’s statement (if provided by the candidate).” (Procedures 3.)

The notification of advancement to Candidacy will “*assess the candidate’s career to that time and indicate as specifically as possible what expectations will have to be met if tenure and promotion are to be awarded.*” (Senate T&P Policy H.2.)

The process of advancement to Candidacy will normally be initiated by the AC in late August of the candidate’s Pre-Candidacy 3 year.¹ The Adjudicating Committee shall render a decision at the beginning of September of the same year. Only in extraordinary circumstances will the Chair of the Department initiate the process through a written recommendation (Procedures 4). A candidate for Advancement will provide to the Chair of the AC the documents as described above

¹ From the Senate T&P FAQ Sheet (Aug. 2004): “What schedule applies to candidates appointed on dates other than July 1? Normally, the schedule commencing the next July 1 applies: for example, a probationary member of faculty appointed on January 1, 2003, would move through pre-candidacy and candidacy as if they had been appointed on July 1, 2003.”

by August 15th of the same year, and will work with the Chair of the AC to develop a complete and accurate dossier so as to enable the AC to make an informed decision as to Advancement to Candidacy. At a minimum this dossier will consist of the items listed above, but will also include whatever other information the candidate feels demonstrates their case for advancement. This could include copies of papers in preparation, published reviews of the candidate's work, etc.

The AC will first assess the documentation provided by the candidate to determine if there is sufficient information to reach an informed decision based on the information provided. If the AC feels that additional information should be obtained in order to consider the case for Advancement to Candidacy the AC through the Chair of the AC will inform the candidate. Once the AC is content with the material available it will make a decision on Advancement to Candidacy based on "the probability that the pre-candidate will satisfy, or fail to satisfy, the University tenure and promotion criteria and the unit standards." (Procedures 6.) The AC will communicate its decision and its rationale to the Dean and will provide a copy of this letter to the candidate.

3 Tenure and Promotion Procedures

3.1 Adjudicating Committee

To be read in conjunction with the Senate T&P Policy, section F.3.2.

3.1.1 Constitution

The Adjudicating Committee is normally constituted in the spring for the following academic year starting July 1st. The Chair of the Department of Computer Science and Engineering will propose the membership of the committee from faculty members drawn from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering. In exceptional circumstances members may also be drawn from other units within the University. Student members of the committee will also be nominated by the Chair of the Department of Computer Science and Engineering. The membership of the AC must be approved at a meeting of the Department of Computer Science and Engineering. The AC consists of

- 7 probationary/tenured faculty, at least 5 with tenure, which includes *ex officio* members.
- normally 2 students (graduate or undergraduate). The student members of the committee may be appointed in the early fall rather than in the spring.

The chair of the Department of Computer Science and Engineering is an *ex officio* member of the AC and is also a full voting member.

Should situations arise in which members are unable to serve or in which a potential conflict of interest is identified between a candidate and a member of the committee, that member of the committee will recuse themselves from this file and not participate in any review of that candidate's file (Senate T&P Policy F.2.11). Quorum for the AC is 7 members. Members participating in the adjudication of a file must be present for all meetings at which the file is considered.

Meetings of the AC will be held *in camera* and no minutes will be taken (Senate T&P Policy F.2.1). A copy of the agenda will be kept as a record of the meeting. The only exception is for portions of meetings at which a candidate or his/her representative is present. Such portions of

meetings will be recorded. The recorded portion will be transcribed and added to the candidate's file (Senate T&P Policy F.2.2).

3.1.2 Duties

Naming of members to the File Preparation Committees – F.3.1.1.(a)

Each File Preparation Committee (FPC) will consist of three members.

- One member chosen by the candidate.
- Two members chosen by the AC in consultation with the Departmental Chair (who is *ex officio* a member of the AC).
- At least one member of the FPC will also be a member of the AC in the year in which the file is adjudicated.

Each member of the FPC will normally be a faculty member from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering.

Adjudication – F.3.2.1.(a)

“The principal substantive assessment of a candidate’s file, which shall be based on the evidence in the file, takes place in an Adjudicating Committee within the candidate’s home unit.” (Senate T&P Policy F.3.2.1(a))

When a file is first presented to the AC from an FPC, members of the AC will review the file to determine if it contains sufficient information upon which members of the AC will be able to reach a fair and reasoned decision on the candidate. Any deficiencies in the structure or composition of the file will be communicated to the FPC through a member of the FPC present on the AC and the file returned to the FPC for further work.

Before adjudicating any file, the Chair of the AC will confirm that the candidate has received a redacted version of the file (prepared in accordance with Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.6.(b)). The Chair of the AC will also inform the candidate of the date of the meeting of the AC and determine if the candidate will be making a presentation at the meeting (Senate T&P Policy F.2.2).

Voting – F.3.2.1.(c)

“For tenure files, the Adjudicating Committee will review the evidence in the file and include in a report the detailed results of votes on professional contribution and standing, teaching and service rated as excellence, high competence, competence or competence not demonstrated, and the vote on the recommendation for tenure and promotion. For promotion to Full Professor files, the Adjudicating Committee will review the evidence in the file and vote only to promote or delay.”
(Senate T&P Policy F.3.2.1.(c))

All members of the AC adjudicating the file are voting members. All votes will be by secret ballot. Ballots will enable members of the AC to vote only in the specified category as described above. Ballots will be submitted to a member of the AC who will count the ballots. A valid completed ballot must be received from all members of the AC quorum. (No spoiled or unfilled out ballots will be accepted. If a vote receives such a ballot the voting will be repeated.) It is not acceptable for members of the AC quorum to abstain from voting. By accepting membership on the AC, members accept the responsibility to render a decision on the file.

Once a valid vote has been recorded the committee will consider any divergence between total votes for professional contribution and standing, teaching and service, and the vote on tenure and promotion. A rationale for any substantive divergence must be provided in the report of the AC.

Adjudicating Committee Report – F.3.2.3

The report of the AC will include:

- Detailed description of the evaluation of evidence in the file;
- Rationale for decision;
- Explicit statement of the role of referees' letters in shaping the decision of the Adjudicating Committee may be helpful;
- Articulate how the evidence in a file satisfies the unit-level standards, e.g. does the evidence in the file support a rating of "high competence" when weighed against the standards set out for high competence?
- Detailed results of votes as outlined above.

A copy of the report of the Adjudicating Committee will be forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty of Science and Engineering, and a copy of the report will be forwarded to the candidate by either registered mail or by hand. If the candidate wishes a copy will also be sent to the candidate electronically.

3.2 File Preparation Committee

To be read in conjunction with Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.

3.2.1 Constitution

The process of file preparation requires a significant effort on the part of both the candidate and the FPC. The process of developing a file for Tenure and Promotion or Promotion begins in the fall almost a year before the file being considered by the AC. A normal timeline for the preparation of the file is provided below

November - Candidate prepares information for the file. This information should be updated later by the candidate, and certainly before the preparation of packages that are sent to referees, however the information provided here will be used by the FPC in selecting referees. The following information is required

- An updated CV of the candidate.
- The candidate's personal statement. (At the discretion of the candidate.)
- Copies of normally three papers that will be sent to referees for professional contribution and standing.

Ideally the candidate will provide this information electronically in order to simplify distribution of the data to referees.

December - The FPC for the candidate is struck. The candidate must select their representative to the FPC and the Chair of the Department in consultation with the current Chair of the AC will select the other two members of the FPC. At least one of the other two members will also be a nominee for the AC for the following year.

January - The FPC meets formally to distribute tasks among the members of the FPC.

February -The FPC completes draft lists of

- Names of external referees for professional contribution and standing
- Names of collegial referees for teaching
- Names of service referees
- Names of students to be solicited as teaching referees
- Names of teaching assistants associated with the candidate
- Names of graduate students previously but not currently supervised by the candidate

- Names of co-authors who will be contacted to determine the relative contribution of the candidate to joint work.

- The candidate provides an ordered list of the names of referees who will also be written to, and will review the draft list of names prepared by the FPC for potential conflict. The candidate will communicate any such potential conflicts to the FPC. The FPC will review the list in the light of potential conflicts and may refine the list based on information provided by the candidate. If the FPC chooses to not write to a particular referee, the rationale for that decision must be documented in the file. The candidate does not have a veto over the names selected by the FPC.

- The FPC writes to the collegial teaching referees to ensure that the referees can complete their task in the winter term.

March - The FPC receives referee reports on teaching. Statistical course evaluations for the candidate should be obtained from the departmental database when the candidate has completed their teaching prior to September.

April - The FPC prepares the documentation that will be sent to referees for professional contribution and standing.

May - The FPC sends letters to referees. Letters are sent to

- Students
- TA's
- Graduate students previously but not currently supervised by the candidate

- Referees for professional contribution and standing
- Referees for service.

Referees for professional contribution and standing also receive a package prepared by the FPC and the candidate.

July - The FPC reviews the information received and follows up on missing letters. If necessary the FPC will extend the list of referees in the various categories to ensure the file is complete.

August - The FPC completes the file. This includes

- Adding contextualizing information to the file. This should include explicit information as to the procedures followed when compiling the file.
- Adding biographies of referees for professional contribution and standing to the file
- Adding list of referees and their origin (FPC or candidate) to the file

September 1 - The FPC communicates the file to the AC.

Files for promotion may be adjudicated at any time, although the general time course follows that given above. To dovetail with the meeting schedule of other bodies, it is desirable that the AC completes its work on promotion files by the end of January.

3.2.2 Duties

General – F.3.1.1.

“The File Preparation Committee has the responsibility of assembling a file which is complete and which fairly and accurately reflects the candidate's academic career at York and/or elsewhere. It will be responsible for presenting diverse career paths fairly and effectively, so that candidates' professional contribution and standing, teaching and service can be equitably assessed. Where a candidate is appointed at the level of Pre-Candidacy 3 or later in the probationary period, the File Preparation Committee will make reasonable efforts to obtain teaching evidence from the candidate's previous institution, consistent with the terms of Section F.3.1.2. The File Preparation Committee will not adjudicate the file.” (Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.1.(b))

The primary duty of the FPC is to develop a file that is an accurate and complete description of the candidate's accomplishments. It is not the duty of the FPC to be an advocate for the candidate.

Preparing Documentation on Professional Contribution and Standing – F.3.1.3

The candidate will provide the FPC with a ranked list of at least four referees for professional contribution and standing. The committee will ensure that when it writes to potential referees that precisely one quarter of all of the referees written to are drawn from the list provided by the candidate. Names will be chosen from the candidate's list in the order provided. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.3.(a).) Note that this does not guarantee that one quarter of the final letters will correspond to the candidate's list, but rather that one quarter of all referees written to will be selected by the candidate.

When the file is complete, it is desirable that the file contains sufficient information on the candidate's contributions in professional contribution and standing for the AC to make an informed decision on the candidate's performance. Normally this can be accomplished if the file contains six informed letters from referees; otherwise additional letters may be required by the AC. The FPC is encouraged to write for sufficient letters so that six thorough letters will be available in the file. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.3.(b).) All letters received will be included in the file for later adjudication.

To assess the relative contribution of the candidate to joint publications, the FPC will write to all co-authors of significant work of the candidate with the exception of graduate students currently supervised by the candidate. The letter written to co-authors will ask the co-authors to comment on the relative contribution of the candidate to the joint work. If the candidate has a significant number of co-authors the FPC may choose to write to a representative sample. This should be properly documented in the FPC's letter in the candidate's file. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.3.(e).) The candidate should also provide a summary of his/her contributions to joint work. If the candidate has a significant number of co-authors the candidate may choose to limit this summary to key publications.

The package being sent to referees will be prepared by the FPC in collaboration with the candidate. The candidate is responsible for providing copies of papers, papers in preparation, a

CV and, if provided by the candidate, a candidate's statement. The FPC will provide copies of the relevant tenure and promotions documentation and will write the covering letter. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.3.(g).) The candidate has the right to review the contents of the package and can add material to the package.

Preparing Documentation on Teaching – F.3.1.2

Candidates are required to prepare a teaching dossier and copies of current course materials for review by collegial referees. The candidate has complete freedom in providing whatever material he or she feels appropriate. The referees are encouraged to view candidate's on-line and written course material in refereeing the candidate's teaching. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.3.(a).(iii).)

For files for tenure and promotion, the FPC will normally solicit three letters from collegial referees for Teaching (Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.2.(a)) unless the FPC feels that the candidate has demonstrated an "extraordinary contribution to teaching" in which case the FPC should solicit sufficient letters to document this fully. This is unlikely to take more than six letters. Two-thirds of the referees will be chosen by the FPC, one-third will be chosen by the candidate.

The FPC will write to all teaching assistants associated with the candidate. The teaching assistants will be asked to comment on their experiences in the courses taught by the candidate. If the candidate has supervised a significant number of teaching assistants then the FPC may choose to write to a representative sample. This should be properly documented in the FPC's letter in the candidate's file. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.2.(a).(v).)

The FPC will write to all graduate students previously supervised by the candidate. If the candidate has supervised a significant number of graduate students then the FPC may choose to write to a representative sample. This should be properly documented in the FPC's letter in the candidate's file. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.2.(b).(i).(c).)

The FPC will seek to obtain at least ten letters from undergraduate students taught by the candidate. Normally this can be obtained by writing to 45 undergraduate students. Normally the FPC will write to a total of 45 undergraduate students taught by the candidate. 30 names will be chosen randomly by the FPC from the list of students taught by the candidate. The candidate will provide an additional 15 names. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.2.(b).(ii).) If a lower than normal return rate is experienced, the FPC will extend the process in order to ensure that ten letters are present in the file.

Statistical course evaluation information is maintained by the department and will be included in the file by the FPC. Current student evaluation forms do not provide the students with the opportunity to sign their comments and so no course-evaluation-written comments will be included in the file prepared by the FPC.

Preparing Documentation on Service – F.3.1.4

For files for tenure and promotion, the FPC will normally solicit three letters for service. (Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.4.(a)) unless the FPC feels that the candidate has an "extraordinary breadth of service" in which case the FPC should solicit sufficient letters to document this service fully. This is unlikely to take more than six letters (Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.4.(c)).

The candidate will provide 1/4 of all potential referees for service while the FPC provides 3/4 of the service referees. (See Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.4.(a).)

Transmission to Adjudicating Committee – F.3.1.1.(c)

“The only commentary provided by the File Preparation Committee shall be factual information required to contextualize the evidence in the file (e.g., background information on external referees). The candidate will be given the opportunity of reviewing any such contextualizing commentary before the file goes to the Adjudicating Committee.” (Senate T&P Policy F.3.1.1.(c))

The FPC will include in the file a letter that will document the processes and procedures followed by the FPC. It will also and identify any deviations from the “normal practice” of FPC’s within the Department of Computer Science and Engineering. This letter must avoid evaluative statements.

The FPC will also prepare a redacted version of the file for communication to the candidate. It is the policy of the AC to communicate a complete redacted copy of the file to the candidate prior to adjudicating the file.

4 Adjudication Criteria**4.1 Professorial Stream: Associate Professor****4.1.1 Introduction**

“An Associate Professor is a matured scholar whose achievements at York and/or elsewhere have earned his or her colleagues’ respect as an individual of superior qualities and achievements.” (Senate T&P Policy C.1.2).

A candidate for promotion and/or tenure must extend the boundaries of knowledge of Computer Science or Computer Engineering and be committed to the transmittal of this knowledge in the broadest possible sense. A candidate will be evaluated based on: (i) ongoing research in Computer Science/Engineering, (ii) effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, effective mentoring and supervision of graduate students; the candidate’s courses must be academically current and evolve with the field in an appropriate manner, and (iii) active participation in the management and operation of the department; this includes the assumption of leadership responsibilities for portions of the service life of the Department, ongoing development of the undergraduate and graduate Computer Science/Engineering curriculum and participation in service to the Department, Faculty and University as a whole.

4.1.2 Professional Contribution and Standing

A candidate must make a significant, ongoing and independent contribution in research, which, under normal circumstances, will involve the following:

1. A candidate must perform substantive research in Computer Science/Computer Engineering or in a related field, liberally defined for the purposes of tenure and promotion.
2. A candidate must have established an ongoing, independent research program. Single-authored contributions unequivocally indicate an independent research program. Collaborative research is encouraged, but the contribution of the candidate must be identified.
3. Candidates must provide the results of their research to their research community through peer-reviewed, archival publications, of a type judged important in the candidate's area. Refereed journal articles are the premier sign of research significance. Refereed conference proceedings are also important for assessing the significance of the research. In some fields, an argument

might be made that a refereed conference paper is equivalent to a good journal article or that a specific conference is the premier venue for publication in that field. Other refereed contributions such as a monograph or chapter in a book will also be taken into account. Non-refereed contributions will generally carry a lower weight, although invited contributions may be taken as evidence of standing in the field. Candidates are advised to publish in a variety of venues some of which are at “arms-length” (e.g. the candidate is not on the applicable editorial board or program committee).

4. A candidate’s research must be of sufficient stature and merit to attract ongoing peer-reviewed external funding (e.g., NSERC grants). Candidates are expected to apply for, and to receive external peer-reviewed funding to support their research program and their graduate students. The candidate's research must be known within the field, and must be work of the type which the referees judge has (or will have) positive impact on the research of others. Candidates are expected to actively present their work at conferences, workshops and seminars at academic or industrial institutions.

In assessing Excellence, High Competence, and Competence what counts critically is the impact or potential impact of the candidate’s research as evaluated by external referees. Impact can be demonstrated in a variety of ways including highly cited publications in high quality journals and conference proceedings. Requirements for Excellence, High Competence, and Competence are defined below. Candidates not meeting the criteria for Competence are deemed “Competence Not Demonstrated.”

A high quality journal is a journal in the candidate’s field of study which has a significant impact on the research community (as demonstrated, for example, by impact factors based on journal citations). The publication process in such journals is based on peer review of the complete manuscripts to select and screen high quality submissions.

A high quality conference is an international conference in the candidate’s field of study that has a significant impact on the research community. The members of the program committee of such conferences are recognized scholars in their fields. The publication process in such conferences is based on peer review of the complete manuscripts to select and screen high quality submissions.

A journal or a conference publication must be a complete description of a significant body of work (not a short correspondence, communication, or an abstract). In the normal course of events, a conference paper should yield a more complete journal paper. Due to a rather long publication process in some top quality journals and the negative impact of these delays on the dissemination of research results, many researchers in Computer Science and Engineering select conference proceedings to publish their work. The Department recognizes that the quality of some of these conferences and their reviewing process are equal to the best journals in the respective fields. The Adjudicating Committee will assess the quality of conferences on the basis of evidence provided by a candidate and external reviewers.

4.1.2.1 Criteria for Competence

To receive a recommendation of competence, a candidate is normally expected to

- Have published, or have accepted for publication, an average of one refereed journal publication or refereed conference paper per year² since his/her appointment at York University, in a venue identified as ‘high quality’, as defined above. A rank of competence is achievable with refereed papers published solely in high quality conferences.
- Have applied for external grant(s) at the level of an NSERC Discovery Grant.

² Here, and elsewhere in the document ‘year’ refers to ‘years of service’. That is, periods of time during which the candidate is on leave (medical, or otherwise) do not count.

- Be identified as an active researcher in their identified field by a majority of the professional contribution and standing referees and by the adjudicating committee.

4.1.2.2 Criteria for High Competence

To receive a recommendation of high competence, **a candidate would be expected to meet all of the requirements for competence**, and, in addition, is normally expected to

- Have published or have accepted for publication, an average of one refereed high-quality **journal** publication or publication in a venue that has been identified as high-quality journal equivalent every other year since his/her appointment at York University.
- Have developed an independent research program.
- Have received ongoing funding from an external granting agency appropriate to their research area.
- Be identified as an active research scholar whose research has provided a substantive contribution to their field as identified by a majority of the professional contribution and standing referees.

4.1.2.3 Criteria for Excellence

To receive a recommendation of excellence, **a candidate is expected to meet all of the requirements for high competence**, and, in addition, is normally expected to

- Have published, or have accepted for publication, a substantial body of work that has had a demonstrated and significant impact on their field.
- Be identified as an active research scholar whose research has, and continues to influence their field, as identified by a majority of the professional contribution and standing referees.

4.1.3 Teaching

A candidate must be an effective teacher, mentor and supervisor of students, and contributor to course development.

1. A candidate must teach effectively at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Effective teaching should be demonstrated over a range of course types in the Department from first and/or second year courses to upper level course in the candidate's area of expertise, assuming that the candidate has had the opportunity to teach this broad range of courses. The candidate should present the material at an academically appropriate level but be sensitive to students' level of understanding. The candidate should adopt an appropriate teaching style, methods and techniques to match students' level of understanding. Should issues be identified in terms of quality of instruction, the candidate should seek appropriate remedy such as from the Department or the Center for the Support of Teaching.
2. A Candidate must teach in a professional manner and should maintain a professional relationship with students. Specifically, he/she should demonstrate impartial and consistent respect for all students as individuals with their distinctive learning needs and capacities. The candidate's in-class conduct should be based on integrity, honesty, and fairness, and should comply with the acts and regulations of the University.
3. Normally, a candidate for Associate Professor should have been the primary supervisor of at least one graduate level thesis to completion. The candidate is expected to provide effective supervision of graduate students, supervising their theses through to completion. Supervisors should make themselves accessible to students they are supervising and provide them with materials and resources relevant to their theses not available in the university. Supervisors

should be sensitive to their students' level of understanding, take responsibility for their professional development by sending them to conferences, site visits and the like, and help them to disseminate their work in academic journals, conferences and workshops. The candidate must be a member of the Graduate Program in Computer Science and Engineering.

4. The academic *content* of all undergraduate and graduate courses taught by a candidate should be substantive, and match the approved course curriculum.
5. Student performance in courses taught by a candidate should be evaluated via appropriate exams, tests, assignments, projects, presentations and the like. Grading material must reflect the course content and intent.
6. A candidate should present material in class in a professional manner. This includes clear delivery, and good use of appropriate instructional aids such as the blackboard, overheads or slides. Material is presented in a manner that engages and stimulates the students. Students should feel that the candidate cares about their intellectual development, and is sensitive to their level of understanding.
7. Within reason, a candidate must make him or herself accessible to students both within and outside the class via a combination of encouraging questions in class, office hours, email, newsgroups and other forms of communication.
8. Candidates are expected to ensure that courses they teach are current, evolve with the field in an appropriate manner, and the content and level are appropriate. A candidate who teaches in multi-section and/or team-taught courses is expected to be a full and active contributor to the course, and to aid in its ongoing development and review.

Quality supervision of undergraduate projects is highly valued. The successful coordination of large, multi-section, undergraduate classes is highly valued.

Student letters, letters from colleagues and the Departmental statistical evaluations of undergraduate courses, and teaching awards all play an important part in evaluating the above criteria. Colleagues who evaluate teaching will be asked not just to conduct a class visit but also to evaluate the academic content of the course and the various course materials (notes, exams, web pages).

4.1.3.1 Criteria for Competence

To receive a recommendation of competence, a candidate is normally expected to

- Have taught their assigned courses in a professional manner, meeting student and departmental expectations on the content and delivery of the courses taught.
- Have renewed and updated the courses taught so that they remain current and appropriate to the discipline.
- Have served on the supervisory committee of at least one graduate student.
- Have acted as the primary supervisor of at least one honours undergraduate thesis (or equivalent).
- Have acted as the primary supervisor of at least one graduate student.
- Have been evaluated through the normal departmental course evaluation process as having a teaching performance not substantially below the departmental median.

4.1.3.2 Criteria for High Competence

To receive a recommendation of high competence, a candidate **would be expected to meet all of the requirements for competence**, and, in addition, is normally expected to

- Have acted as the primary supervisor of at least one graduate student who has graduated from their graduate program.
- Have been evaluated through the normal departmental course evaluation process as having a teaching performance near or above the departmental median.
- Have collegial and student teaching referees paint a consistent picture of the candidate as a highly effective teacher..
- To have contributed to curriculum development within the department.

4.1.3.3 Criteria for Excellence

To receive a recommendation of excellence, **a candidate would be expected to meet all of the requirements for high competence**, and, in addition, is normally expected to

- Have been evaluated through the normal departmental course evaluation process as having a teaching performance consistently higher than the departmental median.
- Have collegial teaching evaluations that use superlatives in describing the candidate's teaching performance.
- Have student letters consistently enthusiastic in their praise of the candidate

Although a teaching award is not a requirement for a recommendation of excellence, performance at a level at which the candidate would be considered for such an award is. In evaluating teaching awards the AC must assess the nature of the award and the evidence in support of it.

4.1.4 Service

A candidate must have clearly demonstrated an ongoing and significant contribution to the management and operation of the Department and/or the University.

Candidates should be active rather than passive in terms of their service contributions, and should show a willingness to engage in intellectual and collegial dialogue with faculty, staff, and students; should effectively contribute to the general well-being of the Department and the University as a whole.

1. Candidates should seek and show leadership in one or more service tasks within the department and/or the University.
2. Apart from active participation in departmental meetings, they should demonstrate willingness and flexibility in assuming service roles where their knowledge and good judgment could benefit the Department.
3. Candidates should demonstrate their effective performance in voluntary service roles as well as in the roles assumed at the request of the Department or the University. In accordance with the Section B3 of the Senate "Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures" document, the Department will stress the distinction between the participation in committees that perform more routine tasks and significant administrative work or the contributions to the development of academic (research, teaching, computing) policies and environments.

An example of a significant service contribution is the development of the academic curriculum. This may include a significant revision of existing course structure (how multiple courses integrate and interact to cover an area), the development of course infrastructure, the development of new pan-course instructional laboratories, or even the introduction of a new stream.

Service contributions to the development, operation, and management of academic programs may overlap with contributions to teaching. For instance, the development of course infrastructure, new laboratories, streams, or academic programs have clearly defined and interconnected teaching and service components. The Adjudicating Committee will review and assess these contributions in both contexts.

Contributions to the research infrastructure such as serving on journal editorial boards, conference program committees, and conference organization is to be encouraged, but is normally judged under "Professional Contributions". However, the File Preparation Committee may recommend that this kind of activity be listed under "Service", if this activity adds recognition to the Department and the University. The Adjudicating Committee makes the final decision which category this type of activity is assessed under.

4.1.4.1 Criteria for Competence

To receive a recommendation of competence, a candidate is normally expected to

- Be a good "citizen" in the management of the Department, assuming his/her fair share of service requirements (for instance, by participating in committees that do important but possibly routine tasks).

4.1.4.2 Criteria for High Competence

To receive a recommendation of high competence, **a candidate would be expected to meet all of the requirements for competence**, and, in addition, is normally expected to

- Have participated, effectively and actively, in his/her fair share of service roles.
- Be an effective contributing member of departmental or university committees.
- Have demonstrated initiative in service in one or more aspects of their service roles.

4.1.4.3 Criteria for Excellence

To receive a recommendation of excellence, **a candidate would be expected to meet all of the requirements for high competence**, and, in addition, is normally expected to

- Have demonstrated sustained, effective, and innovative leadership in a variety of service positions. The demonstration of effective leadership in a significant service role is required for a recommendation of excellence.

4.2 Professorial Stream: Full Professor

4.2.1 Introduction

"A Professor is an eminent member of the University whose achievement at York and/or in his/her profession have marked him or her as one of the scholars from whom the University receives its energy and strength." (Senate T&P Policy C.1.3).

Promotion is based on an assessment of eminence. Although it is not expected that a Full Professor will have exhibited eminence in all three of Service, Professional Contribution and Standing and Teaching, normally a Full Professor will have demonstrated sustained and ongoing achievements in all three areas and to have demonstrated a level of exceptional commitment (eminence) in at least one area. This eminence in one area must be coupled with a minimum level of contribution in the other two areas. For each of the three areas, the minimum level of contribution is given below:

4.2.2 Required Minimum in Professional Contribution and Standing

- Have published or have accepted for publication, an average of one refereed high-quality journal publication or publication in a venue that has been identified as high-quality journal equivalent every other year since his/her appointment at York University.
- Have developed an independent research program.
- Have received ongoing funding from an external granting agency appropriate to their research area.
- Be identified as an active research scholar whose research has provided a substantive contribution to their field as identified by a majority of the professional contribution and standing referees.

4.2.3 Required Minimum in Teaching

- Have acted as the primary supervisor of at least one graduate student who has graduated from their graduate program.
- Have been evaluated through the normal departmental course evaluation process as having a teaching performance near or above the departmental median.
- Have collegial and student teaching evaluations paint a consistent picture of the candidate's high competence in teaching.
- To have contributed to curriculum development within the department.

4.2.4 Required Minimum in Service

- Have participated actively and with effectiveness in his/her fair share of service roles.
- Be an effective contributing member of departmental or university committees.
- Have demonstrated initiative in service in one or more aspects of their service roles.

In addition to meeting the minimum standard in each area, a Full Professor will demonstrate eminence in at least one area, as defined below.

4.2.5 Eminence in Professional Contribution and Standing

To demonstrate eminence in terms of Professional Contribution and Standing a Full Professor is normally expected to

- Have demonstrated a clear record of outstanding, internationally recognized scholarship (based on the evaluation of qualified Canadian and/or international referees). The AC will consider the cumulative impact of the Candidate's research on his/her research field rather than the impact of an isolated piece of work.
- Be identified by referees as defining and influencing research directions in their area.
- Have demonstrated a record of sustained publication in highly regarded archival publications in their research area.
- Attract sustained and significant research funding in their research area.
- Contribute to the management, organization, and professional structure of their research area by acting as reviewer, organizing committee member, conference organizer, journal editor, etc., for events in their research area.

- Serve as external reviewers on grants, PhD theses, and similar reviewing bodies.
- Have a record of ongoing supervision of graduate students including the supervision of at least one PhD student to completion.

4.2.6 Eminence in Teaching

To demonstrate eminence in terms of Teaching, a Full Professor is normally expected to

- Be identified as an outstanding instructor by undergraduate students.
- Be identified as an outstanding supervisor by graduate students.
- Be identified as an exceptional instructor by collegial referees.
- Have his/her teaching recognized through the nomination or receipt of teaching awards.
- Have contributed substantially to curriculum development at the undergraduate or graduate level.

4.2.7 Eminence in Service

To demonstrate eminence in terms of Service, a Full Professor is normally expected to

- Have served with distinction in a significant administrative role within the Department or University. Here 'significant' implies effort at a level of Graduate Program Director, Undergraduate Program Director or Chair, or more senior administrative positions.

In unusual circumstances, the case for promotion may be made primarily on the basis of exceptional contributions in one of the three categories or on a balanced portfolio in all three categories. Evidence of exceptional contribution would include: For Service, exceptional distinguished and sustained service contributions at a senior level; For Professional Contribution and Standing, extended research contributions of exceptional quality as identified by external reviewers; For Teaching, extended teaching or pedagogical contributions of considerable distinction and influence. Evidence for a balanced portfolio requires a candidate to exceed significantly the minimum criteria described in all three categories and to be close to eminence in one or more of the three areas so that the portfolio adds up to eminence overall.

4.3 Alternate Stream: Associate Lecturer

4.3.1 Introduction

“An Associate Lecturer is a superior teacher who has also demonstrated a competent level of service to the University that one would expect from a colleague in whose hands the care of the University has been placed by the granting of tenure.

It is because of this trust and because of its desire to give instruction of the highest quality that the University establishes a minimal threshold over which individuals in the Alternate Stream must pass to become part of that trust. In recognition of attainment of a level of distinction as a superior teacher whom it wishes to retain, the University grants a promotion to the rank of Associate Lecturer with tenure. It is expected that the Associate Lecturer will maintain, enhance and perhaps broaden his/her capabilities as a teacher over time. As a tenured member of the faculty of York University, an Associate Lecturer is governed by the general rules of the University relating to tenured faculty.” (Alternate Stream B.1.2)

A candidate for promotion and/or tenure in the Alternate Stream must be committed to education in Computer Science/Engineering in the broadest possible sense. *“Nothing less than excellence (superiority) in teaching and competence in service to the University”* is the required standard for the granting of tenure to an individual in the alternate stream (Alternate Stream A). A candidate will be evaluated based on:

- Effective teaching, mentoring of students, and ensuring that their courses are academically current and evolve with the field in an appropriate manner, and
- Active participation in the management and operation of the department. This includes assuming leadership responsibilities for portions of the service life of the department, ongoing curricular development of the Computer Science/Engineering curriculum and participation in service to the Department, Faculty and University as a whole.

4.3.2 Teaching

A candidate must be an effective teacher and contributor to curricular development.

- A candidate must teach effectively in the courses assigned by the Department.
- The academic content of all courses taught by the candidate is substantive, and matches the approved course curriculum.
- Student performance in courses taught by a candidate is assessed via appropriate exams, tests, assignments, projects, presentations and the like. Grading material must reflect the course content and intent.
- A candidate should present material in class in a professional manner. This includes clear delivery, and good use of instructional aids. Material is presented in a manner that engages and stimulates the students. Students should feel that the candidate cares about their intellectual development, and is sensitive to their level of understanding.
- A candidate has been assessed through the normal departmental course evaluation process as having a teaching performance substantially higher than the departmental mean.
- A candidate has teaching evaluations that use superlatives in describing the candidate’s teaching performance.
- A candidate has student letters consistently enthusiastic in their praise of the candidate
- Although a teaching award is not a requirement for a recommendation of excellence, performance at a level at which the candidate would be considered for such an award is. In evaluating teaching awards the AC must assess the nature of the award and the evidence in support of it.
- Candidates are expected to ensure that courses they teach are current, evolve with the field in an appropriate manner, and the content and level are appropriate. A candidate who teaches in multi-section and/or team-taught courses is expected to be a full and active contributor to the course, and to aid in its ongoing development and review.

4.3.2.1 Criteria for Superiority (excellence)

For *“Excellence”*, it is normally expected

1. That the candidate consistently achieves levels substantially higher than the departmental median in the statistical evaluations (compared to tenured and tenure stream faculty). The Adjudicating Committee will normally take year level information and the nature of the courses taught into account, when interpreting the statistical evaluations.

2. That the candidate is recognized as an outstanding instructor by undergraduate students.
3. That the candidate is recognized as an outstanding instructor by peer referees.
4. That the candidate is recognized as an innovator and leader in curricular development.

4.3.3 Service

To receive tenure and promotion, a candidate must have clearly demonstrated an ongoing and significant contribution to the management and operation of the Department and/or the University. Candidates should be active rather than passive in terms of their service contributions, and should show a willingness to engage in intellectual and collegial dialogue with faculty, staff, and students; and, should contribute to the general well-being of the Department and the University as a whole.

- Candidates should seek and show leadership in one or more service tasks within the department and/or the University.
- Candidates should demonstrate their effective performance in voluntary service roles as well as in the roles assumed at the request of the Department or the University. The Department stresses the distinction between the participation in committees that perform more routine tasks and significant administrative work or the contributions to the development of academic (research, teaching, computing) policies and environments.

An example of a significant service contribution is the development of the academic curriculum. This may include a significant revision of existing courses, the development of significant course infrastructure, the development of new courses and laboratories, or even the introduction of a whole new stream.

Service contributions to the development, operation, and management of academic programs may overlap with contributions to teaching. For instance, the development of course infrastructure, new laboratories, streams, or academic programs have clearly defined and interconnected teaching and service components. The Adjudicating Committee will review and assess these contributions in both contexts.

4.3.3.1 Criteria for Competence

A rating of Competence will be accorded to a candidate who has been a good “citizen” in the management of the Department, assuming his/her fair share of service requirements, though rarely in a leadership position. For competence at the Associate Lecturer level it is normally expected that

1. A candidate should seek and show leadership in one or more service tasks within the department and/or the University.
2. Apart from active participation in departmental meetings, a candidate should demonstrate willingness and flexibility in assuming service roles where their knowledge and good judgment could benefit the Department.
3. A candidate should demonstrate their effective performance in voluntary service roles as well as in the roles assumed at the request of the Department or the University. In accordance with the Section B3 of the Senate "Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria and Procedures" document, the Department stresses the distinction between the participation in committees that perform more routine tasks and significant administrative work or the contributions to the development of academic (research, teaching, computing) policies and environments.

Note that these criteria correspond to the criteria for ‘High Competence’ for Associate Professors.

4.4 Alternate Stream: Senior Lecturer

4.4.1 Introduction

“The rank of Senior Lecturer denotes an individual who exhibits leadership and makes a substantial contribution as a teacher and colleague.

Promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is not coincident with a minimum period of time at the Associate level, nor is it a routine progression. The promotion is granted in recognition of distinguished accomplishments in teaching and service.” (Alternate Stream B.1.3)

Evaluation will be based on the candidate’s contributions in teaching and service.

- It is normally expected that the case for promotion to Senior Lecturer will be made on the basis of the candidate’s contribution to teaching. In such case teaching related to undergraduate programs at the level of ‘Eminence’ for Full Professor and the publication of textbooks, lab handbooks, or papers on education research, are expected. Faculty or University-wide teaching awards are evidence of teaching at the level of ‘Eminence’ but are not the only such evidence. In evaluating teaching awards the AC must assess the nature of the award and the evidence in support of it.
- The case for promotion may in some cases be made primarily on the basis of the candidate’s contributions to service. In such case service at the level of ‘Eminence’ for Full Professor is expected.