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Purpose of today’s Discussion

- Have a candid discussion of the Faculty Evaluation process.
- Explain the FEC process.
- Discuss how your career will be evaluated.
- Answer your questions - and prepare you for what is coming!
- We will discuss expectations in the award of merit increments as well as tenure.

Ultimately, the goal is to Demystify FEC - FEC is your friend, not your enemy!
What is FEC
What is FEC?

FEC is the organism that rewards performance. FEC makes decisions on

- Merit increments.
- Tenure.
- Promotion (to the rank of Professor).

FEC also makes recommendations to the Dean of Engineering with respect to applications for sabbatical leave.
FEC Composition
FEC Composition

FEC membership consists of the following:

- The Dean of Engineering (FEC Chair - has full voting rights)
- The 4 Engineering Department Chairs
- The Chair of BME
- Four additional members, 1 from each Engineering Department. Once elected to FEC, these members represent the Faculty of Engineering, not their home Departments.
- One external member representing the “President’s Review Committee.”
- One FSO External to the Faculty of Engineering (only during the evaluation of FSOs).
Tenure Discussions

During tenure deliberations, one additional member from each department is added to FEC. Each additional member has a special mandate (discussed later).
FEC Deliverations
Things to discuss

We will discuss two things:

- The award of merit increments.
- Tenure.
Merit Increment Discussions
Department Chair receives annual reports in September.

Over the next two months, the Chair meets with Department members and makes increment recommendations based on a finite increment pool (1.15 * the number of faculty members in the department).

Chair recommendations are received by FEC. FEC makes final decisions, based on a comparison with the rest of the faculty.

The evaluation covers three main areas: (i) Teaching, (ii) Research and (iii) Service
Teaching Activities

Evaluation of Teaching
Teaching is a major responsibility of every academic. One that is very difficult to evaluate.

Elements that are considered during the evaluation process include:
Evaluation of Teaching

- Input received from Students
  - Teaching ratings (from the students USRIs)
  - Student written comments.
  - Direct dialog.
- Direct experience (attending classes)
- Course development (curricular changes, lab development, etc).
- Signs of exceptional efforts or initiatives.
- Perusal of examinations, assignments and class notes that reveal the quality of the course and expectations.
Evaluation of Teaching may also include

- Versatility to teach small and large classes.
- Coverage (depth) of the subject matter.
- Teaching of new courses and development of new labs.
- Out-of-class counselling, advising and supervision.
- (Quality of the) Supervision of graduate students.
- Creativity and innovation.
- Awareness of new elements in field of instruction.
- Usefulness as a resource to the department and colleagues.
- Production of teaching aids such as textbooks, class notes, etc.
- Adherence to approved class curriculum.
Evaluation of Research
Evaluation of Research

Concept:
- Research activities are directed at advancing knowledge.
- Publication activities are directed towards dissemination of knowledge.

The two are closely related as the assessment of peers working in the same field is the best way of determining the quality of creative activity.

The main problem is that engineering research has many facets and is quite diverse:
- different activities often publish at different rates:
- quality and productivity are “discipline-specific.”
Things considered by FEC

- Quality and quantity of journal papers. Quality can often be paralleled to the quality of the journal. Journal impact factor is often a valuable tool, but can be misleading when comparing across different disciplines.

- Books published as well as patents filed.

- Funding (especially grants given following a peer review process) NSERC discovery, NSERC Strategic Grants, NSERC CRD Grants, etc.

- Industrial Chairs.
Things considered by FEC (cont.)

- Number of Graduate students supervised.
- Quality of supervision (students graduate on time, student participation in publications, quality of the papers published by PhD students, etc.)
- Correlation among: total funds # graduate students # J. publications.
- Conference publications: Difficult to judge; however in some areas, conferences are highly valued.
- Overall impact of the research program (local, national or international)
Evaluation of Service
Evaluation of Service

- Service is very important. Without service, our departments would stop functioning, journals would stop reviewing articles, conferences would be unable to run.

- Specially valued forms of internal service are those that carry a responsibility and can include:
  - Associate Chairs
  - Program directors/advisors

- Other internal committees are also important. Contribution is weighted according to responsibility and work required.

- Participation in Oral Exams for PhD and MSc students.

- Refusal to participate in administrative responsibilities can be regarded as a negative factor.

- Below average contributions in committee work can also be regarded as negative.
External Service

- As you move throughout your career you will be expected to engage in other forms of professional (external) activities which can include:

  - Membership in Journal Editorial Boards.
  - Journal Editorships.
  - Organization of Conferences and/or special sessions in international events.
  - Service to Engineers Canada and/or the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board.
  - Membership in other professional organizations.
Other Elements in the Evaluation

- **Awards:**
  - Paper awards.
  - Institutional, provincial, national, and international achievement awards.
  - Teaching awards (institutional, national and international).

- and finally, any other element or initiative that benefits
  - department, faculty, or the University,
  - the engineering profession.
Tenure
Except in special cases, new staff members are appointed to a probationary period of 4 years.

Near the end of this probationary period, the Department chair must make one of 3 possible recommendations to the Dean:

(i) that a 2nd probationary period of two years be offered
(ii) that an appointment with tenure be offered, or
(iii) that no further appointment be offered

In cases (ii) and (iii) the decision is referred to the FEC.

At the end of the second probationary period the Department Chair must recommend that either (i) tenure be awarded, or (ii) no further appointment be made. The FEC makes the final decision.
Criteria for Tenure

The evaluation of tenure hinges upon the following elements (from the Faculty Agreement):

- Teaching
- Research and scholarly work
- Knowledge of the discipline and specialization
- Professional and other contributions

Teaching and research are the main components and are given equal weight.
Evaluation of Teaching

- Similar to what was said earlier in the annual evaluation of teaching.

- At the end of the probationary period the expectation is that a faculty member should have established himself/herself as a competent teacher at all levels (undergraduate, graduate).
In tenure considerations, the whole career of an individual is considered, not only the years spent here.

Notwithstanding the previous point, the key element in the evaluation process is the establishment of an independent research program on campus.

Establishing a program entails several elements that include:

- obtaining funds to sustain a research group.
- develop a student group of a certain size and strength.
- Staring to gain recognition and notoriety of the research community by publishing “quality work” with students.
During the evaluation there will be a thorough scrutiny of the staff’s publication record, including:

- Quality and quantity of journal papers published.
- Books and filed patents along with their “impact”.
- Co-authors in those papers.
  - A clear separation from former PhD-PDF supervisors is expected.
  - Emphasis is placed on the individuals research program.
  - Single authored papers and/or publications with graduate students are expected. Publishing with students is a must and speaks to the quality of supervision.
  - Conference papers are also looked at but normally carry less weight.
Your research program must be sustainable. The academic system works as follows:

- join the Department and get your first NSERC grant
- accept 1 or 2 students (depending how much you get)
- Slowly grow your program. This is done by: going out getting additional grants, then bringing more students.

A correlation is expected between funding level, number of graduate students supervised and your output (publications)
Graduate Student Supervision

- At the time of tenure it is expected that a faculty member has attracted resources to establish a student group of a sufficient critical mass.

- Graduating some students is very important.

- Students should be completing their degrees in a timely manner. MSc or PhDs taking too long to graduate is often indicative of poor supervision.
Knowledge of the Discipline and Specialization

- Evidence of peer recognition:
  - Internal opinion of your colleagues (this is the main responsibility of the “additional Department member” during tenure discussions).
  - Letters of reference, particularly specific comments referred to the quality of research.
  - The question here is: is there anybody out there who actually cares about your work?
Service and Other areas

- Service to the Department is important. A Department can only run if we all collaborate.
- Be a good citizen. Realize that you need to make a contribution.
- When asked to join a committee, make an effort to accept.
- If you are taking part in committee, an effort is expected. Doing nothing is worse than not serving at all.
Some Final Comments
Some Final Words

- FEC expectations have increased steadily over recent past.

- The reason is: The Faculty of Engineering has undergone a major rejuvenation of personnel and is now among the elite research intensive schools in North America. Many people have been hired and expectations change according to their performance (including yours!)

- Expectations are high because the average performance is outstanding - at all ranks.

- The tenure process is exhaustive, but is a friendly one: FEC is looking for reasons to award tenure, not reasons to say no.
### Some Recent Statistics

Here's a table showing some recent statistics for various academic years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>00</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># faculty at end of 1st prob. period</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># faculty at end of 2nd prob. period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2nd prob. period by Chairs &amp; Dean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2nd prob. period by FEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year extension of 2nd prob. period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of faculty awarded tenure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># non-renewals of faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time for Discussion