

## ARTICLE 24 - Evaluation of teaching

### Section 24.1 - General

#### 24.1.1 Formal evaluation

\*24.1.1.2 **Levels of performance** As a result of such evaluation, it shall be determined that teaching is ~~outstanding~~ good, satisfactory ~~that it meets expectations~~, or that it is *unsatisfactory*, it being understood that

- (a) “good” shall mean teaching performance that demonstrates strong pedagogical goals, the employment of thoughtful teaching methods and course design to achieve these goals, and a successful and engaging learning environment for students.
- (b) “satisfactory” shall mean teaching performance that demonstrates clear pedagogical goals, commonly used teaching methods and course design to achieve these goals. ~~“meets expectations shall mean teaching performance that is comparable to a relevant group of peers in light of the application or matter under consideration.”~~
- (c) “unsatisfactory” shall mean teaching performance that is demonstrably unacceptable in light of the minimum standards of the profession.

### Section 24.2 - Formal evaluation

\*24.2.1.3 **Action by dean and FTPC** Following receipt, by the dean, of the report done pursuant to 24.2.1.1, and without further submitting the matter to the DTTC or chair:

- (a) If the dean, after preliminary consultation with the FTTC and after subsequent consultation with the member and the chair, has reason to believe that the member's teaching may be *unsatisfactory*, the dean ~~shall~~ may initiate the Direct Peer Review of Teaching procedure (as per 24.2.2) if the following conditions are met:-
  - (i) ~~Such belief must be founded upon either a pattern of weak A-reports or other relevant preliminary indications of unsatisfactory teaching.~~ the average of all the member's A-reports from the last three years is equal to or less than 2, and
  - (ii) the FTTC receives a recommendation from the Dean in favour of initiating a Direct Peer Review of Teaching and votes in favour of it.

It is understood that members having received teaching awards in the last five (5) years may not have their teaching classified as *unsatisfactory* for the same period.

- (b) If the member or the dean (after preliminary consultation with the FTTC and after subsequent consultation with the member and the chair of the department), has reason to believe that the member's teaching may be ~~outstanding good~~, the dean ~~shall will initiate, subject to consent by the member and in consultation with the FTTC, initiate~~ the Direct Peer Review of Teaching procedure (as per 24.2.2) if the following conditions are met:-
  - (i) the average of all the member's A-reports from the last three years is equal to or more than 4;  
and
  - (ii) the member has requested or consented to the review.

~~Such belief must be founded upon a pattern of strong A-reports and other relevant preliminary indications of outstanding teaching.~~

It is understood that when such a Direct Review of Teaching is initiated, the only possible determinations are *good* and *satisfactory* as per 24.1.1.2.

- (c) In the case where neither (a) nor (b) takes place, the dean and FTPC shall conclude that the member's teaching ~~meets expectations~~ *satisfactory* and shall so state.
- (d) The determination under (c) shall be communicated to the DTPC for the purposes of the recommendations required in the matter under consideration (without further comment on teaching by the DTPC or chair) and shall subsequently be included by the FTPC and dean in their recommendations.

#### 24.2.2 Direct Peer Review of Teaching

\*24.2.2.1 There shall be a list of not fewer than ~~15-40~~ *Teaching Evaluators* (TEs). The initial list and subsequent modifications shall be agreed upon by the Association and the employer.

\*24.2.2.4

- (a) In cases of promotion, tenure or discipline for deficient performance of workload duties under 39.3.3, the ~~dean and~~ FTPC, taking into account the report of the DTPC under 24.2.1.1, the TE reports, information considered by the DTPC, A-reports, and any information added by the member, shall indicate whether the member's teaching is deemed to be ~~outstanding good~~, to ~~meet expectations~~ *satisfactory*, or to be *unsatisfactory* (as defined under 24.1.1.2).
- (b) The determination under (a) shall be communicated to the DTPC for the purposes of the recommendations required in the matter under consideration (without further comment on teaching by the DTPC or chair) and shall subsequently be included by the FTPC and dean in their recommendations to the Joint Committee.
- (c) In cases of contract renewal, (a) and (b) apply, mutatis mutandis, to the action of the FTPC and its recommendation to the dean.
- (d) In cases where a formal warning is being considered, if the quality of teaching is an issue, the TE reports shall be included in the material considered by the FTPC in 39.3.2.2(b).

#### 24.2.3 Role and Duties of the Teaching Evaluators

\*24.2.3.2 **Procedures** Guided by the general considerations in 24.2.3.1, the TEs shall carry out their work as follows.

- (a) They shall meet as a group with the member, to establish relevant facts about the member's courses, teaching methods and materials, and any special circumstances.
- (b) They shall establish relevant facts about the nature of the courses taught (e.g., whether they are compulsory or service courses), and any special circumstances, such as the member's participation in departmental colloquia, symposia, or the like. They shall examine all relevant material provided by the DTPC, chair, dean or member, excluding the A-reports and any opinion prepared under 24.2.1.1(b).
- (c) They shall, after consultation with the member, undertake an investigation, which may include, among others, the following:

interviews with students, currently enrolled at the University of Ottawa, who are or have been directed by the member or who are or have been taught by the member;

written assessments from appropriately selected former students, graduated from the University of Ottawa;

examination of textbooks or other teaching materials prepared by the member;

observation of teaching by means, and during times, determined after consultation with the member.

(d) Once the investigation is completed, each TE shall send to the dean a separate and detailed report which shall contain

(i) a statement (agreed on by all three members) of the scope of the investigation; and

(ii) —a summary of the information gathered and an analysis of the results,

~~it being understood that TE reports must not contain a determination as to whether teaching is outstanding, meets expectations, or is unsatisfactory,~~

(iii) a statement outlining whether the TE judges the teaching to be good, satisfactory, or is unsatisfactory as per article 24.1.1.2. It is understood, however, that final determination of the level of teaching performance is being reserved for the FTPC and dean pursuant to 24.1.1.2 and 24.2.2.4(a).

**APUO PROPOSAL** – Presented to the employer on 20 March 2013

These modifications are the result of the proposed changes to article 24 and don't constitute an official opening of this article for the purposes of negotiations.

## ARTICLE 17 - Engagements

### Section 17.3 - Specific provisions for limited-term regular appointments

#### 17.3.3 Renouvellement d'engagement régulier

- \*17.3.3.1 Tout professeur régulier, engagé selon les dispositions de 17.3.1, doit être avisé par le doyen, au plus tard le 15 décembre précédant la fin de son engagement, si celui-ci sera renouvelé; et, le cas échéant, à quelles conditions.
- \*17.3.3.2 Sous réserve de 17.3.3.3, l'engagement d'un professeur régulier syndiqué non permanent doit être renouvelé lorsque:
  - (a) les conditions précisées dans la lettre d'engagement en cours ont été remplies par le membre;
  - (b) la qualité des activités savantes et des services à la communauté universitaire est satisfaisante, et l'enseignement dispensé par le membre, selon l'évaluation faite conformément à l'article 24, est satisfaisante ~~satisfait aux exigences~~;
  - (c) le membre a maintenu les compétences particulières, correspondant aux besoins du département, pour lesquelles il avait initialement été engagé.

L'évaluation de ces critères doit respecter le devoir d'accomodation conformément à l'article 8.

Dans le cas d'un premier renouvellement, l'engagement d'un professeur régulier syndiqué non permanent peut être renouvelé même si le professeur n'a pas répondu à l'ensemble de (a), (b), et (c) ci-dessus, pourvu que l'ensemble de (a), (b), et (c) seront probablement atteints avant que le dossier du membre soit examiné en vue du deuxième renouvellement. Dans le cas d'un second renouvellement, le membre doit répondre à l'ensemble de (a), (b), et (c), à moins que les parties à la convention ne s'entendent autrement.

- \*17.3.3.3 Nonobstant ce qui précède, l'engagement d'un professeur régulier non permanent peut ne pas être renouvelé lorsque, suite à l'application de l'article 19 de la présente convention, le professeur a été désigné pour être mis à pied.
- \*17.3.3.4 Lorsque l'engagement d'un professeur régulier non permanent n'est pas renouvelé, le doyen doit l'informer par écrit des raisons de cette décision.

**APUO PROPOSAL** – Presented to the employer on 20 March 2013

These modifications are the result of the proposed changes to article 24 and don't constitute an official opening of this article for the purposes of negotiations.

## ARTICLE 25 - Tenure and promotion for faculty members

### Section 25.3 - Critères

#### 25.3.2 Professeur agrégé

\*25.3.2.1 La promotion au rang de professeur agrégé est accordée lorsqu'un membre remplit les conditions suivantes.

(b) Le membre a fait preuve d'un enseignement qui, lorsqu'évalué conformément aux stipulations de l'article 24, est jugé ~~satisfaire aux exigences~~ satisfaisant. Il est entendu que lorsque la demande est faite dans la deuxième année d'un engagement continu à l'Université d'Ottawa, le dossier d'enseignement doit satisfaire aux exigences à l'Université d'Ottawa et doit présenter suffisamment d'expérience d'enseignement, y compris un enseignement à plein temps post-doctorat (ou l'équivalent du doctorat) de niveau universitaire à d'autres établissements, pour pouvoir montrer, sur une période d'au moins trois années, une tendance d'enseignement ~~qui satisfait aux exigences~~ est satisfaisant.

\*25.3.2.3 Dans l'évaluation du rendement du membre en regard des critères énumérés à 25.3.2.2(b) et (c) ci-dessus, un enseignement de bonne qualité ~~excellente~~ peut compenser un rendement qui ne serait que satisfaisant dans ses travaux scientifiques, littéraires, artistiques, ou professionnels.

#### 25.3.3 Full professor

\*25.3.3.1 The parties agree that promotion to the rank of full professor is ~~a recognition~~ recognition of the high quality of the member's contributions to teaching and scholarly activities in the university setting.

\*25.3.3.2 Promotion to the rank of full professor shall be granted when a member meets the following conditions.

(b) The member has evidenced teaching which, when evaluated in accordance with the provisions of article 24, is deemed ~~to meet expectations~~ satisfactory. It is understood that, where the application is made in the second year of continuous appointment at the University of Ottawa, the teaching record must be such that, at the University of Ottawa it meets expectations and there is sufficient teaching, including full-time post-Ph.D. (or equivalent of Ph.D.) university-level teaching at other institutions, to demonstrate a pattern of teaching of at least 3 years that ~~meets expectations~~ is satisfactory.

\*25.3.3.3 Promotion to the rank of full professor shall be granted to a member who, instead of complying with the conditions set forth in 25.3.3.2, meets the following requirements.

(b) The member has taught over a wide range of levels and her teaching, when assessed in accordance with article 24, is found to be ~~outstanding~~ good.