Faculty and Administrator Perceptions of a Faculty Evaluation Process and Its Ability to Advance Faculty Enrichment

by

Mary Marguerite Giovannetti

M.A., Simon Fraser University, 1998
B.Ed., Mount Saint Vincent University, 1978

Dissertation in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the

Curriculum and Instruction Design Program

Faculty of Education

© Mary Marguerite Giovannetti 2015

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Fall 2015

Approval

Name: **Mary Marguerite Giovannetti**

Degree: **Doctor of Philosophy**

Title: ***Faculty and administrator perceptions of a faculty evaluation process and its ability to advance faculty enrichment***

Examining Committee: **Chair: Dr. Vicki Kelly**
Associate Professor

Dr. Allan MacKinnon
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor

Dr. Michael Ling
Supervisor
Senior Lecturer

Dr. Shawn Bullock
Supervisor
Assistant Professor

Dr. Michelle Pidgeon
Internal/External Examiner
Associate Professor

Dr. Gary Poole
External Examiner
Senior Scholar
Faculty of Medicine
University of British Columbia

Date Defended/Approved: November 23, 2015

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research

c. as a co-investigator, collaborator or research assistant in a research project approved in advance,

or

d. as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Abstract

Using qualitative case study methodology, this study examined faculty and administrator perceptions of a faculty evaluation process at a special purpose teaching university that was for the majority of its history a community college. The study explored faculty and administrator satisfaction with the process, what they considered the most important components of the faculty evaluation process to be, and whether the process led to faculty enrichment.

Through five focus groups and in-depth interviews with five participants, the themes of tensions, opportunities, and contradictions emerged. Examining the process of faculty evaluation and participants' lived experiences with it exposed the gap that exists between the process surrounding faculty evaluation at this institution and the perceptions and preferences of faculty and administrators who are affected by or have responsibility for this process. A further analysis of the faculty evaluation process using Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) "thinking tools" unearthed how the process structures and confines the actions of participants and perpetuates a "structuring structure" (1977/2004, p. 72).

Since faculty enrichment is an expected outcome of a faculty evaluation process, this study employed Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning to illustrate how faculty enrichment could be conceptualized through Faculty Learning Communities. Finally, this study uncovered the unintended effects of a faculty evaluation process that has been cemented in the culture of an organization for most of its 47-year history; therefore, this study could be useful in informing the design of faculty evaluation programs at other institutions.

Keywords: Faculty evaluation; Bourdieu's "thinking tools"; qualitative case study methodology; faculty enrichment; Wenger's social theory of learning; faculty learning communities

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to the late Charles Brady Giovannetti, a gifted carpenter, a man of few words, and a father who hungered for a formal education. To us, Dad!

Acknowledgements

I must first begin by acknowledging my senior supervisor, Dr. Allan MacKinnon. From my first meeting with him prior to beginning my formal Ph.D. studies to the completion of this dissertation, he has been a constant supporter and advisor, who has been eager to assist, quick to respond to my queries, and generous with his time. Our many meetings over the last five years have always provided me with direction and compelling ideas to consider.

Dr. Michael Ling, I could not have completed this dissertation without you. You constantly awakened in me a desire to know more, to understand difficult theoretical concepts better, and to view them as a lens to understanding my life's work. I always left our stimulating conversations more enlightened, more challenged, and inspired to do more.

Thank you, Dr. Shawn Bullock, for your valuable perspective and feedback on this dissertation. You added much to my understanding of what I was trying to accomplish and how I might best accomplish it. I realize how fortunate I was to have you join SFU at a time when I really needed your expertise.

To my colleagues at Capilano University and to the participants in this study, I sincerely thank you for your support and encouragement during my Ph.D. studies, which have been an incredibly satisfying personal learning endeavour.

To my family, especially Bob, Matthew, Breanne, and Patricia, who endured my absence as I hid myself away for more days and months and years than we ever expected, I thank you for your patience and support.

To my daughter Patricia who has endured my absence the most, I look forward to attending your Ph.D. defence in the future. To my grandchildren, Dominic, Eli, Myles, and Jayden, who were all born in the years after my starting this Ph.D. journey, may your desire to learn always be sparked by the beauty of "wonder."

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1.

Introduction

This dissertation explores the topic of faculty evaluation through qualitative intrinsic case study methodology and employs Pierre Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) "thinking tools" to aid in understanding the faculty evaluation process at my institution. Bourdieu's "thinking tools" offer a framework to examine the educational institution and the roles and positions that individuals occupy in it with regard to its faculty evaluation process. In addition, this study employs Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning to explore how faculty enrichment, an expected outcome of faculty evaluation, can be conceptualized through Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs).

Faculty evaluation is a complex process that seeks to balance a university's right to assess teaching performance, a faculty member's right to a fair and informative evaluation, and a student's right to provide feedback on his or her learning experience. Faculty evaluation is a topic that has captured my attention over the course of my teaching career. Being evaluated by my program co-ordinators, my colleagues, and my students is a formal process that I have always approached with trepidation. To understand more fully the faculty evaluation process at my university and to explore more deeply why it triggers an affective response in me, I chose to devote my dissertation to the prickly topic of faculty evaluation and the role it plays at my institution, a special purpose teaching university located in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

As stated, faculty evaluation processes serve a number of purposes; they are developed to provide the university with information on which to base personnel decisions, the faculty member with information regarding his or her teaching

performance, and the students with an opportunity to voice their views regarding their learning experience. However, there may be a gap between the policies that institutions develop and the lived experiences of administrators and faculty who navigate these policies. Consequently, the problem addressed by this thesis is the gap between policies and processes surrounding faculty evaluation in post-secondary institutions and the perceptions and preferences of faculty and administrators who are affected by or have responsibility for those policies and processes.

1.2. Background

I remember so clearly my first teaching assignment at my institution in 1979. I had taught for a year at another college whose programs were designed to follow a self-paced curriculum model, which allowed motivated students to thrive and those who needed more direction to become disenchanted. I hungered for the opportunity to teach and interact with a group of students as we journeyed through the curriculum together, so I promptly sent off my resume in response to a job ad that appeared in *The Vancouver Sun* seeking a business instructor at Capilano College.

Within a few days, I was called for an interview and met with the selection committee. Fortunately for me, the next day I received a conditional offer of employment, which was contingent on my meeting with the Dean and his approving my hire. Two days later, the Dean and I met and I handled my interview with him very well, until it came to a question about where I lived. I had moved to Coquitlam from a fishing village on Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia, so you can imagine my surprise when he asked if I lived on the North Shore. Not sure where the North Shore was, I replied that I lived in Coquitlam. This reply apparently saved me from exposing my ignorance, a sometimes useful tactic to employ in my teaching and administrative roles.

Capilano University (CU), established as a community college in 1968, has prospered from its humble beginnings. Its first program offerings were housed after regular school hours at a secondary school in West Vancouver with a student population of 784 (Capilano University, 2011). By 1977, courses were being offered on three campuses: North Vancouver, Sechelt, and Squamish. Although it was a community

college, its first degree offering was in Jazz Studies in collaboration with the BC Open University and by 2003, it was the first college in the province to independently grant applied degrees in music therapy, jazz studies, business administration, and tourism management (Capilano University, 2009, p. 4). In 2005, Capilano College submitted its application for accreditation to the Northwest Commission of Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), and after significant effort on the part of the administration, faculty, and staff, accreditation was granted in February 2013. Meanwhile, a significant change took place in April of 2008 when the Government of British Columbia announced that Capilano would be designated a special purpose teaching university (Office of the Premier, https://www.capilanou.ca/2008-media-releases/April-25,-2008--Province-to-establish-Capilano-University/). According to the B.C. University Act, a special purpose teaching university serves a specific geographical area of the province and provides "adult basic education, career, technical, trade, and academic programs leading to certificates, diplomas, and baccalaureate and masters degrees." In addition, special purpose teaching universities undertake "applied research and scholarly activities to support [their] programs", to "the extent [their] resources permit" (Ministry of Advanced Education, http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/publications/legislation.htm, para. 6). Capilano University's geographical area includes the school districts of North Vancouver, West Vancouver, Sea to Sky, and the Sunshine Coast. The university offers a variety of baccalaureate degrees and programs from the certificate level to master's degrees.

Capilano's designation as a special purpose teaching university was in response to the British Columbia government's *Campus 2020 Report* (Plant, 2007) that called for regional universities to serve the needs of their constituents. Capilano University (CU) was one of five existing institutions that were given a new designation. Its designation as a special purpose teaching university has provided challenges and opportunities. For example, the new designation has required CU to align its governance structure to meet provincial government legislative requirements, it has enabled CU to expand its degree offerings, and it has provided increased marketing opportunities locally and internationally. CU has approximately 15,000 students enrolled in credit and non-credit programs (8000 in credit programs and 7,000 in non-credit courses) with approximately 530 international students representing 56 countries studying in 54 programs at the

university (Capilano University, 2011). In addition, approximately 670 faculty members and 48 administrators are employed at the university (Capilano University, 2011).

CU prides itself on the teaching excellence of its faculty, which it has promoted through its tagline "Great Teaching, Great Programs, Great Future," and on its commitment to individual student success within its supportive collegial community. For 36 years, I have been primarily a faculty member at Capilano, although I have held Chair and Acting Dean positions. I have witnessed many positive changes and tremendous growth and, more recently, significant budgetary constraints resulting in devastating program cuts during my association with the institution. What has become clear through all these upheavals is the resilience of this institution to move forward even in the face of increasingly limited resources. My colleagues devote many hours to sitting on university committees, to engaging in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, to developing innovative curricula that will attract and retain students, to representing the institution locally, nationally, and internationally all with the desire to shape the university and its policies so that it is the best that it can be.

However, like any institution, sometimes a policy written in words and created to operationalize a process can vary significantly from the lived experiences of those who are affected by it. And so it has been for me. Throughout my association with CU, I have often been puzzled by its approach to faculty evaluation and by my personal reaction to it. Consequently, for me, there has indeed been one constant during my partnership with this institution: My consistent dread when the Dean's office would inform me via the department divisional assistant that I was entering my "evaluation year."

CU's faculty evaluation program, which has been in effect since the early 1970s (Capilano College, 1972), resides in the Faculty Collective Agreement. Many of its primary components remain unchanged but one significant change has been the inclusion of a mentorship clause in 2007. Faculty members (probationary) are formally offered mentorship, at the discretion of the co-ordinator, after student questionnaires expose areas of concern in terms of teaching skills, interpersonal skills, lesson organization, subject competency, classroom management, content delivery, etc.

Although many co-ordinators offer assistance and guidance to new faculty in terms of organizational and institutional procedures, many faculty members are also in need of instructional and emotional support. When a new faculty member transitions into a new teaching position or the profession, it is a crucial time for him or her to gain assistance and support from colleagues and the institution as they often come to realize the "insufficiency of their preparation, lack of student enthusiasm, the extent of management and discipline difficulties, and the exhausting nature of their work" (Johnson, Ratsoy, Holdaway & Friesen, 1993, p. 296).

To give credence to these sentiments and context to the reason behind my desire to understand better the faculty evaluation process at my university, I offer you *My Story*, which describes my experience working with a new faculty member as we navigate hiring, evaluation, and the Alerting and Guidance provision of the faculty evaluation process. A pseudonym is used and details significantly altered and frequently invented to protect the identity of this faculty member.

1.3. My Story

My 36 years of teaching experience combined with several years of administrative experience have provided me with a multitude of opportunities to learn how the system of faculty evaluation works from a variety of perspectives at the university. As a non-regular (sessional) or regular (permanent) faculty member, the formal evaluation process creates tension and anxiety in me. Will I have "good" classes this year? Will the students be able to separate the quality of my teaching from their grades in my courses? Will the co-ordinator be impressed with my teaching skills and delivery when s/he visits my class? What will I learn about myself? There is a never-ending list of doubts and questions when it comes to the formal evaluation process – it is a tension that continues to build until the process is complete and the results reflect what I had hoped for.

In addition to the perspective of a faculty member regarding the faculty evaluation process, I have also had the responsibility of chairing departmental search committees. In this role, I have great hopes that we, the Search Committee members,

have found a gifted teacher who has enthusiasm for teaching and learning, expertise in the particular subject area, and whose contributions to the university will complement the department and open the department and the university to new ways of thinking about pedagogy, curriculum design, program assessment, etc. The committee wants to hire someone who works well with others, who is eager to become a contributing member of the department by volunteering to participate in projects, committee work, etc. The Search Committee wants to ensure that the decision it has made was indeed the right one. As members of this committee, we make clear in the interview and in the requirements for the teaching demonstration that takes place during the interview process that we do not want a "talking head," but rather an instructor who actively engages students in the learning process and who goes the extra mile for them. And yet, what often happens is that we hire someone for whom we have high hopes only to discover that as colleagues, as administrators, or as members of the university community we may have let this person down by not offering the support that the faculty member really needed to find his/her place and way within the system.

What follows is an account of my experience working with a new faculty member in my role as a co-ordinator at the departmental level. I present this story here in Chapter 1 in order to help establish the context for the thesis, its significance, and a statement of the research problem that guided my study.

We hired Jackson in late July and his teaching assignment was to begin officially in August. I met with him in early August to outline the courses that he would be teaching, to explain a multitude of departmental and university procedures, and most importantly to welcome him to the department and offer support in any way that I could. The department and the university were excited by this hire; his interview and references were impressive, and we could see how Jackson could really add depth to our course offerings and assist the university's new endeavours to develop more undergraduate degrees now that the university had been designated a special purpose teaching university. I gave Jackson a copy of the Faculty Collective Agreement as a resource for the many questions that would, no doubt, arise as time went on. At this meeting, we had talked about professional development requirements, the evaluation process, the organization of the department, office assignments, etc., and I provided him with much

6

too much information for anyone to absorb in one sitting. Nevertheless, I knew that there would be ample opportunity to guide Jackson as he transitioned to teaching at CU.

When mid-August rolled around, I introduced Jackson to his new colleagues and formally introduced him at our first department meeting in late August. Jackson offered to assist on a few committees but seemed reticent to take on "too much" since his teaching load consisted of teaching four courses in the fall and four courses in the spring. Three of the courses in the fall and two in the spring would be courses that Jackson had not taught before, although he had the academic qualifications to have them assigned to him. I recognized quite early that Jackson was a dedicated, conscientious teacher – the constant dark circles under his eyes continually reminded me that he was struggling to balance the course preparation with the marking of assignments that just kept pouring in. I met with Jackson on numerous occasions to check in with him, to see how things were going, to ask him how I might help him. I gave him words of encouragement, connected him with industry contacts to arrange for guest speakers, and offered on numerous occasions to visit his classes to provide feedback prior to the official evaluation process. Jackson seemed to me to put boundaries up around him – he kept me at a distance – and insisted he could manage on his own.

Students were starting to grumble about some frustrations they were having with his classes to other instructors. I talked to Jackson about his need to do formal student evaluations this term and reminded him that the formal Co-ordinator evaluation could take place this semester or next. I offered to visit his classes on an informal basis to provide feedback prior to the formal evaluation; I suggested that he might like to visit other instructors' classes, which we strongly encourage in the department as lots of new ideas for student engagement come from visiting each other's classes. I wanted to throw Jackson a lifeline, but I sensed resistance or perhaps exhaustion.

Those grumblings from students grew louder. Near the end of October, I received an email jointly written by four students outlining their concerns. I immediately informed the students that I needed to follow university policy regarding instructor complaints and sent them a copy of the procedures and assured them that they really needed to speak with their instructor to give him the feedback. They assured me that

they had given the feedback in class on numerous occasions and that nothing had changed. By this point, Jackson still has not had his formal student evaluations done for the fall semester and I was anxious for him. I emailed Jackson and asked him to come to see me to check in on how his term was going. Jackson called me just prior to the meeting to tell me that he was running late as he was trying to get papers marked in time for his afternoon class and could we reschedule. I told him that I had received an email from students expressing some concerns about one of his courses. He asked me what I thought he should do. I suggested that he take ten minutes at the beginning of his class to let students know that since he is interested in getting feedback on the course, he would distribute a feedback form to each student who would complete it anonymously while he left the classroom for ten minutes. A student would be responsible for collecting the forms and placing them in an interoffice envelope and placing them on his desk. When he returned to the class, he would let students know that he would be more than willing to meet with students to discuss any concerns that they had with the course and that he was available to meet during his office hours scheduled for that week. Jackson followed my suggestions and commented that the students were very eager to have the opportunity to provide the feedback.

This request for informal written feedback from the students seemed to diffuse the situation for Jackson and the students. Jackson had his formal student evaluations completed two weeks prior to the end of classes in two of his four courses. By the end of the term, Jackson had survived teaching four courses (three of them new preps) and the first round of formal student evaluations. Remarkably, Jackson never asked to review the evaluations that semester, although I explained on a couple of occasions that he could review them or we could review them together. Perhaps, however, the informal evaluations were informative enough for him. By the time final exams were over in December, Jackson was exhausted and I truly felt concerned for him. He needed to rest in addition to start prepping for the next semester. How could I do more for him? I was feeling nervous for him. He seemed to be drowning under the workload and yet was he really interested in finding value in the student feedback? I pondered solutions – could Jackson do other work in place of teaching, could he get release time to work on a university project, could he reduce his workload? I knew Jackson needed to work full time and that his voluntarily reducing his workload was not a possibility. I hoped the

8

second term would be better. Two preps instead of three might make a difference to his work-life balance.

In the spring semester, I decided to go on educational leave, which meant that a new co-ordinator would be taking over the administration of the department. The co-ordinator visited Jackson's class a couple of times during the spring semester. However, for evaluation purposes, the co-ordinator formally made a classroom visit much later in the term. For most instructors, this would not be an ideal time to visit a class and so it was for Jackson.

By the end of April, Jackson's evaluation file was complete; it contained student evaluations from four classes (two each from the fall and spring terms) a colleague evaluation, and a co-ordinator evaluation. Jackson made a submission to his evaluation file, which did not challenge any of the contents, but rather provided further context for student comments.

The Evaluation Committee for the department reviewed Jackson's file and decided that he would benefit from Alerting and Guidance. The file was forwarded to the Dean, who supported the committee's recommendation. The Dean then sent a form letter to Jackson advising him of the decision to place him on Alerting and Guidance because his teaching performance was "less than satisfactory" and requesting that he work with the co-ordinator to select between three to five people that he would like to have on his Guidance Committee. (A faculty member's evaluation is deemed satisfactory or less than satisfactory, as noted in Article 11.5.5.1.1 of the Faculty Evaluation Process, Appendix C.) The co-ordinator asked if I might meet with Jackson to see how he was doing now that he had been informed that he was being placed on Alerting and Guidance.

Jackson arrived in my office looking downcast. He let his briefcase fall to the floor and slumped into a chair that I had placed next to the round table in my office. My office is generally seen as a welcoming spot along the way to the photocopier or to the washroom. I welcome colleagues to chat, catch up on our lives and to have those serious discussions that always need a quiet, confidential space. Jackson's mood was gloomy; watching him I realized how disappointing it was for him to learn that his

teaching was less than satisfactory and that he had been placed on Alerting and Guidance. His downcast eyes during our conversation revealed volumes. How could he have been set up for such a letdown?

I also felt that Jackson was feeling "chippy" in the sense that he was defensive and wanted to know how this evaluation was going to affect his ability to keep this teaching position. I tried to find words of encouragement that would help him to see that this experience could be a valuable learning opportunity for him. We talked about a lot of things: being more relaxed in the classroom, sidelining some of the challenges he faced with students by setting up classroom procedures differently thereby lessening the opportunity for conflict to occur. Although I felt that Jackson would benefit from guidance, I also realized that at this point in time the university's offer of guidance felt more to Jackson like a penalty or corrective action than an offer of support.

At the time of my first teaching assignment at Capilano, I, like Jackson, experienced what many new faculty members who are hired because of their content knowledge, advanced degrees, and professional expertise often discover: Transitioning into a teaching position in higher education can be challenging. After their first official introduction into their department, newly hired faculty members are deluged with a plethora of policies and procedures that they are expected to follow. Many of these policies include formal evaluation processes that may appear intimidating, confusing, and haphazard. Arranging a mentorship partnership may help smooth the transition into teaching by providing support and guidance, yet so often these partnerships do not develop as expected leaving the new hire feeling isolated and bewildered.

Mentorship and faculty evaluation systems are two processes that are often interconnected. For example, at CU, a faculty member is offered mentorship, at the discretion of the co-ordinator, if the first round of student questionnaires raises performance concerns. Although this approach to mentorship functions more like remediation, the fact remains that opportunities for faculty to improve their teaching performance are often enhanced with the support they receive from a mentor.

Faculty evaluation programs should provide instructors with an opportunity for self-reflection, instructional innovation, and professional development. In addition,

faculty evaluations frequently determine future teaching opportunities, faculty retention and promotion, and peer support arrangements. Consequently, the processes that are put in place to oversee faculty evaluation systems have far-reaching effects; they can be opportunities for what Arreola (2007) calls "professional enrichment" while simultaneously limiting or expanding career prospects (p. xx).

Arreola (2007) emphasizes the importance of connecting faculty evaluation systems to professional enrichment programs to provide instructors with the opportunity to enhance their teaching performance by developing the pedagogical skills and expertise they need to become proficient teachers. Any faculty evaluation process should, of course, involve faculty in its design and implementation and include multiple sources of information regarding the instructor's teaching effectiveness (Seldin, 2006a; Arreola, 2007). Faculty evaluation programs might be expected to provide faculty with opportunities for enrichment but so often they do not. Faculty frequently come through the formal evaluation processes with the knowledge that they have met the requirements to continue to teach at the institution. They breathe a sigh of relief that the process is over allowing them to focus their attention on the tasks at hand, at least until the next round of formal evaluations. Typically, faculty who make it through the formal evaluation process often do not receive feedback that provides them with any basis to make a plan to enhance their teaching – their teaching is good enough. They have met the criteria for continued membership in the organization and all is well.

Comprehensive faculty evaluation systems and formal faculty mentorship programs are reflections of a university's learning culture. *My Story* helps to establish the context for this study by illustrating the sorts of challenges and complexities that faculty evaluation and mentorship policies typically must contend with and provides a lens for understanding how the faculty evaluation process has been enacted at my institution.

1.4. Research Questions

In order to investigate the perceptions and preferences of administrators and faculty regarding the faculty evaluation process at CU, this dissertation explored three principal research questions:

- How satisfied are faculty and administrators with the faculty evaluation process?
- What do faculty and administrators perceive to be the most important components of a faculty evaluation program?
- How satisfied are faculty and administrators that the current faculty evaluation process advances faculty enrichment, that is, opportunities for continuous improvement and professional growth at CU?

For the purpose of this study, administrators are individuals who hold positions at the level of Dean or higher. Co-ordinators are faculty peers who have administrative responsibility to complete faculty evaluations. They are not deemed to be part of the university administration. They are elected by their peers and receive partial release from teaching to fulfill their co-ordinator duties.

1.5. Significance of the Study

Although a great deal of quantitative research exists on student evaluations of teaching (see Marsh, 1987; Centra, 1993; Murray, 2006; Gump, 2007), few quantitative studies have explored how faculty members would like to be evaluated. Worcester's (1993) quantitative study examined faculty and administrator perceptions of faculty evaluation at a technical college. Szeto and Wright (2003) used quantitative research methodology to survey how faculty at one mid-size American university would like to be evaluated. Rector (2009) used the same survey instrument and a quantitative research design to extend the research to include selected "faith-based" institutions of higher learning in the Southeast United States. Hightower (2010) noted a gap in the literature on faculty and administrators' perceptions on faculty evaluation, particularly at two-year colleges in the United States. He used quantitative approaches and modified Seldin's (1984) survey instrument to explore faculty and administrator perceptions of the evaluation process at Virginia Community College.

These studies were limited to quantitative research design and approaches, whereas this study invokes qualitative case study methodology to examine faculty and administrator perceptions of a faculty evaluation process and its ability to advance faculty enrichment. The particular context is one of an institution that was for the majority of its existence a community college and is now a special purpose teaching university. This qualitative case study provides an opportunity to extend ideas regarding faculty evaluation programs that are represented in the research literature. Since qualitative research in the area of faculty and administrator perceptions of faculty evaluation processes is underrepresented in the research literature, this study can make a significant contribution to our understanding of how faculty and administrators comprehend policies and processes of faculty evaluation, how those policies and processes are enacted in the institution and influence lived experiences within the community.

This study employed Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) "thinking tools", which are explained in detail in Chapter 3, to aid in understanding the experiences, actions, and perceptions of faculty, co-ordinators, and administrators regarding the faculty evaluation process. Bourdieu's "thinking tools" have been used as a theoretical framework in a wide variety of research studies that have reviewed, for example, the evaluation of university degrees (Grenfell, 2009), educational policy (Blackmore, 2010), teacher professional development (Hardy, 2010), student teacher cohorts (Mandzuk, Hasinoff & Seifert, 2003), support for student transitions into higher education (Leese, 2010) and changes in the capital of teaching assistants (Woolhouse, Dunne & Goddard, 2009). Although Bourdieu's "thinking tools" have been employed widely, this dissertation may be one of the first to use them to analyze a faculty evaluation process and administrator and faculty perceptions of it.

A fundamental tenet of an effective faculty evaluation program is to enhance the professional development of individual faculty members (Rifkin, 1995; Licata & Morreale, 1999; Arreola, 2007). While both faculty and administrators question the effectiveness of faculty evaluation programs and their ability to improve teaching performance (Arreola, 2007), one key area that this study addressed is whether faculty evaluation programs provide opportunities for faculty enrichment defined as opportunities for

continuous improvement and professional growth. Typically faculty evaluation programs uncover strengths and weaknesses in teaching performance and attempt to provide remedies for those who do not meet an acceptable standard of performance. However, many faculty evaluation programs do not require faculty who meet the standard to provide evidence of their continued faculty enrichment, which is an important aspect that this study included. Finally, Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning provided a basis for conceptualizing what faculty enrichment could be in the form of engagement in various Faculty Learning Communities associated with the institution.

1.6. Overview of Methodology

"Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences" (Merriam, 2009, p. 5). My interest in more fully understanding the faculty evaluation process through the lived experiences of faculty and administrators led me to choose qualitative research. Since the faculty evaluation process at CU serves as the focus and context for this study, a case study approach was chosen for the research design. This study focuses on a particular phenomenon, the faculty evaluation process at one university, and provides a rich description of this phenomenon at the institution through first-person profiles, *My Story*, and excerpts from focus group transcripts. It also seeks to provide a better understanding of the faculty evaluation process. Consequently, this study meets the expectations for a case study approach as outlined by Merriam (2009).

More qualitative research is needed to determine administrator and faculty perceptions of faculty evaluation to complement quantitative studies that have been completed; therefore, in-depth interviews were held with select faculty and administrators who come from a variety of disciplines. "The primary way a researcher can investigate an educational . . . process is through the experience of the people, the 'others' who make up the organization or carry out the process" (Seidman, 2006, p. 10). In-depth interviews, according to Seidman (2006), provide "the best avenue of inquiry" when the researcher is interested in the experience of individuals and "what meaning

they make out of that experience" (p. 11). Consequently, two in-depth interviews were conducted with five individuals.

The first interview focused the participant's journey to becoming a teacher or an administrator and on his or her experience with the faculty evaluation process at the institution. The interview questions prompted the participants to share how they came to be educators, how they went about getting feedback on their teaching, and their experience with the faculty evaluation process at the university. The first interview also focused on details of that experience that related to the components of the faculty evaluation process, the opportunity for improvement in teaching performance, and the opportunity for faculty enrichment.

The second interview continued to explore their experience with the faculty evaluation process and asked participants to make meaning from their experience with the faculty evaluation process. Participants were asked what the experience of going through the faculty evaluation process means to them, what they have come to understand about the faculty evaluation process based on their experience, what would an ideal faculty evaluation process look like, and to what they would compare the experience of going through the faculty evaluation process. (See Appendix A.)

In addition to the five interviewees, five focus groups participated in this study; they included:

- Deans' Focus Group (five participants)

- New Instructors' Focus Group (five participants)

- Senior Faculty Focus Group (three participants)

- Co-ordinators' Focus Group (six participants)

- Vice-Presidents' Focus Group (two participants).

The five focus groups and in-depth interviews with five individuals formed the basis of the data collection. The focus group questions (see Appendix B) were generally

very similar to the questions posed in the in-depth interviews, which allowed me to use a constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to process the data.

To assist in understanding participants' experiences, document analysis of the faculty evaluation process was also included in this study as a document is a "product of the context in which [it is] produced and therefore grounded in the real world" (Merriam, 2009, p. 156).

1.7. Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 introduces this dissertation by including the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the research questions, and an overview of the research design. In addition, my narrative provides context for this study and shares my experience navigating the faculty evaluation process at my institution.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature that focuses on the multiple sources of information that are typically included in faculty evaluation systems. In addition, it examines some of the main themes in the literature regarding the benefits and challenges of student questionnaires (SETs), formative and summative evaluations, peer evaluations, and faculty portfolios. Furthermore, some contemporary approaches to faculty evaluation are also included as well as an overview of Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs). Since faculty may be offered mentorship at CU, at the discretion of the co-ordinator after the first round of student evaluations, a limited review of mentorship is provided.

Chapter 3 presents the research design and explains why qualitative research and an intrinsic case study design are suitable for this study. Furthermore, it addresses how in-depth interviews and focus groups were used to collect data and discusses participant selection, data collection, and data analysis. This chapter also provides an explanation of Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1990, 1992) "thinking tools" as a framework for understanding the faculty evaluation process and faculty and administrator perceptions of it.

Chapter 4 presents a profile of each of the interview participants in this study. Each profile is followed by a commentary, which highlights some important aspects of CU's approach to faculty evaluation and insights that Bourdieu's "thinking tools" unearthed. The profiles are crafted as first-person narratives using the participants' words. According to Seidman (2006), crafting profiles is a compelling way to learn about the participants and their experience with the phenomenon being studied and a valuable method of sharing interview data.

Chapter 5 presents my interpretations of the data based on the transcripts of the focus groups and in-depth interviews and introduces the themes that emerged, which capture the tensions, opportunities, and contradictions of the faculty evaluation process.

Chapter 6 employs Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) "thinking tools" to analyze the faculty evaluation process and participants' experiences of it.

Chapter 7 presents two discoveries that I have made in the writing of this thesis and applies Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning to frame an idealization of faculty enrichment in the form of Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs).

Chapter 8 relates my findings to the research questions, how these findings might be used in the academy, and what my recommendations are for further research.

Chapter 2.   Literature Review

Due to the extensive literature that exists on faculty evaluation, this literature review focused on the multiple sources of information that are typically included in faculty evaluation systems.   However, this review is not exhaustive.   This chapter outlines the reasons underlying the development of faculty evaluation processes, some of the main themes in the literature regarding the benefits and challenges of using questionnaires for student evaluation of teaching (SETs), formative and summative evaluations, peer evaluations, and faculty portfolios.   In addition, some contemporary approaches to faculty evaluation are also included as well as a conceptual framework for analyzing faculty evaluation processes.   An overview of Faculty Learning Communities is also included.   Since my university's official offer of mentorship comes after SETs indicate a performance concern, a limited review of mentorship is provided.

2.1. The Purpose of Faculty Evaluation

Determining the purpose of a faculty evaluation program is critical to its design and implementation.   Three primary reasons for the development of faculty evaluation programs are to improve teaching performance, to make personnel decisions, or to provide information to government agencies and accrediting bodies (Seldin, 2006).   Determining the purpose will assist in deciding which documentation to include, the sources of data collection, the depth of data collection and analysis, and how the findings will be shared (Seldin, 2006).   Faculty evaluation systems can serve a formative and/or a summative purpose.   According to Arreola (2007), the system must provide "the rich diagnostic information for improving or enhancing faculty performance, as well as for providing accurate, reliable and relevant data on which to base personnel decisions" (xxix).

Buller (2012) lists a number of key questions that must be dealt with should an organization undertake a review of its faculty evaluation program, and not surprisingly the first one relates to its purpose. Some other questions he poses include:

> With whom will the results be shared? What sources of information am I required by institutional policy to consult as I conduct this review? What sources of information am I allowed – even though not required – by institutional policy to consult when I conduct this review? Am I authorized to make a decision, or am I merely recommending a course of action to a supervisor, committee, or other party? Does institutional policy require me to retain records of how I reached my decision for a certain period of time? (p. 18-19).

Knowing the purpose of the review of faculty evaluation will help to determine what needs to be reviewed and how the review should be conducted (Buller, 2012). Since the driver of a faculty evaluation plan is its purpose, it determines all aspects of the process such as who is responsible for evaluating faculty, what documentation should be included in the review, and how frequently evaluations should be conducted. For example, according to Licata (1986), tenured faculty are typically evaluated on a three- to five-year cycle. However, new hires are typically evaluated more frequently. Nevertheless, institutions that are undertaking an evaluation policy review should make certain the policy language clearly addresses "the purpose for the review, expected results, and institutional support" (Licata & Morreale, 1999, p. 11). Undoubtedly, the purposes of a faculty evaluation system should be clearly identified and communicated to all stakeholders involved in and responsible for that system.

2.2. Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs)

One form of information that is widely used in faculty evaluation processes is student questionnaires, also referred to as student evaluations of teaching (SETs), which are designed to gather information on a faculty member's teaching performance. In addition to teaching performance, effective faculty evaluation systems generally also include feedback on service and research. While research can be quantified in terms of the amount of money received, the commercial value of the research, and the number of articles published, assessing teaching performance relies heavily on the use of SETs.

Bergquist and Phillips (1975) contend that SETs give "teaching a fighting chance against research as the basis for evaluating faculty performance" (p. 187).

SETs are the most widely used source of information regarding teaching performance (Wolfer & Johnson, 2003). They provide a means for faculty to receive feedback on their content knowledge, rapport with students, fairness of evaluation methods, and students' overall level of satisfaction with their teaching performance. Typically, SETs include open and closed questions, space for written comments and ensure anonymity. In addition, they present statements about an instructor's teaching responsibilities, and contain a single item that determines overall satisfaction with teaching performance, all of "which are summarized . . . as evidence of teaching effectiveness" (Algozzine, Gretes, Flowers, Howley, Spooner, Mohanty, & Bray, 2004, p. 135). The SET results can also be viewed as a feedback tool for the teacher, an administrator's personnel decision-making tool, a student's course selection tool, as well as a pedagogical research tool (Marsh, 1987).

Although SETs evaluate student satisfaction with an instructor's teaching performance, sometimes they also ask students to self-assess their commitment to the course, their commitment to learning, and their satisfaction with their own performance in order to gain insight into their assessment of the teacher's performance. Since SETs primarily focus on teaching and not on student outcomes, the prevalence of SETs as an end-of-term customer satisfaction survey is reflective of the increased value that is placed on meeting the needs of the educational consumer by giving him/her a voice in the assessment of the quality of teaching deliverables.

Not surprisingly, researchers contend that bias exists in SETs; for example, Denson, Loveday, and Dalton (2010) provide an overview of a number of research studies that indicate that female students tend to give more favourable ratings than male students, seniors also give higher ratings than freshman, and students may use the SET to retaliate against low grades. Meanwhile, professors with higher rank and more experience appear to be rated more highly than those less experienced and of lower rank; professors who are well liked and who are lenient with their marking also receive higher ratings while smaller class sizes and easier courses appear to result in higher

ratings also (Denson et al., 2010, p. 342-343). However, Gump (2007) cautions against accepting the research results regarding the "leniency hypothesis" and calls for more research to look at "past studies with respect to methodologies, conclusions, and implications to discern the extent to which context-specificity renders the results of studies applicable to little more than the populations on which they were based" (p. 65). Likewise, Centra's (2003) study examined whether expected final grades influence SET ratings, and concluded that faculty cannot expect to improve their ratings on SETs by giving less course work and higher grades. Faculty and student perceptions of SETs expose a perception gap, according to Sojka, Gupta, and Deeter-Schmelz's (2002) study: Faculty perceive that students do not take SETs seriously and that they assign higher ratings to lenient, entertaining instructors; however, students perceive that grading more leniently will not affect SET ratings, impact faculty careers, or lead to improvements in courses or teaching style (p. 47).

After reviewing the vast literature regarding SETs, Arreola (2007) concludes that easy grades do not buy higher ratings; small classes do not guarantee high ratings while large classes do not guarantee low ratings; however, students in required courses and students in math and science courses do tend to rate more harshly. Furthermore, he asserts that there is no overall gender bias in student ratings, and the scheduled time of the class does not affect ratings either. Most importantly, he contends that student ratings can be quite helpful in instructional improvement efforts and a reliable instrument for assessing teaching quality provided they are properly "constructed, administered, and interpreted" (p. 98). When it comes to SETs, according to Benton and Cashin (2012), you can find studies that support "almost any conclusion"; these researchers note that "in general, SETs tend to be statistically reliable, valid, and relatively free from bias or the need for control, perhaps more so than any other data used for faculty evaluation" (Idea Paper #50, p. 12).

The time and financial and human resources devoted to administering SETs in class time has many universities considering a move to an online format. While some advantages for an online approach include their ease of use, fast return times, typed anonymous responses, and more available class time for other activities, concerns prevail around low response rates, the undue influence of events like exam results

21

during the time period that students have to complete the form, and the possibility of groupthink where students collectively decide how to evaluate the teacher (Pallett, 2006). However, faculty are discovering ways to increase the online response rate by gently reminding students about the importance of their feedback and by providing the current response rate at the beginning of the next few classes in an attempt to challenge the class to achieve a 100-percent return rate (Pallett, 2006). Attempts to increase online student response rates also include positive approaches such as explaining how the evaluation process works and how the evaluation data are used as well as more controversial approaches such as withholding grades, giving a bonus mark for completing the evaluation or counting it as an assignment (Crews & Curtis, 2011).

Should teaching performance be evaluated by using SETs or should it be measured based on student learning? Wienburg, Hashimoto, and Fleisher (2009) propose using grades students achieve in subsequent courses in the same subject as evidence of student learning and as a method of assessing the quality of teaching. They analyzed student data in three economics courses over a 10-year period and found no relationship between the amount of learning an instructor produces and their SETs, concluding that SETs produce no "meaningful information about learning" (p. 253). They found that SETs were "strongly related to grades and that learning, as measured by future grades, was unrelated to SETs" (Wienburg et al., p. 254). These authors believe that instructors should be evaluated based on the "course experience they provide and the amount of human capital they produce," an approach they purport that supports the teaching mission of the university (Wienburg et al., p. 251). However, this recommendation stands in opposition to the current trend that relies heavily on SETs to evaluate teaching performance. Analyzing a student's results in a subsequent course in the same subject may be a straightforward system of analysis and eliminate the criticisms around SETs, yet SETs do give students an opportunity to provide feedback to their teachers and are still recognized as an important component of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system provided that they are properly constructed, administered, and interpreted (Arreola, 2007; Benton & Cashin, 2012).

2.3. Formative and Summative Evaluations

Regarding professional development opportunities within evaluation processes, Wolfer and Johnson (2003) advocate distinguishing between the purpose of summative and formative evaluations. If administrators are looking to make personnel decisions, summative evaluations are a reasonable measure to employ. Summative evaluations, according to Seldin (2006), should be distributed in the last two weeks of the term. Moreover, he cautions that an instructor's performance can only be accurately evaluated if it assessed "several times over several semesters by several evaluation sources before it is accepted as reliable data" (p. 18). However, if improving teaching effectiveness is the purpose, formative evaluations that provide feedback about what is working well and what needs improvement are the appropriate choice. Formative evaluations provide clear benefits to faculty provided they are distributed earlier in the term for the benefit of students and teacher. George and Cowan (1999) also see formative evaluations as a path to improvement that supports teachers' and students' learning and offer a variety of strategies that enable teachers to discover from their students' feedback opportunities for improvement in course design, activities, assessments, etc. Seldin (2006) recommends distributing formative evaluations to students for their feedback in week five of the term so that instructors have ample time to respond to student concerns. For formative evaluations to improve instruction, Centra (1993) notes that the following conditions must be met: the instructor must gain new knowledge from the evaluation, must value the new knowledge gained, must understand how to change, and must be motivated to change (p. 9).

Arreola (2007) and Seldin (2006) caution against using a homemade version of an SET questionnaire and recommend choosing one that has solid research and psychometrics behind it. For example, the IDEA Centre's Survey Form, *Student Reactions to Instruction and Courses*, is commercially available and can be modified to align with an institution's needs. This form, presented in Arreola's (2007) text, includes 20 statements that relate to the instructor. For example, these two statements: "Asked students to help each other understand ideas or concepts," and "Formed teams or discussion groups to facilitate learning," indicate an expectation of a student-centred approach to teaching. The IDEA form also has students rate their progress in the course

related to other courses taken at the university in terms of course learning objectives. Furthermore, a section that has students rate the difficulty of the course as well as the amount of work and reading required is included. The all-important question, "Overall, I rate this instructor an excellent teacher," is also included (Arreola, 2007). Arreola (2007) recommends that the information that the SETs provide should be for the exclusive use of the faculty member for enrichment and growth purposes and that aggregate data that provide a summary of an overall pattern of performance over time can be used for personnel decisions (p. xxii).

An interesting observation is that the 20 instructor statements on the IDEA student survey are included in formative evaluations but not in summative evaluations. These 20 statements are important for faculty improvement measures, an important component of formative evaluations, but for a summative evaluation, they are too late in the process to provide any helpful information to faculty. The IDEA survey is clearly intended to demonstrate that formative evaluations are necessary prior to distributing summative evaluations, which include only aggregate summary data. Seldin (1993) notes that if the rating form is to improve teaching, "20 – 30 diagnostic questions" that elicit evaluation of "specific teaching behaviours" is appropriate, but if the form is to gather information for a personnel decision, "four to six questions calling for overall ratings" of faculty performance is appropriate (p. 2). Nevertheless, what continues to be increasingly evident is that SETs, although widely used, are only one component of a faculty evaluation system and one source of information regarding teaching performance.

Wolfer and Johnson (2003) note that there is little evidence that teachers use the ratings on SETs to improve their teaching performance and suggest that SETs are useful for making only crude distinctions on an instructor's effectiveness; they cite d'Apollonia and Abramie's (1997) categories of unacceptable, adequate, and exceptional as reasonable delineations regarding teaching performance. However, Yao and Grady's (2005) study found that faculty paid attention to and valued student feedback on SETs and in general were interested in using the feedback to improve their teaching, although implementing student suggestions depended on the quality of the feedback received (p. 124). Murray (2006) also considered whether SETs significantly contributed to

teaching improvement. After reviewing the "research evidence from faculty surveys, field experiments, and longitudinal comparisons," Murray (2006) suggests that improvement in teaching does occur from SETs especially when supplemented with "expert consultation" (p. 8), which indicates that faculty would benefit from meeting with a faculty development specialist when reviewing their SETs results. Faculty development programs that provide expert consultation to faculty when reviewing the results of SETs would make, according to Murray, a "strong contribution to improvement of teaching" (p. 13). Finally, with the increased emphasis on accountability in higher education, Surgenor (2013) succinctly states, "it is time to reconsider our attitude toward summative SET[s], to ensure that [they] play a role in promoting quality learning and not just quality stats" as SETs have the potential to indicate an instructor's commitment to teaching improvement (p. 374).

2.4. Peer Evaluation

Peer evaluation is one form of information that may be included in a comprehensive faculty evaluation system, although Arreola (2007) strongly recommends excluding it from the evaluation process. Peer evaluation may be useful as a component of formative evaluation to guide the instructor to improvement, but should not be used in summative evaluations (Arreola, 2007; Zakrajsek, 2006). If peer evaluations are required, Arreola (2007) offers these guidelines to provide some degree of reliability:

- Develop a checklist of best practices to highlight the characteristics and behaviours the peer will be focusing on

- Train a team of peer observers who would individually observe the teacher multiple times throughout the term

- Introduce students to the system of peer observation

- Arrange for a formal observation of the teaching only after the peer team members have visited the class a couple of times

- Compile a report of the team's observations

- Follow up with a post-observation debrief

Millis (2006) and Chism (2007) agree with Arreola's (2007) guidelines and emphasize that whether peer observations are used for summative or formative evaluation processes, the same procedures be used. Peer evaluations are a valuable source of information for formative feedback and summative decision-making (Chism, 2007), although Arreola (2007) recommends that as little weight as possible be given to them. Requiring multiple observations from a peer observer team may seem equally unworkable considering the increased workload that faculty are managing and the limited financial resources of post-secondary institutions. However, Arreola's (2007) suggestion that peer evaluations be excluded from the faculty evaluation process is advice that is may be well worth heeding, although peer evaluations do serve a useful purpose when they are used to provide helpful feedback that will assist a colleague. Some institutions, for example Capilano University, allow permanent faculty to waive peer evaluations (see Appendix C, Article 11.5.3.2.1), which suggests that some institutions deem them less useful after the probationary period has ended, a point that Zakrajsek (2006) appears to agree with when he states that peer evaluations are "perhaps most beneficial to newer members of the department" (p. 179). Not to be overlooked is Chism's (2007) recommendation that a written peer evaluation should review at a minimum, "classroom [teaching] performance, quality of examinations, course outlines and course materials, syllabi, reading materials, reading lists, laboratory manuals, workbooks, and classroom assignments" (p. 44).

Zakrajsek (2006) suggests an interesting add-on to the typical peer evaluation and the guidelines offered; this approach has the peer spending ten minutes with only the students before the end of class to pose these two questions for individual and then class discussion: "What encourages learning in this class? and "Is there anything you feel would further encourage learning in this class?" (p. 177). If comments are overwhelmingly positive, the peer prompts the students for suggestions to give the instructor and if the opposite is true, the peer prompts the group to provide some positive feedback. This feedback is then incorporated into the peer evaluation. Zakrajsek (2006)

also recommends that the instructor provide the peer with a copy of his/her teaching philosophy and that they engage in a discussion prior to the classroom visits to ascertain what the instructor's vision of an ideal class session would be. This approach closely resembles features of the BBQ (Bare Bones Questions), designed by Snooks, Neeley, and Williamson (2004). Although BBQ has been modified since it was first designed, it now makes the peer's interactions with the students the primary source of information on teaching performance. This decision evolved from the realization that the students' feedback was the richest and the most valuable for the instructor. Other factors that prompted this decision included the amount of time that peer observations entail and the limited financial resources available to hire a faculty development officer to conduct the evaluations. In the BBQ approach, peers receive a short training session then visit a colleague's class to elicit feedback from the students individually and in groups. The peer takes on the role of empathetic colleague when meeting with the instructor to review the feedback transcript (Snooks et al., 2004). BBQ differs from SGID (Student Group Instructional Diagnosis (Redmond & Clark, 1982), a five-step process, in these two ways: a consultant meets with the instructor to discuss teaching style and interests prior to the classroom visit, and a third meeting later in the term allows the instructor to meet with the consultant to discuss the success of the changes that were implemented.

Bell (2001) reports on another approach to peer evaluation, a triad support system. This approach is comprised of teacher, peer, and educational developer and involves a four-cycle teaching, peer observation, and feedback process. For three sessions, the teacher plans and teaches his/her lessons; the peer observes and provides both oral and written feedback on teaching methods. Roles are reversed for one session when the teacher observes the peer who also provides an explanation of teaching philosophy and an explanation of teaching methods demonstrated. After each session, the teacher reflects on each session in writing, attaches the written peer feedback, and submits it to the educational developer for comment and review. At the end of the four-cycle process, the teacher prepares a final report outlining what s/he has learned and areas for development. This model is based on providing positive feedback and asking critical pedagogical questions, a model that would be particularly valuable for teachers interested in and motivated by opportunities for professional development.

2.5. A Need for Training

Providing training to faculty evaluators adds to the credibility of the faculty evaluation process; however, a key concern around faculty evaluation is the lack of training that is provided to evaluators. Persson (2002) determined that "publications on training programs for faculty supervisors on how to conduct an effective evaluation appear to be nonexistent" (p. 13). Most training deals with legalities, following evaluation procedures, completing the necessary forms, and at "best, . . . to judge faculty according to prescribed criteria for a summative review" (p. 14). Persson's study developed a model for faculty supervisor training to assess faculty performance and concludes that the model can be described in these three words: communication, consistency, and competency. Communicating sensitive feedback on a faculty member's performance and areas for improvement can be taught through role playing and coaching skills; consistency in how evaluations are administered and judged requires "a culture that values assessment of performance and ongoing professional development to improve performance" while competency can be addressed "through training and the development of interpersonal skills" (p. 213).

The importance of being evaluated by qualified evaluators is essential to an effective faculty evaluation process. According to Arreola (2007), faculty resistance to evaluation stems from their "suspicion that they will be evaluated by unqualified people" (p. xxv). Seldin (2006) prefers that training be provided to evaluators and that the training include these components:

> What to look for, how to use the evaluation instruments, how to work together with other evaluators, how results will be used, the function and responsibilities of the evaluators, how faculty evaluation leads to professional development, the mechanics of the program, and recent research findings of faculty evaluation (p. 28).

Peer reviewers, according to Iqbal (2013), must be "adept at evaluating teaching according to established criteria, providing constructive feedback, and writing a useful report based on their findings" (p. 10); and she also suggests that the university's teaching and learning centre be enlisted to provide the training. Chism (2007) stresses the importance of training for first-time peer reviewers to ensure that "the review process is understood, best practices are known and that fair and objective evaluations are

produced" (p. 42). Although universities currently face a multitude of demands for dwindling resources, providing training to evaluators that does more than review the procedures on how to employ an assessment instrument and how to document violations of employment laws should be a priority if the outcomes of the evaluation process are to be valued by stakeholders.

2.6. Faculty Portfolios

Portfolios continue to garner attention and support as a component of faculty evaluation systems. Portfolios provide a medium for faculty to assemble samples of their teaching practice, record reflections on their work, and take some control of the evaluation process. Trevitt, Stocks, and Quinlan (2012) suggest that these five elements be included in portfolios: "representations of practice; engagement with key ideas in education and educational literature; reflective commentary that takes an inquiring or critical stance; integration and linkages between the first three elements; and sufficient breadth to include multiple aspects of teaching practice" (p. 163-164). Portfolios serve to document evidence of teaching effectiveness by the inclusion of SETs, peer observations, samples of student work, copies of exams, quizzes, and activities. In addition, samples of scholarly activity such as conference attendance, presentations, publications; a list of rewards and accomplishments; and self-reflection on lessons learned, changes to teaching practice, and a philosophy of teaching statement that grounds the portfolio are frequently included (Devanas, 2006).

Although portfolios are increasing being used to understand an instructor's philosophy and teaching practices, what is becoming evident is the different approaches that they must take depending upon their use as a formative instrument for teaching improvement or as a summative evaluation measure that typically guides personnel decisions. As a formative instrument, portfolios allow for critical self-reflection; however, as a summative evaluation measure, they become records of successes since self-criticism is not highly regarded in promotion and tenure processes (Devanas, 2006; Seldin, 2010). Chism (2007) points out the value of the portfolio for formative purposes, which can allow for "collaborative faculty development . . . as teachers come together to discuss a given portfolio component, such as syllabi or summaries of student ratings or

teaching philosophy statements, for the purpose of common reflections and explorations or assumptions" (p. 172). Portfolios for summative evaluation, according to Chism (2007), are "usually a cumulative record of the faculty member's work in rank" and are generally used for promotion and tenure (p. 169).

Teaching portfolios provide opportunities for changes in teaching practice, a foundation for advancing the instructor's scholarship of teaching, a vehicle for self-reflection, a method of recording improvements in pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and an important value-added component of a faculty evaluation system. Buller (2012) views portfolios as a way to provide opportunities for continuous improvement for all faculty; "it is not the case that excellent faculty members can't do better. The people who have the most accomplished records in teaching, research, and service are often those who value additional advice on how to keep on improving" (p. 119). However, according to Seldin, Miller, and Seldin (2010), portfolios should be supported by "empirical evidence" and should be a "judicious, critical, purposeful analysis of performance, evidence, and goals" (p. 5). Pratt (1997) agrees noting that teaching portfolios should provide rigorous evidence of teaching and that self-evaluation and reflection are critical components that should provide "evidence of growth and change, successes and failures, plans and aspirations, with reflective comments that take the evaluator deep into the substance and reasoning of the teacher's evolving thinking and approaches" (p. 41). Consequently, instituting faculty portfolios requires a significant amount of planning, consultation, and policy development before they can be implemented.

2.7. Some Contemporary Approaches to Evaluation

Another approach to faculty evaluations and to improving teaching quality is based on developing a list of best teaching practices. Lubawy (2003) proposes that faculty work together to compile a list that would include instructor characteristics and course management processes. The list of best teaching practices would then be incorporated into the faculty evaluation process. Teachers would formulate an evaluation plan that would include selecting best practices that they would like to improve on. When the term is complete, teachers would complete a self-assessment of

their improvement and readjust their plan for the next evaluation period. The process could also include term-end "SETs and a peer evaluation or student focus group" (Lubawy, 2003, p. 1). This approach appears to promote continued professional development, another vital component of a faculty evaluation plan. However, Arreola (2007) cautions against the best practices movement since what might work well at one institution may not work well at another; a faculty evaluation system must be "predicated upon and reflect the values, priorities, traditions, culture and mission of the institution" (p. xvi).

A comprehensive faculty evaluation system needs to provide reliable information to administration on who is and who is not performing well and useful feedback to instructors on what is working well and what warrants improvement. In an attempt to find a better method of faculty evaluation, Fink (2008) designed a model of evaluation that gathers information on four teaching dimensions that connect instructor performance and student learning. Information is based on the design of learning activities, student-teacher interactions, student learning achieved by the end of the course, and an instructor's efforts to improve (p. 5). Design of learning activities can include samples of syllabi, assignments, and exams; teacher and student interactions can be reflected in student questionnaires and peer evaluations; quality of student learning can include exams, projects, samples of work at different grade levels (A to F), what percentage of students achieved A's, B's, etc.; and an instructor's efforts to improve can be documented in an instructor self-submission that addresses student learning, efforts to improve, new insights and professional development documentation. Fink (2008) claims that this model formulates SET questions that more appropriately address the four dimensions of the teacher's role than do the typical questions included in SETs. Criteria for weighting and evaluating standards for these dimensions have to be established and administered. The most obvious shortcoming is the time needed to implement and administer this system; however, Fink's (2008) approach provides good insight into expanding evaluation sources for a more comprehensive evaluation system based on the dimensions of teaching. This approach also models the portfolio design, which provides a broad repository of information.

McAlpine and Harris (2010) developed a framework that encompasses seven aspects of teaching practice to assist in the development of criteria for evaluation of teaching effectiveness and improvement. The iceberg serves as a model for the skills that are included in the framework; the first of the seven categories, delivery skills, is seen as visible to students and above the waterline while the remainder are seen as invisible: design, personal and professional development, subject matter expertise, management skills, mentoring/supervising, and departmental development. They define each of the categories in the framework, offer sample criteria for assessing each category, suggest sample artefacts, and identify appropriate sources of information such as academic managers, peers, and students for each category. McAlpine and Harris (2010) caution against the overuse of SETs in evaluating teaching and offer their framework to make explicit the hidden aspects of teaching practice (p. 16).

The University of Windsor has developed a Peer Collaboration Network (PCN) for Teaching Improvement, which it claims is a unique model because it resides outside the Teaching and Learning Centre, is "confidential, voluntary, non-evaluative," instructor-led, and "does not pose a significant commitment of time" (The Peer Collaboration Network, uwindsor.ca/pcn, para. 2). PCN is based on the familiar three-meeting model, which includes a pre-meeting prior to the classroom visit, classroom observation, and a post-observation meeting. A faculty member requests a classroom observation and provides specific information to the observer regarding the teaching behaviours that he or she would like the observer to focus on in the observation. The post-observation is not viewed as evaluative but as an exchange of approaches to teaching and learning. Instructors are encouraged to participate in a reciprocal teaching observation, although it is not required. The language that is used to promote and execute the PCN is important: peers are collaborators and whether an observer or an observee, the process is formative and its intention is to promote professional growth through peer evaluation.

In contrast to PCN, the 360-degree review is a process that elicits feedback from a variety of stakeholders with whom a faculty member has contact on a regular basis during the performance of his or her professional duties. Buller (2012) suggests that the 360-degree review not be overlooked as a tool to provide feedback from a variety of sources. He notes that the point of this process is to discover how a faculty member

"interacts with all kinds of stakeholders and to learn what he or she is like to work with and for" (p. 38). According to Buller (2012), the questions that are asked of the stakeholders – supervisors, support staff, or peers – should vary depending upon the interactions the faculty member is having with that stakeholder. "Too many 360-degree review processes ask the same questions of subordinates, peers, and supervisors even though their interactions are very different" (p. 38).

2.8. Faculty Enrichment

Should faculty evaluation processes be designed to provide opportunities for faculty to assess and reflect upon their performance with an eye to continuous improvement and professional growth? This question has been key to the current study under investigation in this dissertation. The term this study uses to refer to opportunities for continuous improvement and professional growth is faculty enrichment. Although the most recognized term used in the research literature is professional development, faculty enrichment is a term that is often used synonymously. However, faculty enrichment conjures up a sense of being changed by what one has experienced and signals active professional learning whereas professional development can be viewed as "something being done to the professional" (Webster-Wright, 2009, p. 713).

Arreola (2007) embraces the term "meta-profession" to reflect the broad range of skills sets faculty need to successfully perform their roles of "teaching, scholarly, creative activities, service, and administration" (p. xx). Consequently, he believes the term "professional enrichment" is a more appropriate term than faculty development and notes that faculty evaluation programs and professional enrichment programs "should work hand in hand" (p. xxi).

Most universities offer a variety of professional development opportunities for faculty members. When it comes to professional development activities, pedagogical and technology issues tend to dominate (Hardy, 2010). The one-time sessions that are perceived to be of the most interest and importance to faculty are generally what get presented. Although satisfaction rates for the professional development sessions may be high, there is no clear evidence that satisfaction is linked to learning outcomes for

faculty and consequently to student outcomes (Steinert, Mann, Centeno, Dolmans, Spencer, Gelula, & Prideaux, 2006). This approach to professional development is reflective of the belief that faculty need to top up their knowledge base in terms of educational technology skills and pedagogical practices; it emphasizes content knowledge rather than enhanced professional learning (Clark & Hollingsworth, 2002; Hardy, 2010; Saroyan, Amundsen, McAlpine, Weston, Winer, & Gandell, 2004; Webster-Wright, 2009).

Likewise, the popular skills-based approach to faculty professional development workshops often leaves little time during the workshop for participants to try out the new skills, which may result in reduced effort by faculty to use them in their teaching (Hardy, 2010; Saroyan et al., 2004). Moreover, a common approach to professional development seems "predicated on the assumption that learning consists of discrete finite episodes with a beginning and an end" (Webster-Wright, 2009, p. 704). What is often missing in terms of professional development is a professional learning approach that "continues over the long term" within a supportive learning community and is "continuing, active, social, and related to practice" (Webster-Wright, 2009, p. 703) allowing teachers to be "reflective practitioners" (Schon, 1983) as they collaboratively co-construct knowledge with peers in an inquiry-based approach to teaching and learning.

As Webster-Wright (2009) notes, the research into professional development literature regards professional development as a series of "episodic updates" that are "decontextualized and separated from situated learning" (p. 703). Bolam (2008) questioned what approaches to professional development reflect improvement in teaching and student learning and concludes improvements are more likely to occur in Faculty Learning Communities in contrast to the one-time workshops or short courses that reflect the dominant approach to professional development and teachers' prevailing observation of what they think constitutes professional development. Conversely, when teachers were asked "how they learn, they referred to examples of work-based learning, collaboration with professional colleagues, analysis and use of data about student learning and involvement in research" (Bolam, 2008, p. 174).

Johnson and Ryan (2000) note that four general themes emerge in the literature regarding evaluation of college teaching: defining faculty roles and expectations, understanding teachers and teaching contexts, meeting the multiple demands of teaching evaluations, and the need for better use of evaluation for faculty development (p. 109-110). They state that "evaluators and educators need to learn how evaluation of teaching can better serve faculty development needs, and more instructors need to learn how evaluation can help them improve their teaching" (p. 177). So often, faculty evaluation programs are a flawed quality control measure that meets the university's need for accountability for instructional quality and not for faculty development. Placing more importance on accountability results does not lead to improved instruction or quality faculty evaluations (Duke, 1990). Consequently, faculty evaluation processes should provide opportunities for boosting morale, for faculty recognition, especially for those who significantly exceed minimum standards, while attracting faculty to professional development opportunities that will allow them to hone their teaching craft and develop professionally.

Pratt (1997) contends that faculty evaluation policies focus on process rather than substantive aspects of teaching (p. 23). The tendencies for evaluation policies to focus on the "duties-based approach" or the "technique approach" result in little attention being paid to the "underlying intentions and beliefs that give meaning" to the deeper aspects of teaching (p. 27-29). Faculty evaluation programs must balance the need for accountability with the need for faculty development. Yet frequently it is the accountability measures that drive the institution's faculty evaluation program. Faculty evaluation programs "grounded in a faculty development philosophy are key to building a climate of continuous quality improvement" (Schaffner & MacKinnon 2002, p. 3). Consequently, faculty evaluation programs often miss a vital opportunity to engage faculty in the evaluation process by limiting the documentation of teaching effectiveness to SETs and peer observations thereby limiting the faculty member's involvement in the process and thus opportunities for faculty development.

Arreola (2007) contends that faculty evaluation systems that are "implemented without reference to professional enrichment opportunities or programs are inevitably viewed by faculty as being primarily punitive"; for faculty, the assumed intent of these

systems "is to gather evidence for disciplinary purposes" (p. xxii, xxv). Schaffner and MacKinnon (2002) agree that performance evaluation criteria "that are not aligned with faculty development are generally perceived as punitive and serve to inhibit faculty confidence and faculty improvement" (p. 6). Consequently, one of the failures of faculty evaluation programs is the expectation that the faculty evaluation program will solve performance issues when in fact faculty evaluation should be linked to faculty development programs (Seldin, 2006). A major benefit of integrating faculty evaluation and faculty development programs is that it "endorse[s] the principle of continuous improvement within the institution" (Arreola, 2007, p. xxv). Another benefit to linking faculty evaluation to professional development is the potential it has "to aid in transforming institutional cultures to learning communities" (Persson, 2002, p. 16).

2.9. Guiding Principles for a Faculty Evaluation Program

Arreola (2007) offers several guiding principles for the development of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. One fundamental tenet is that "there is no one best evaluation system that [can] be successfully applied to any and all colleges and universities" (p. xvii). Likewise, Seldin (2006) asserts, "no perfect faculty evaluation system exists today on any college or university campus" (p. 19). The following guiding principles, based largely on Arreola's (2007) research, can act as a framework to assist in analyzing an institution's faculty evaluation process.

- The results of an evaluation are a judgment, which may be expressed in words such as excellent, very good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, fair, good, poor. That judgment is based on a measurement, a number that will involve some aspects of faculty performance such as student ratings, peer evaluations, chair reports (Arreola, 2007, p. xvii).

- The process of evaluation is subjective, although measurement "should be obtained as objectively and reliably as possible"; consequently, true objectivity in a faculty evaluation process is unattainable (Arreola, 2007, p. xvii).

- All measurement data should be interpreted "by means of a predetermined, consensus-based value system to produce consistent evaluative outcomes" (Arreola, 2007, p. xix).

- "Faculty evaluation systems must be linked to professional enrichment programs for maximal self-improvement effect" (Arreola, 2007, p. xxii).

- "Successful faculty evaluation systems must provide meaningful feedback information to guide professional growth and enrichment and evaluative information on which to base personnel decisions" (Arreola, 2007, p. xxii).

- The faculty evaluation system should be woven into the organization's mission, values, goals, and strategic directions (Buller, 2012; Seldin, 2006b; Arreola, 2007).

- The faculty evaluation process must include information from a variety of sources such as peers, self, administrators, and students (Arreola, 2007, p. xxvii).

- The purpose of the faculty evaluation system serves as "its cornerstone" and "influences the sources of data, the kind of information gathered, the depth of data analysis; and the dissemination of findings" (Seldin, 2006, p. 4).

- Training of evaluators should be a necessary component of a faculty evaluation program (Seldin, 2006).

2.10. Faculty Learning Communities

Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs) provide increased opportunities for faculty development as they "take an active, reflective, collaborative, learning-oriented, and growth-promoting approach toward the mysteries, problems, and perplexities of teaching and learning" (Mitchell & Sackney, 2009, p. 30). Consequently, FLCs could be viewed as a vehicle for faculty enrichment: Opportunities for continuous improvement and professional growth. Student learning forms the core of FLCs and allows for faculty to participate in action research with their classrooms serving as their learning laboratories. As they experiment with new approaches to teaching, learning, assessment, curriculum planning, and a plethora of motivated inquiries that the learning environment provides, instructors work collaboratively to discover new approaches to teaching and learning informed by educational research literature that can help guide their inquiries. Moreover, by continuously questioning their approaches to teaching and learning and by reflecting on their practice, faculty members build a collaborative enterprise that fosters critical inquiry.

Cox (2004) defines FLCs, typically associated with faculty development within higher education settings,[1] as a small group of cross-disciplinary faculty and staff who are committed to actively and collaboratively engaging in a year-long curriculum that is focused on enhancing the scholarship of teaching and learning and community building. FLCs promote five key goals: shared values and vision, shared supportive leadership, supportive collegial and structural conditions, collective intentional learning and application, and shared personal practice (Hord, 1997, pp. 2-5) and emphasize these three big ideas: student learning, collaboration, and a focus on results (Dufour, 2004). Providing opportunities for networking partnerships that are based on "mutual trust, respect, and support" are also important to the success of FLCs (Bolam, 2008, p. 165). Cox (2004) considers FLCs opportunities to investigate how diversity can enhance teaching and learning, to increase the rewards for excellent teaching, to provide financial support for teaching and learning initiatives, and to expand the evaluation of teaching and the assessment of student learning (p. 10).

While there is fairly common agreement on the goals and features of FLCs, their structures may vary. They may be envisioned as encompassing a whole university community that engages its internal and external members to work collaboratively to effect improvement first and foremost in student learning. Although FLCs may operate at the cross-institutional, university, or departmental level, the membership of FLCs may be comprised of not only faculty but also administrators, staff, alumni, and students. Groundwater-Smith and Mockler (2009) note that FLCs may "be formed for a specific purpose" (p. 9) whereas Cox (2004) indicates that FLCs can also be topic- or cohort-based.

With improving student learning the priority, FLCs encourage individual and collective reflection on pedagogical questions in order to create a learning environment that promotes "shared meaning through action" (Grimmett, 2007, p. 145). FLCs are built on a model of sustained professional learning that encourages collegiality, collaboration, and shared practice. This sustained model of professional learning offers an alternative

---

[1]Faculty learning communities (FLCs) may also be called professional learning communities (PLCs). To simplify the text, the term FLC is used in this section of the literature review.

38

to the one-shot faculty development workshops which rarely address "the faculty role in the teaching/learning dynamic: individual beliefs, experiences, and research regarding [teaching and] learning" (Layne, Froyd, Morgan & Kenimer, 2002, p. 1). Akopoff (2010) cautions that although teachers are generally positive about their participation in this shared endeavour, inconsistent implementation can impact their effectiveness. From her doctoral research, she determined best practices entailed solid administrative support and faculty familiarity with the goals and methods of FLCs. Likewise, Peskin, Katz, and Lazare (2009) stress FLCs are more likely to be successful if they have a clear organizational purpose that challenges the status quo and support Akopoff's (2010) and Donnell and Harper's (2005) observation that participants are often seeking a solution to their current problem rather than deeply investigating the complexities of teaching and learning. Furthermore, Sam (2002) identifies a number of obstacles to developing FLCs, which most notably include lack of formal ownership, lack of physical and financial resources, lack of participation from faculty who are afraid to join for fear of not being viewed as competent, and lack of teaching experience of some faculty. In addition, the isolation of teaching practice, the culture of individualism that pervades the teaching profession, the view of some faculty that teaching problems are really student problems, the perpetuation of the status quo, the perception by faculty that administration is behind the implementation of FLCs, the politics of territoriality, and finally those who perceive that FLCs are a fad are also obstacles that Sam (2002) identified in his research. All of these concerns need to be considered as they highlight the importance of establishing FLCs that provide a supportive learning environment built on mutual trust and collaboration.

FLCs are also a response to Boyer's (1990) conceptualization of the Scholarship of Teaching (SoT), which entails enquiring into and reflecting upon teaching practice and its effect on student learning, in an effort to raise the status of teaching in higher education. Coming together to share experiences, to frame pedagogical questions so that they address student learning, to experiment with action research methods, to advance faculty professional knowledge and practice, to learn from educational literature, to be members of a learning community built on trust, and to engage in the participatory leadership needed to build and grow a FLC can provide faculty enrichment opportunities for FLC participants.

2.11. Best Practices of Mentorship

Mentorship has the capacity to support, empower, and develop collegial relationships that benefit participants and the institution. Although mentorship comes in many forms from traditional to e-mentoring, it has the potential to be a transformative experience. However, its complexity should not be underestimated, as mentorship is a multifaceted process that reflects the institution's "historical and organizational context and is subject to the influence of its own institutional culture" (Zellers, Howard, & Barcic, 2008, p. 581).

2.11.1. Benefits

Many universities are choosing to design and implement mentorship initiatives for a variety of reasons. The reasons can range from succession planning to expanding interdisciplinary collaboration and faculty development opportunities. Potential benefits of mentoring programs include assisting with recruiting, retaining, and promoting faculty; initiating faculty into the organization's culture; building collegiality and networks among program participants; increasing productivity of participants; and promoting professional growth (Lumpkin, 2011). Boreen, Johnson, Niday, and Potts (2009) report on the benefits of mentorship from "increased job satisfaction, higher retention, and improved instructional problem solving . . . to increased morale, improved classroom management and organization, and effective instructional strategies" highlighting the value that mentorship programs can offer to teachers, students, and the university community (p. 10). Furthermore, from their extensive review of the research literature on mentoring, Zellers, Howard, and Barcic (2008) outline the following additional organizational benefits that are derived from mentorship relationships, which include: preservation of intellectual capital and institutional memory; support of cultural diversity; improved leadership capacity; and cost effectiveness (p. 557). Mentorship benefits are, of course, not limited to the organization; mentors also report on the intrinsic benefits that accrue to them such as personal satisfaction, a sense of contribution and accomplishment (p. 558). Meanwhile, mentees also report increased "self-confidence and organizational commitment," while finding their work more satisfying (Zachary, 2005, p. 9).

Many other mentorship arrangements prevail in the research literature; for example, group mentorship consists of a leader working with a small group over an extended period of time; team mentoring allows for a mentor to work with small teams of mentees to address common concerns; peer mentoring enables peers at the same level of the organization to work together for mutual benefit; and e-mentoring connects individuals in an online environment (Yopp, 2006, p. 24). Mentoring can also fall into a structured formal approach that targets specific groups and has a clearly focused mission tied to organizational objectives; an ad hoc approach that is recognized officially by the organization but left to run itself; and informal mentoring arrangements that typically take a needs-driven approach and occur haphazardly (Cranwell-Ward, Bossons, & Gover, 2004).

Whatever the structure, the right mentor-mentee match can make for a transformative learning experience where both learn a great deal about teaching and relationship building. "The most significant predictor of positive mentoring results is whether mentors and mentees share a close, trusting relationship" (Yopp, 2006, p. 27.) Since not every instructor in academe has "equitable access" to informal mentoring relationships, institutions may consider developing a Faculty Mentorship Program (Zellers, Howard, & Barcic, 2008, p. 581).

2.11.2. Guiding Principles of Faculty Mentorship

Guiding principles for establishing a Faculty Mentorship Program include ensuring a co-ordinator is selected to head the program; creating an advisory committee comprised of representatives from the university faculties; developing a mission statement, goals, and operational strategies; encouraging voluntary participation in the program; providing input into matching process; initiating participants into the mentorship program through orientations to prepare them for their roles; expecting regular meetings and interactions, evaluating the program's effectiveness through formative and summative evaluations (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006; Zutter, 2007). In addition, mentorship programs should been viewed as vehicles to professional development that open up opportunities for mentors and mentees to engage with a community of mentors and

mentees in order to increase their networks and learning relationships (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Zellers et al., 2008).

To make the mentorship partnership work, Klasen and Clutterbuck (2002) recommend that the mentor assist the mentee to identify his/her learning needs, which are incorporated into a "Personal Development Plan" (PDP) (p. 170). This PDP becomes the driving force behind the focus of their meetings, their roadmap to goal achievement, and the criteria by which they evaluate the success of their partnership. These authors encourage the mentee to take a lead role in implementing his/her PDP, while the mentor provides guidance and support.

When it comes to deciding if mentorship partnerships should be assigned or selected, multiple perspectives prevail. Since new hires are less likely to have the social network to choose a mentor, it is important for a formal mentorship program to allow dyads to have a voice in determining the partnerships (Zellers et al., 2008). One new approach to initiating mentor-mentee matches is speed mentoring, which is designed to allow each mentee to spend 10 minutes meeting individually with a select group of mentors to determine which mentor might be the best fit for them (Cook, Bahn & Menaker, 2010). This approach contrasts with more formal methods that use an application process. The application requires mentors to outline their teaching and mentoring strengths while mentees are expected to identify the goals they hope to achieve (Zutter, 2007).

Haphazardly designed mentorship programs can cause more harm than good. Lack of a formal plan, limited access to a mentor, lack of time for reflective teaching conversations, and a poor mentor-mentee match all highlight the need for a formal well-developed institutional Faculty Mentorship Plan that provides the human, financial, and physical resources necessary to make it an institutional priority. Klasen and Clutterbuck (2002) recommend that before organizations implement mentorship programs they determine organizational support, organizational need, their benefits to the organization, and the potential objections (p. 192). However, they also note that when it becomes clear that the organization needs a mentoring program based on the observations of administration in relation to its goals, a needs assessment may be unnecessary.

Although mentorship is usually associated with a "dyadic process between one novice and one experienced professional" (Nakamura, Shernoff & Hooker, 2009, p. xxi), the learning relationships that mentorship can enhance should move beyond the immediate mentor-mentee pairing to build a community of learners made up of mentors and mentees. Consequently, mentorship should be envisioned as a process that includes "collaboration, challenge, critical reflection, and praxis" (Daloz, 1999, and Galbraith, 1991, cited in Langer, 2010, p. 26) and that provides a mutually enriching learning experience developed through reciprocal learning conversations, a means for continued professional development, and a space of safety and confidentiality in a nurturing nonjudgmental environment.

Mentorship is a "vivid expression of an organization's vitality. It embraces individual and organizational learning. It values and promotes individual and organizational growth and development" (Zachary, 2005, p. 4). In short, mentorship can thrive in a learning culture, and mentorship partnerships are a way of strengthening learning and developing a learning culture. When implementing a new faculty mentorship program, it is important that the program be viewed as opportunities for reciprocal learning, not as a program to remediate. Starting the program with interested and motivated new hires and enlisting the support of faculty who are highly regarded for their teaching and interpersonal skills would get a program off to a strong start.

2.12. Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of a variety of components of faculty evaluation programs, included examples of some contemporary approaches to faculty evaluation, presented the need for evaluator training, and emphasized the importance of linking faculty evaluation programs to faculty enrichment opportunities. In addition, this chapter stressed the importance of understanding the purpose of faculty evaluation processes, outlined several guiding principles for developing a faculty evaluation system, provided an overview of Faculty Learning Communities, and concluded with a limited review of mentorship.

Chapter 3.   Research Methods

3.1. Research Design

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research design and to explain why qualitative research and case study are suitable for this study. I specifically address how in-depth interviews and focus groups were used to collect data. I also discuss participant selection, data collection, and data analysis and make a case for employing Bourdieu's "thinking tools" as a framework for analyzing the faculty evaluation process.

3.2. Qualitative Methodology

"Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences" (Merriam, 2009, p. 5). My interest in more fully understanding the faculty evaluation process at CU through the lived experiences of faculty and administrators at this institution led me to choose qualitative research. Focus groups and interviews captured the experiences of select faculty who have navigated the faculty evaluation process and of select administrators who have responsibility for the faculty evaluation process at CU. According to Merriam (2009), qualitative research considers the researcher the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, the process inductive, and the product richly descriptive (p. 14).

3.3. Case Study

Capilano University, designated a special purpose university in 2008, is a university located in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. Since the faculty evaluation process at this institution serves as the focus and context for this study, a

case study approach is well suited to the research design. This study focuses on a particular phenomenon, the faculty evaluation process at one university, provides a rich description of this phenomenon at the institution, and provides a comprehensive examination of faculty evaluation at this institution.

Yin (2009) defines a case study as an inquiry that "investigates a phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between the context and the phenomenon are not clearly evident" (p. 18). Creswell (2007) defines case study as a "qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system (a case) . . . through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information . . . and reports a case description and case-based themes" (p. 73). This study meets these criteria for a case study design. This study investigates faculty evaluation within its real-life setting. The focus of the phenomenon of faculty evaluation at CU is a bounded system. Data collection included interviews, focus groups, and document analysis; a case description is shared through a narrative that I present and through participant first-person profiles. The focus groups and interview transcripts allow themes to emerge for analysis. In addition, this study can be termed an intrinsic case study (Stake, 1994) as it presents a unique case that explores the particularities and complexities of a faculty evaluation process at a post-secondary institution designated a special purpose teaching university in 2008.

Since qualitative research is interpretative, many studies in applied fields such as education follow a basic interpretive design and are considered a basic qualitative study (Merriam, 2009, p. 22). As a qualitative researcher, I am interested in understanding the lived experiences of participants as they navigate the faculty evaluation process at the university, how they interpret those experiences, and the meaning they attribute to those experiences. Since this study examines the intricacies and complexities of a faculty evaluation process at one university, it is a qualitative case study (Merriam, 2009).

Throughout my Ph.D. studies at Simon Fraser University, I have been exploring my interest in CU's approaches to faculty evaluation and professional development. These two topics merge in this dissertation as I seek to understand the faculty evaluation experiences of my colleagues at CU and their perceptions of its ability to advance faculty

enrichment. Because of my strong commitment to and association with CU, which began in 1979 and continues to this day, I am a participant observer in this study. I have experienced the faculty evaluation process throughout my teaching career at CU and relate to the voices that emerge in the interviews and focus groups, which allow me to gain an understanding and an interpretation of their experiences. My role as participant observer is to ensure the findings of this research produce an accurate account of the faculty evaluation process as experienced by the participants in this study. In addition, my role as a participant observer acknowledges my history with the university, which has afforded me the opportunity to experience the context and the phenomenon under investigation and acknowledges my value as a researcher (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011). My years of experience with the faculty evaluation process complements this qualitative case study design and enriches the quality of the data obtained and of the interpretation of that data, which are two key advantages of a participant observer (DeWalt, DeWalt & Wayland, 1988, p. 264). Being aware of what participants in this study may not be aware of and what they may take for granted regarding the faculty evaluation process, gaining a broader perspective of information from the participants and of the context, and engaging in self-reflection to fully understand my experiences and the experiences of participants in this study are primary features of my role as participant observer (Spradley, 1980).

Spradley (1980) explains that the degree of participation for an observer can be viewed on a continuum from minimal participation to complete participation. Since I am a faculty member at CU and have had extensive involvement with the university and have experienced the faculty evaluation process over the course of my teaching career, Spradley would likely identify my participation as "complete". Dewalt, DeWalt, and Wayland (1988) refer to complete participation as a "member of the group that is being studied" (p. 263) and note that the approach that researchers use can be "highly individualistic" because of the context, the theoretical approach, and the personal characteristics of the researcher (p. 261). I believe that my role as participant observer in this study is unique. I am a full participant in the sense that I am an active member of the teaching and learning community at the university. I facilitated focus groups and conducted interviews that provided participants with the space to explore in depth the topic of the university's faculty evaluation process. My role was one of facilitator and

listener. I provided the space for participants to share their lived experiences with the process, and I sought to maintain my neutrality. Consequently, I view my role of participant observer as facilitator, recorder, and interpreter of participants' experiences with the faculty evaluation process.

3.4. Bourdieu's "Thinking Tools"

In order to provide a framework for understanding faculty and administrator perceptions of the faculty evaluation process, I employed Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) "thinking tools" in an attempt to "make sense of the relationship between objective social structures" (the role of faculty evaluation at CU) and "everyday practices" (why faculty and administrators engage in the practices they do in relation to the faculty evaluation process) (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002, p. 1).

The faculty evaluation process only exists by the actions that staff, faculty, and administrators take to operationalize the process – the process structures the actions of these individuals, which in turn reproduces a "structuring structure," to use Bourdieu's phrase (1977/2004, p. 72). Bourdieu's forms of capital (1997) and particularly his concepts of habitus, field (1993), doxa (1990), and symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) provided a lens into understanding how the faculty evaluation process is operationalized at CU. These concepts opened up the themes that emerged from the data and the faculty evaluation process itself to an additional layer of analysis that provided an understanding of the power and inequities of the faculty evaluation process that guiding principles of faculty evaluation were alone not able to unearth.

3.4.1. Habitus

Habitus is a concept that helps to explain how the evaluation process unfolds and is played by the individuals who are involved in it. Habitus is a reflection of one's history, one's place in the world/organization, which affords one agency in a field that is confined by rules that determine what is legitimate and what is not. Habitus is vital to understanding how faculty strategize to achieve legitimacy through the faculty evaluation process. As faculty become familiar with the faculty evaluation process at the institution,

their habitus tacitly adapts to how the process operates and how one should operate in relation to that process. This observation demonstrates that habitus is not static as it provides a means for individuals to negotiate, accept, resist, or reconceptualize the faculty evaluation process, provided it is worth the investment. "Habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world, a world endowed with sense and value, in which it is worth investing one's energy" (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 44).

Habitus predisposes individuals to behave in ways that are aligned with their place in an organization, their acquired capitals and the value that an organizational places on these forms of capital. Habitus serves to help understand the limited range of suggestions put forward by many of the participants in this study regarding the reconceptualization of faculty evaluation at CU. Habitus serves as a basis to explain what is considered legitimate, what is considered "thinkable," and what is considered "doable" in terms of faculty evaluation in the field of CU (Grenfell, 2009, p. 21). For Bourdieu, habitus is "a socialized body. A structured body, a body which has incorporated the immanent structures of a world or a particular sector of that world – a field – and which structures the perceptions of that world as well as actions in that world" (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 81).

Habitus has a constraining function and an expanding function for it constrains the actions of individuals based on their personal and professional histories but allows for agency which expands the possibilities of the actions and practices that an individual can and will engage in, which in turn are mediated by the structure of the field and the capitals they possess. "The habitus, a system of dispositions acquired by implicit and explicit learning, which functions as a system of generative schemes, generates strategies which can be objectively consistent with the objective interests of their authors without having been expressly designed to that end" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 76).

Bourdieu (1993) theorizes that individuals, their worldviews, and their actions stem from their habitus – their past experiences that inform thoughts, perceptions, and actions. For example, an individual's family, school, and work life shape an individual's perception of the world and his or her place in it. Since habitus is rooted in past experiences that inform present action, it suggests that individuals are predisposed to

behave in certain ways that are representative of the structuring of their lived experiences. These past experiences acquired through the structuring of school, work, and family experiences go on to structure "subsequent experiences" which in turn go on from "restructuring to restructuring" (Bourdieu, 1977/2004, p. 87). Bourdieu's concept of habitus provided a basis for understanding how administrators, co-ordinators, and faculty perceive and engage in the faculty evaluation process in differing ways and how these individuals make sense of this process.

3.4.2.   Field

While habitus is grounded in past experience that informs present actions, a field is grounded in the "structured system of social relations" among individuals, groups, and organizations (Grenfell & James, 1998, p. 16). These structured systems of social relations determine what is valued, what is recognized as legitimate, and what is "doable" within a particular field such as CU. Consequently, what is recognized as legitimate in the field reproduces a "strict hierarchy to the advantage and disadvantage of factions within it" (Grenfell & James, 1998, p. 23). Bourdieu (1993) states that for a "field to function, there have to be stakes and people prepared to play the game endowed with the *habitus* that implies knowledge and recognition of the immanent laws of the field, the stakes" (p. 72). For example, the field of CU is grounded in "the structured system of social relations" that surrounds the faculty evaluation process. The department evaluation committee determines if the faculty member's SETs, co-ordinator report, and peer evaluation constitute a satisfactory evaluation and then forwards its recommendation to the Dean, who then decides to accept or reject the evaluation committee's suggestion. All of these interactions are based on "a structured system of social relations" (Grenfell & James, 1998, p. 16) that include individuals who understand the implicit rules on how to play the evaluation game to achieve a successful evaluation (the advantaged) and individuals who are generally new to the institution or who are somewhat marginalized because they are minimally involved in the university, the field, on a regular ongoing basis (the disadvantaged). The disadvantaged are typically unaware of the stakes involved in the evaluation process because they may not be fully present in the field, which limits their ability to develop an understanding (the habitus) of what constitutes a successful evaluation at the university (the field).

3.4.3. Capital

Capital is the communication channel that connects the concepts of habitus and field (Grenfell, 2010). For Bourdieu (1997), capital is comprised of three principal forms: cultural, social, and economic, which can be "conceptualized as forms of wealth as they can be acquired and exchanged for each other" (Woolhouse et al, 2010, p. 767). "Capital has value because it exists through esteem, recognition, belief, credit, confidence in others and can be only be perpetuated so long as it succeeds in obtaining belief in existence" (Bourdieu, 1986, cited in Grenfell, 2009, p. 20). Capital becomes recognized as such by the value that it purchases for itself in a chosen field, for example, in education. What is valued in the specific field determines its capital; consequently, it determines what is and what is not "doable and thinkable" based on its recognized value (Grenfell, 2009, p. 21). Therefore, capital serves as a marker for those who possess it and for those who do not. How one acts and makes sense of the world and his or her place in it is rooted in the capital that one has built up. Bourdieu's (1997) forms of capital shed light on how faculty and administrators make sense of the faculty evaluation process and their place in the organization. Their forms of capital mark their place in the organization and determine the exchange rate for the capitals they posses.

3.4.4. Cultural Capital

Bourdieu (1997) conceptualizes cultural capital in three distinct forms: the embodied state, which refers to skills or competencies that are inseparable from the holder and which presupposes an investment of time and resources that the holder deploys to acquire skills, competencies, etc. The objective state, which refers to the use or consumption of objects that reflect the culture of the holder; and the institutional state, which exists, for example, in a system of formal education. An example will help to clarify these forms of cultural capital: A teacher at CU who has completed a Master of Education degree will have developed teaching skills, knowledge, expertise, and competencies that the university values and recognizes as valuable preparation for a teaching position at the university. This practical knowledge becomes an embodied form of cultural capital. The teacher's use and consumption of texts (objects) form "objective" cultural capital in that the texts require prior knowledge of the discipline for the teacher to

50

understand them. The Master of Education program housed in a specific university provides a means for cultural capital to exist in an institutional state. When the teacher graduates with the Master of Education degree, this credential takes on an objective value and functions like money, economic capital.

3.4.5. Social Capital

Social capital or group membership is composed of the quality of one's social networks, connections, and relationships, which work in concert with and accelerate access to the other forms of capital; social capital "exerts a multiplier effect on the capital [one] possesses in [one's] own right" (Bourdieu, 1997, p. 51). For example, my faculty and administrative positions at CU enabled me to form networks at several levels of the university. These connections enabled me to access information (cultural capital) and access funds (economic capital) because of the social capital that my networks provided.

3.4.6. Economic Capital

Economic capital refers to money, property, tuition, etc., that can be used in exchange for other types of capital and converted back into economic capital. For example, tuition (economic capital) is paid to attain a Ph.D. degree (cultural capital) and the degree enables the possessor to secure a higher paying job (economic capital). Economic capital, according to Bourdieu (1997), is "immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights" (p. 47).

3.4.7. Doxa

Doxa, a taken-for-granted, unquestioning view of reality, surrounding the faculty evaluation policy ensures that the institutional press of this policy's implementation is accepted as natural, yet it is through the concepts of orthodoxy (beliefs and values that reflect the status quo within the field) and heterodoxy (the beliefs and values that challenge the status quo within the field), that demonstrate how the policy can serve to reproduce and confine the actions of the principal players in the evaluation game or

push them to challenge it (Webb, Schirato & Danaher, 2002, p. xiii). For Bourdieu (1977/2004) orthodoxy is

> straight or rather *straightened*, opinion, which aims, without ever entirely succeeding, at restoring the primal state of innocence of doxa, exits only in the objective relationship which opposes it to heterodoxy, that is, by reference to choice . . . made possible by the existence of *competing possibilities* and to the explicit critique of the sum total of the alternatives not chosen that the established order implies (p. 169).

3.4.8. Symbolic Violence

Symbolic violence is violence that is symbolic in nature rather than physical but that emerges from inequities that exist in social structures, which can limit an individual's access to resources or opportunities because of the individual's lack of capital within a particular field and habitus (Webb et al., 2002). Although symbolic violence may limit access and aspirations of individual faculty through the faculty evaluation process for example, these individuals may not perceive the process as acting in this way but rather perceive it as the natural way that the process operates and therefore do not question it. Consequently, symbolic violence refers to "the violence which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 167).

Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field, (1993) doxa (1990), and symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) coupled with his forms of capital (1997) took me on a journey I never expected to take. Through the narratives of five participants in this study, to an analysis of my institution's faculty evaluation process, it was Bourdieu's "thinking tools" that stretched my thinking, knotted my brain, and enabled me to probe more deeply into the faculty evaluation process and participants' perceptions of it.

3.5. Method of Research

Five focus groups and in-depth interviews with five individuals formed the basis of the data collection. The following focus groups participated in this study:

- New Instructors' Focus Group (five participants)

- Senior Faculty Focus Group (three participants)

- Co-ordinators' Focus Group (six participants)

- Vice-Presidents' Focus Group (two participants)

- Deans' Focus Group (five participants)

In total, 21 individuals participated in the focus groups. Two individuals who participated in focus groups were also interviewed for this study. I conducted two in-depth interviews with each of these two individuals prior to their participating in a focus group; the interviews were held in June of 2013. One participated in the New Instructors' Focus Group, and one participated in the Deans' Focus Group. By participating in two in-depth, face-to-face interviews, each of these two participants had the opportunity to focus solely on their experience with the faculty evaluation process and the meaning they attributed to their experiences. Participating in a focus group approximately two months after their individual interviews gave the participants time to reflect on what they had shared in the interviews and to learn from other participants' experiences with and perspectives on the faculty evaluation process and how those experiences and perspectives differed from or were similar to their own. For example, it was in the New Instructor's Focus Group that Linda, a pseudonym, learned that other new instructors were also not well informed about how the faculty evaluation process is operationalized. Moreover, it is in this focus group that Linda learns that her very positive outcome was sharply different from other new instructors. Likewise for Darrell, a pseudonym, it is in the Deans' Focus Group that he realizes how different his perspective is on the question of faculty enrichment. In his interviews, he notes that under the right conditions, faculty enrichment, envisioned as opportunities for continuous improvement and professional growth, do occur in the faculty evaluation process. However, in the Deans' Focus Group, he learns that his perspective is sharply different from the majority of participants in this focus group. The opportunity to participate in in-depth interviews followed by the opportunity to participate in a focus group provides benefits for the interviewees, the focus group participants, the researcher, and the research.

The total number of participants in this study was 24. The participants represented 10 different disciplines at the university and every university-wide faculty division had representation in this study; 16 of the participants were faculty members and 8 participants were administrators. The majority of participants in this study are female. Since the majority of administrators, which includes Deans and the executive-level members of the university, are female (66 percent), the majority of co-ordinators are female (approximately 65 percent, according to a count taken from current Human Resource Department co-ordinator lists), and since participants were selected to participate based on their experience with the evaluation process and not on their gender, 78 percent of participants in this study are female.

Since I have been teaching at Capilano University for 36 years and have held the position of Acting Dean of two faculties and Department Chair at various times, I have worked with many individuals at all levels of the institution. My history with and continued association with CU provides a unique vantage point in my role as participant observer in this study. An important aspect of my role as participant observer is to gain a deep perspective on the phenomenon under investigation from participants who have varying degrees of experience with the faculty evaluation process. Consequently, individuals were selected to participate in the focus groups and interviews by purposeful sampling (Merriam, 2009) – based on my knowledge of their experience in teaching or in administration at Capilano University. However, I did consult with one department chair to advise me on whom I might approach from her faculty to participate in the New Instructor Focus Group, and I also consulted with two administrators to advise me on whom I might approach to participate from their faculties in the Co-ordinator Focus Group. Two female colleagues and one male colleague were suggested, all of whom participated in this study. I invited selected individuals to participate by contacting them in person or by sending them an email.

The Senior Faculty Focus group was originally set up to have five participants, but shortly before the focus group was set to convene, I received an email notification alerting me that one of the potential participants had been involved in an accident. I learned after the focus group that a second focus group member had been called out of town unexpectedly. Although I had only three participants in the Senior Instructor Focus

Group, I decided to proceed with it out of respect for the participants who were able to attend. Since each of the co-ordinators who participated in the Co-ordinators' Focus Group were also instructors who had worked from a minimum of 7 to a maximum of 35 years at the institution, I realized that I would learn a great deal from their perspectives both as co-ordinators and as teachers, which would add to the data collected from the smaller Senior Instructors' Focus Group. The Vice-Presidents' Focus Group consisted of only two administrators because there are only three administrators at this level at CU and one of them declined my invitation to participate due to a heavy workload and the focus of this administrator's portfolio, which does not include any responsibility for faculty evaluation. Each focus group lasted approximately two hours. I sent each participant a copy of the approved research proposal and a copy of the informed consent form.

"The primary way a researcher can investigate an educational . . . process is through the experience of the people, the 'others' who make up the organization or carry out the process (Seidman, 2006, p. 10). In-depth interviews, according to Seidman, provide "the best avenue of inquiry" when the researcher is interested in the experience of individuals and "what meaning they make out of that experience" (p. 11). Consequently, two in-depth interviews were conducted with five individuals. The interviewees included a new instructor with one year's experience teaching at the university; a co-ordinator with 20 years of teaching experience at CU and five years in the role of co-ordinator; a senior faculty member who has taught for 10 years at the institution; an administrator with nearly 30 years' teaching experience at CU and five years in an administrative role; and an administrator with three years' experience at the institution and significant teaching and administrative experience outside the institution.

Since my research seeks to examine the experiences of select faculty and administrators at CU in relation to how they interpret their experience with the faculty evaluation process and create meaning from it, my study was informed by Seidman's (2006) approach to interviewing as qualitative research. In his text *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences* Seidman (2006) prefers that three in-depth interviews be conducted. The first interview allows participants to share their "life history"; the second interview explores the participant's present lived experience of the phenomenon being studied, and the third

interview allows participants to reflect on the "meaning of their experience" (p. 18). However, the time commitment and the heavy workload of faculty and administrators at CU necessitated my adjusting the interview protocol to two interviews.

The first interview focused the participant's journey to becoming a teacher or an administrator at CU and on his or her experience with the faculty evaluation process at the institution. The interview questions prompted the participants to share how they came to be an educator, how they went about getting feedback on their teaching, and their experience with the faculty evaluation process at CU. The first interview also focused on details of that experience that related to the components of the faculty evaluation process, the opportunity for improvement in teaching performance, and the opportunity for faculty enrichment.

The second interview continued to explore their experience with the faculty evaluation process and asked participants to make meaning from their experience with the faculty evaluation process. Participants were asked what the experience of going through the faculty evaluation process at CU means to them, what they have come to understand about the faculty evaluation based on their experience at CU, what would an ideal faculty evaluation process look like, and to what they would compare the experience of going through the faculty evaluation process. (See Appendix A.) Seidman (2006) recommends that each of the three in-depth interviews last approximately 90 minutes and be spaced three days to a week apart. Although I conducted only two in-depth interviews for each participant, two interviews did last 90 minutes but most lasted 60 minutes and the second interview was generally conducted between three days to one week after the first in-depth interview to allow participants time to reflect on the meaning of their experience with the faculty evaluation process. As noted previously, one administrator and one instructor whom I interviewed also chose to participate in a focus group.

The focus group questions (see Appendix B) were generally very similar to the questions posed in the in-depth interviews, which allowed me to use a constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to process the data. Although Seidman's (2006) research design generally informed the study, I did hold semi-structured

56

interviews and focus groups and did engage in direct questioning such as "Do you think the faculty evaluation process should change, and if so, how? and if not, why not?"

3.6. Data Collection and Analysis

Following Capilano University Ethics Committee's approval of my research proposal in April 2013, Simon Fraser University Department of Research Ethics approved my research proposal in May 2013. At that time, I began conducting the two in-depth interviews. These interviews were conducted between May and August of 2013. Three interviews were conducted in my office at CU. My large office is located at the end of a quiet corridor that is more conducive to holding in-depth interviews and more private than some of the participants' faculty offices. Two interviews were conducted in administrators' offices on campus.

The focus groups were conducted starting in August 2013 and completed in November 2013. All focus groups were conducted in meeting rooms at CU with the exception of the Vice-Presidents' Focus Group, which was conducted off campus at a restaurant in North Vancouver. All participants signed consent forms at the beginning of the interviews or focus groups, and all participants chose their pseudonyms to protect their privacy and maintain confidentiality.

At the beginning of each interview and focus group, I reviewed the research proposal, which I also forwarded via email prior to the scheduled date of the interview or focus group. All interviews and focus groups were recorded. During the interviews and focus groups, I also took field notes that captured key ideas presented in answers to the questions I posed, my assessment of how the interview or focus group had gone, notes on participant engagement, and ideas to follow up on. I transcribed all focus groups and interviews with the exception of the second part of Linda's, Rachael's, and both of Sandra's interviews. Due to a wrist injury, I hired a transcriber for these interviews and had him sign a confidentiality agreement. To ensure the accuracy of the transcripts that were prepared by the paid transcriber, I checked the typed transcripts against the tape recordings and was very satisfied with the accuracy of the transcript.

I sent participants via email a copy of the transcript of the interview or focus group that they had participated in and asked them to request changes to the transcript or to approve it. The Vice-Presidents' focus group requested changes; one Vice-President added an explanation to a few comments while the second Vice-President made four minor changes to the transcript. One member of the New Instructor's Focus Group requested that two of her comments be modified and one participant in the Co-ordinators' Focus Group requested that one of her statements be revised for clarity. After the changes were made, I sent a copy of the revised transcript to these participants and the transcripts were approved. All participants in this study approved the transcript for the interviews or focus groups that they had participated in.

In addition to the transcripts, I crafted a profile for each of the participants with whom I conducted interviews. According to Seidman (2006), profiles are a "research product that . . . [are] most consistent with the process of interviewing"; they introduce us to the participants, allow us to develop an understanding of them through their lived experience, and "offer insight into the complexities of the phenomenon being studied" (p. 120). Profiles make participants' experiences come alive as they are crafted as first-person narratives using their words. I sent each participant via email a copy of the profile that I had prepared for him or her and met with two of the participants to review the profiles. All profiles were approved with only one participant suggesting a few very minor changes to his profile.

To process the data, I used Lincoln and Guba's (1985) constant comparative method, which recognizes that "the analyst need not have an explicit reason that he or she can state propositionally to justify assigning an incident to a category, but it is incumbent that the analyst engage in making comparisons" (p. 341). While transcribing the interviews and focus groups, I included an additional column for key ideas that emerged from the data. These key ideas allowed me to compare the transcripts against each other for similar ideas and incongruent perspectives, allowing broad themes to emerge. The themes that emerged are presented, interpreted, and analyzed in Chapter 5.

3.7. Trustworthiness

Conventional approaches to quantitative research establish rigor in terms of internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity, while qualitative researchers have advocated for a new vocabulary (Seidman, 2006). Lincoln and Guba (1985) endorse the concept of "trustworthiness", which for these authors is a straight-forward one: "How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of? What arguments can be mounted, what criteria invoked, what questions asked, that would be persuasive on this issue?" (p. 290). The notions of "credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability" are Lincoln and Guba's "equivalents for the conventional terms of internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity" (p. 300). The following section explores Lincoln and Guba's four concepts that comprise their notion of trustworthiness and presents the details of how I operationalized these concepts in my study.

3.7.1. Credibility

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the probability that credible findings will be produced increases through a variety of activities, some of which include prolonged engagement, triangulation, peer debriefing, and member checking, all of which I incorporated into my study. In terms of prolonged engagement, my positions at CU over a period of 36 years have provided me with the opportunity for prolonged engagement with faculty evaluation at the institution and with the majority of participants in this study. In addition, conducting two separate in-person interviews with each of the interviewees provided me with the opportunity to explore the topic under investigation and learn from their lived experience with the faculty evaluation process. The majority of the interviews lasted a total of 2 hours while the focus groups generally last 1.5 hours. Devoting this time to exploring the topic of faculty evaluation was a rare opportunity for participants, as it allowed them to discuss an important topic free from the constant interruptions of their work.

Developing trust takes an investment of time. Fortunately for me, I have worked on an ongoing basis with many of the participants in this study; their willingness to participate in this study, I believe, reflects the trust they have in me to honour their perspectives and to present those perspectives accurately. All participants approved the transcripts for the focus groups and interviews they took part in; in addition, all profiles presented in this dissertation were member checked and approved.

Triangulation was also used in this study to establish credibility. Multiple participants were involved in this research project: A total of 21 individuals participated in the focus groups and five individuals participated in two, face-to-face interviews. The opportunity to interview five participants twice in a face-to-face format allowed me to follow up on ideas or issues that presented themselves in the first interviews. The emergent recurring themes that presented themselves in the interviews and focus groups also triangulated the evidence. In addition, my field notes captured the key ideas from the interviews and focus groups, my assessment of how well they progressed, and ideas to follow up – all of which contributed to triangulating the research. Peer debriefing also assisted in establishing credibility.

Peer debriefing, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985) is the "process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytic session for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit with the inquirer's mind" (p. 308). Both peer debriefing and peer review were methods used in this research to achieve credibility. Peer debriefing takes place during the research and writing process while peer review takes place at the completion of both the research and the final research document. My three Ph.D. committee members actively provided feedback throughout the research process as well as upon completion of the final draft of the dissertation. Finally, I involved all participants in this study through member checks. They were invited to read the transcripts and check them for accuracy. Although participants requested few changes to the transcripts, their feedback enabled me to revise the transcripts as needed and elicit their approval of the requested changes. It is important to note that all participants approved the transcripts in writing for the interviews and/or focus groups in which they took part. In addition, each of the participants whom I interviewed approved his/her profile in writing; these profiles are

first-person narratives that captured their experience navigating the faculty evaluation process at CU and are included in Chapter 4. All of the above processes develop credibility, but member checks, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), are the "most crucial technique for establishing credibility" (p. 314).

3.7.2.   Transferability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) assert that it is the researcher's responsibility "to provide the data base that makes transferability judgments possible on the part of potential appliers" (p. 316), which contrasts sharply with the quantitative approach to establishing external validity by generalizing findings. Consequently, throughout this research project, I established a database of information based on the participants' experiences with the faculty evaluation process, which they shared through interviews or focus groups. The database was also established through the "rich descriptions" of the participants' experiences as presented in the profiles in Chapter 4 and in the excerpts from the transcripts in Chapter 5. By providing these thick descriptions, readers can determine if they provide sufficient information, ideas, and detail to transfer to their institutions. "It is the responsibility of the inquirer to provide a sufficient base to determine a person contemplating an application in another receiving setting to make the needed comparison of similarity" (p. 359-360).

3.7.3.   Dependability

Do the collected data support the recommendations that are presented in the study? This is the question on which dependability hinges. Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommend an "overlap" method to ensure dependability; they assert that establishing credibility likewise establishes dependability, as there "can be no validity without reliability (and thus no credibility without dependability), a demonstration of the former is sufficient to establish the later" (p. 316). Nevertheless, they view the overlap method, their term for triangulation, and the inquiry audit as key methods for establishing dependability. As previously noted, multiple participants took part in five focus groups; I conducted two face-to-face interviews five participants; all transcripts and profiles received written participant approval; peer review continued throughout the research and

through to completion of the finished thesis; and finally, field notes recorded my ideas for follow-up questions, key points made during the focus group or interviews, and my assessment of how well they went. An audit inquiry serves to examine both the process and the product of the research. The audit inquiry "examines the product – the data, findings, interpretations, and recommendations and attests that it is supported by data and is internally coherent so that the 'bottom line' may be accepted (p. 318). An audit inquiry is best served by a disinterested individual competent in qualitative research and knowledgeable about the research topic so as to provide a "sense of interrater reliability to the study" (Creswell, 2007, p. 209). As previously noted, my Ph.D. committee provided feedback throughout the study to ensure the 'bottom line' would be accepted. Creswell notes that qualitative researchers should engage in at least two of the following eight procedures: prolonged engagement, triangulation, peer review or debriefing, negative case analysis, clarifying researcher bias, member checking, thick rich descriptions, and external audits (p. 207-209). Fortunately, this study included five of these eight suggestions.

3.7.4. Confirmability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) use the term confirmability as a substitute for the term objectivity. Confirmability can be established through the audit trail, triangulation, and a reflexive journal. The audit trail, triangulation, and my field notes, which included my challenges and successes throughout the process in addition to the operational details of my study, serve to meet the degree of confirmability necessary for this qualitative study.

3.7.5. Ethical Issues

Maintaining high ethical standards is imperative in any research endeavour. As noted previously, I submitted my research proposal and Questionnaire on Human Subjects to Capilano University's Research Ethics Committee and received approval on April 26, 2013. Following this approval, I submitted my research proposal and Ethics Certificate of Approval from Capilano University to the Department of Research Ethics at

Simon Fraser University. On May 31, 2013, the Department of Research Ethics granted me Minimal Risk Approval for my study.

Informed Consent Form

Ethical standards for this study were met by providing each participant with a copy of the research proposal and an informed consent form. The informed consent form was reviewed with each participant at the beginning of the interview or focus group and provided the goals of the study, general focus of research questions, what participants would be asked to do, the benefits, risks, time required of participants, information on confidentiality, voluntary participation, and storage of confidential files and information. Participants were informed that they could withdraw at any time without prejudice.

An additional (one-page) document obtained data from each individual regarding the number of years they had taught or held administrative positions in higher education, the number of years they had taught and/or held administrative positions at CU, what their current position was, and what pseudonym they had chosen for this study. This document was separate from the main consent form so as to ensure the participant's anonymity. In addition, this document also informed participants that they could withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice and repeated the information about security regarding the storage of the form and data. Because I was concerned that some of the profile details might identify individuals at the university, I checked back with each participant whom I interviewed to ensure that they were in agreement with my presenting their approved profile in the dissertation. The consent form clearly states that no identifying information will be released unless permission is granted. As each participant approved the profile for insertion in the dissertation, I accepted this act of approval as an act of permission. (See Appendix D for a copy of the consent form.)

Confidentiality

Participants in this study were informed at the beginning of each interview or focus group that their confidentiality would be maintained and their identity protected through the use of pseudonyms. In the profiles and in the transcripts, I changed some details, with the permission of the participants, to protect their identities. In addition, I did

hire a transcriptionist, who signed a confidentiality agreement, to transcribe Sandra's interviews as well as Linda's and Rachael's second interviews. I also chose to hold the interviews on campus in my office to protect faculty participants' confidentiality; my office is large, comfortable, and fairly isolated. The consent form requested that focus group participants keep the ideas exchanged in the focus group confidential and not reveal them to parties outside the focus group.

Member Checks

Ensuring that participants have input into the transcription phase of data collection is an ethical imperative. Consequently, interview and focus group participants received copies of the transcripts for the session(s) they participated in. Interview participants also received copies of their profiles. Requested changes to transcripts ensured that the participants' ideas were described accurately.

3.8. Reflexivity Statement

As a participant observer, I have to be constantly aware of my responsibility as a researcher to ensure that this study produces a valid view of the research findings. Consequently, sharing my insights, concerns, and history with the faculty evaluation process at this point in this thesis provides an understanding of where I am situated as a participant observer and why I have been compelled to investigate this topic.

My 36-year association with CU has provided me with many opportunities to enhance my teaching and to grow professionally. Many of these opportunities were serendipitous. As I reflect on my early years teaching at CU, I am struck by how much I learned when the physical environment provided the space and the university's common lunch hour provided the time for my colleagues and me to share teaching ideas as we broke bread together. Faculty would bring their lunch, pull up a chair around a long oblong table in the department's common lunchroom, and the teacher talk would naturally begin. A colleague would share the challenge of trying to stickhandle a student's behaviour; another, an idea for a capstone project; another, how the latest legal precedents were going to affect the curriculum. Whatever the discussion, I was

there to participate, to listen, and to learn. Common lunchrooms and common lunchtimes are a thing of the past at CU, but I am struck by the learning space they provided me in the early years of my teaching career. This learning space enriched me, it changed my teaching practice, and it elevated my confidence in the classroom and in my professional exchanges with colleagues.

I also am struck by how little I knew or understood about the faculty evaluation process in those early days of my career at CU. I do remember that the faculty member distributed the student evaluations while a student was in charge of collecting them, placing them in an envelope, and putting them on the instructor's desk while he or she left the room. Procedures have changed – the divisional assistant or co-ordinator or designate now has the responsibility for distributing the student evaluations most likely to ensure the documents are not tampered with.

Over my 36-year teaching career, I have probably been evaluated formally by students eight or nine times. What do I recall about what they shared? Although the results from my student evaluations typically ranged between 4.7 and 4.9 out of 5, it was the student comments that offered the most concrete feedback. I recall when I was teaching a computer course in the 1980s, the curriculum was designed to include the features of the computer program as well as the theoretical aspects of computer design. I will have to readily admit that I was much more comfortable teaching the features of the program than teaching the theory, and my comfort level with the theory could not be disguised from my students. From the 25 students who were quite happy with the course, one student commented that she really enjoyed the hands-on component of the class but she thought that the theory part was "boring." I was devastated to get this feedback, but I knew in my heart of hearts that there was truth in that comment. It prompted me to rethink how the theory component of the course could be made more relevant and more accessible to students. It did not matter that the other 24 students in the class did not make the same observation; I knew I had work to do to improve my approach to teaching students the theoretical aspects of computing. For me, power lies in that one negative comment that motivates me to action and becomes steeled in my memory to revisit over and over again.

Fast forward to Spring 2014 when I was scheduled for evaluation – what did the formal faculty evaluation process reveal? The results of the student evaluations in my intercultural business class, the only class that I was teaching that term, was 4.89/5, and again it was from the comments that I learned a great deal about how students decide to take a course with me, whether they like the textbook I selected, and in what areas I might improve. Here is what I learned from their comments: A number of students indicated that they had checked me out on rateyourprofessor.com and that the feedback on that website prompted them to select my course. Finding a textbook for this course has never been easy; however, my colleagues, who also teach this course, and I selected a practical text with the right balance of theory combined with case study. Nevertheless, I found myself continuously needing to supplement the text because it lacked enough content, so I was curious to see if the students were dissatisfied with the text. Apparently not, in fact several mentioned that they really liked it. Out of the long list of positive comments there was only one suggestion to improve the course. "Perhaps she could update the course schedule on Moodle?" (Note the question mark.) (See Appendix E for a copy of the student questionnaire.)

Fast forward to Spring 2015 when I was again scheduled for evaluation – apparently, I did not have to be evaluated in Spring 2014. This time I chose to have students in my organizational behaviour class evaluate my teaching. My overall score was 4.7/5 with very positive comments about the course and a few comments about the workload and the challenging questions that the readiness assessments pose. I design readiness assessments that require students to read the chapter assigned and answer questions on the chapter prior to my teaching the material in class. There are four readiness assessments during the course and I take the best three out of four scores on the assessments. The readiness assessments are placed on Moodle and students have 20 minutes to complete the questions outside of class time. I am a stickler about having students arrive on time for class and a student commented on this and noted that I should lighten up because some students have to work. I teach in a business program that expects students to follow the expectations of a work environment, so I will continue to expect that students attend class and arrive on time.

After being evaluated by students through several cycles of the formal evaluation process at CU, I have to admit that generally I garnered little feedback from my students on how to improve the course or my teaching behaviours. And if I thought that my colleagues would provide feedback on the co-ordinator or peer reports that would move me to action or cause me to reflect upon my approach to teaching and learning, that was not the case. During my first year of teaching at a local college, formal faculty evaluations were not even part of the organizational culture; however, I soon came to learn that the faculty evaluation process was embedded in the organizational culture at CU. Yet, in my first years of teaching at CU, when I had a great deal to learn, I never received one suggestion from a peer or co-ordinator report, which must be based in part on classroom observation of teaching. Moreover, during my 36 years of teaching at CU, no peer or co-ordinator has ever offered any constructive feedback on my teaching. Their reports served as a confirmation that I was on the right track; they served as an acknowledgement of my ability to teach; they served as a thank you for a job well done. Consequently, the faculty evaluation process did not provide me with opportunities for faculty enrichment, which can devalue the process for me as a teacher who continually strives to be better at my craft although it does serve to let me know that I am on the right trajectory.

With the positive feedback that I have received from students and peers regarding my teaching performance in this formal evaluation cycle, consider the Dean's recommendation to the President regarding my faculty evaluation for the period 2014-2015, which follows:

> I have reviewed the material in Ms. Giovannetti's file and judge it to indicate satisfactory performance with respect to the evaluation criteria specified in Article 11.5.2 of the collective agreement.
>
> Ms. Giovannetti's file consists of the Evaluation Committee recommendation, a Co-ordinator report, a Colleague report, a self-submission, and student survey results from 2 sections assigned in Spring 2014 and 1 section assigned in Spring 2015.
>
> I concur with the Evaluation Committee's recommendation that Ms. Giovannetti's appointment be continued.

(The file actually contained an additional Co-ordinator report for 2014 and an additional colleague report for 2014, which are not referred to in the above description.

Moreover, I had taught only one course in 2014 and two courses in 2015 thus the limited database of survey results.) In addition to the above recommendation from the Dean to the President regarding my evaluation, which the Dean had signed, is a handwritten note that offers this feedback: "Congratulations on an excellent evaluation, Mary." That's it! That's all! These words would mean so much more if they actually addressed specific behaviours that I demonstrate or contributions that I make to the institution. I realize that Deans are overworked, I understand the desire to get through the file and move on to the next one, but I would have liked more feedback, although I cannot expect more.

When I composed co-ordinator reports and peer evaluations, I did include comments on what I observed that went well and offered suggestions for my peers to consider to enhance the teaching and learning in the classroom. For the most part, I have found that faculty are very willing to receive the suggestions I offer, but I have encountered defensiveness and resistance, which can impact working relationships. When I observed a colleague's class and met with him following the session to review my observations, he resisted my suggestions for involving the students more in the learning process, he resisted my suggestions for finding alternate ways to present the content than relying completely on PowerPoint which, in my view, is often an impediment to the teacher-student learning dynamic. Nevertheless, I included my observations in my peer report along with positive observations regarding the teacher's rapport with his students, their willingness to respond to his questions, his knowledge of his subject, and his strong participation in departmental meetings, curriculum design, and program promotion. I felt that it was my responsibility as a colleague to provide feedback that would improve the teaching and learning in that classroom. However, this observation opens a window into why the faculty evaluation process is viewed with such anxiety by faculty. My observation of my colleague becomes part of this faculty member's personnel file on which a departmental evaluation committee recommends continued membership in the organization or other faculty development measures such as Alerting and Guidance. And it is the permanence of that document that records one classroom visit that provides part of the documentation on which a departmental evaluation committee will makes its recommendation to the Dean. I can certainly see the shortcomings of this approach to peer evaluation, and I can see the shortcomings of my approach to peer evaluation through the example that I just shared. I could have asked

my colleague if I could visit more than one of his classes prior to my writing up my final observations. We could have engaged in more of a dialogue and a reciprocal learning conversation. I could have offered to not submit my peer report and suggest that he just waive his right to a peer evaluation and consider my suggestions. I could have invited him to visit my classes. I could have met with him prior to the class I observed. I probably could have done a lot of things differently. But I did not. My peer report had a few good ideas for my peer to consider in terms of approaches to teaching and learning, and I felt that anyone who has been teaching with PowerPoint as his primary pedagogical delivery tool could really benefit from my suggestions.

I started out with my research topic because I wanted to participate in research that I felt would benefit the institution to which I have devoted my professional teaching career. I realized that I looked upon the faculty evaluation process with dread every time my name appeared on the list of faculty to be evaluated in that particular academic year. Not because of what feedback peer and co-ordinator reports would provide but because of what feedback the students might provide regarding my approach to engaging them in the curriculum. It absolutely sounds ridiculous as I write these words, but these words speak the truth. What if I try some new approaches and the students do not see the value in them? How will my risk-taking with a new curriculum design affect the student evaluations of my teaching?

The faculty evaluation process is one that creates anxiety and tension in me every time I am scheduled for evaluation. I admit I never use the formative evaluation sheets that ask students for feedback on my teaching. I do not feel that I have to – I rely on my intuition to tell me if there is anything amiss in my approach. And my intuition has served me well.

Throughout my Ph.D. studies, I have focused on grasping the research around teaching and learning centres, professional development practices, and how mentorship serves to advance teaching and learning when the right conditions are met. It was through my studies that I learned about the value of Faculty Learning Communities. What I learned from my studies and from attending a Facilitators' and Developers' Workshop led by Milton Cox and Laurie Richlin motivated me to develop Faculty

Learning Communities (FLCs) at CU. FLCs, now in their fourth year of growth at the university, are thriving as evidenced by the number of faculty applying to participate in them and by the number of faculty whose names are on a waitlist hoping to participate in a future FLC since the current FLC is full. Since I have facilitated FLCs over the past four years at CU, I can unequivocally state that they have afforded me the richest learning opportunities for me as a university teacher. Consequently, this support for FLCs may be viewed as a bias in this particular study, although I took action to try to remain objective whenever participants in this study who had participated in FLCs volunteered the benefits of them or whenever co-ordinators spoke of faculty who had benefitted from their participation in FLCs and whom they were responsible for writing co-ordinator reports.

Based on my observations of and experience with CU's approach to faculty evaluation, I felt that this research project might provide the impetus to opening up a conversation about faculty evaluation at my institution and perhaps to reconceptualizing it. Therefore, my desire to investigate this research topic is shaped by my experiences as a long-term faculty member at an institution that was only in its eleventh year of operation when I joined it.

During the interviews and focus groups for my study, I often felt as though the participants and I were engaged in a conversation. The participants told me frequently how much they enjoyed having the time to devote to such as important topic and I was not always as unbiased as I should have been when I facilitated these discussions. I did, however, consistently label anything that I shared in an interview or focus group that demonstrated my lack of neutrality. For example, in my interview with Linda, she begins talking about the word "evaluation" and how she would like to find a substitute for it that would take the fear out of the process. I am inserting a small except from the transcript here – the third column contains notes that I made during the transcription process.

L	Bringing new strategies, asking new questions, which makes you develop professionally. I would erase the stress factor, which does not help an instructor to do good teaching if they are under stress by being evaluated. I would actually change the word evaluation.	Remove stress factor Change word evaluation
M	Can you think of another word?	
L	It has kind of a negative connotation, controlling connotation. I cannot think of another word right now. I cannot think but I will try to come up with one.	
M	Yes, yes. For our second interview, it might be something that you can reflect on.	
L	Reflect on, yes.	
M	Some universities have faculty portfolios where faculty put in samples of their work, exercises, activities, student work to get a broader picture of what they are doing to add to the formal evaluation process.	Portfolio idea suggested by researcher
L	I think that is a very good idea. And I think that having those portfolios would help because you would be sincere. I would not only put wonderful examples of your practice but the portfolio would also give you the opportunity to be critical with yourself and get feedback on your own criticism. Actually, that would help a lot.	Portfolio – critical component needed as well
M	Hum hum	
L	I [pause] I think I don't have enough games in my teaching for example, but maybe my colleagues would say yes you do have enough. You would be your own critic; maybe I am right, maybe I am wrong. Not a portfolio of showing off.	Not a portfolio of showing off!
M	Yes.	
L	That's what I am afraid when I hear portfolio – to contain only the positive things. That portfolio could have different chapters – good teaching experiences, struggles, challenges would be a chapter.	
M	Yes.	
L	And even plans that didn't work out. And maybe a reflection part on maybe why I think it didn't work out. So to have different chapters would be a great thing.	Portfolio: plans that didn't work out/reflection.

Because I suggested the idea of faculty portfolios to Linda, I felt that I could not include her ideas regarding portfolios in my analysis. What I discovered from my analysis of the transcripts is that only three participants suggested portfolios and all were administrator participants, one of whom had little experience with portfolios and the other two administrators had a wealth of knowledge about portfolios. Faculty never suggested

portfolios during the interviews or focus groups likely because they had never been exposed to them as a way of approaching faculty evaluation. In short, I tried to be neutral and when I found that I was not, I labeled my comments research bias and removed them from the analysis. Clearly, this reflexivity statement reveals my biases before the research process began and how I dealt with those biases during the research process. As Merriam (2009) notes, "investigators need to explain their biases, disposition, and assumptions regarding the research to be undertaken. . . . Such a clarification allows the reader to better understand how the individual researcher might have arrived at the particular interpretation of the data" (p. 219).

Finally, it seems prudent for me to consider the limitations of this case study design. For example, this study focused on the phenomenon of a faculty evaluation process at one institution, which was for the majority of its history a community college and is now a special purpose teaching university. Focussing on one institution is an obvious limitation. In addition, this study is limited by the number of participants who were interviewed for this study and/or who participated in focus groups. Five individuals participated in two in-depth interviews, and twenty-one individuals participated in focus groups. The participants were selected by purposeful sampling (Merriam, 2009); they were selected based on my knowledge and experience of their teaching or administrative experience at the university. This approach to selection can also be viewed as a limitation of this study. Finally, since I have over three decades of experience with the faculty evaluation process and have engaged in the process from a variety of positions at the institution, I have been exposed to its limitations and its strengths. And as previously noted, I readily admit that faculty evaluation is a process that creates anxiety in me, which can be viewed as a bias and therefore a limitation to this study.

3.9. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented the qualitative intrinsic case study research design and addressed Siedman's (2006) approach to in-depth interviewing and its appropriateness for the study. In addition, I discussed participant selection, data collection, and data analysis and how trustworthiness was applied to this study, and I

defended Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) "thinking tools" as a valuable framework for analyzing the faculty evaluation process and participants' perceptions of it. Finally, I concluded with my reflexivity statement that uncovers my lived experience with the faculty evaluation process, my desire for change, the biases that I bring to the study and my efforts to address those biases, and the limitations of case study design.

Chapter 4.   Profiles of the Participants

The purpose of this chapter is to present a profile of each of the five participants whom I interviewed for this study. I crafted the profiles as first-person narratives using the participants' words. According to Seidman (2006), crafting profiles is a compelling way to learn about the participants and their experience with the phenomenon being studied and a valuable method of sharing interview data. Following each profile, I present a brief commentary that includes an analysis of some of the important features of the faculty evaluation process followed by examples of how Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) thinking tools provide a lens into understanding participants' reactions to the evaluation process.

4.1. [Darrell]'s Profile

[My journey to becoming an administrator began] very early on in my career when I got involved in faculty coordination. I first became a co-ordinator within the first two or three years of being employed here. I was very much a part-time, non-regular employee. To be candid . . . I think I first got involved in coordination because it was work. If my memory serves me well, my first coordination was in faculty evaluation; I think that's how I got started. For the next 13 years, I was a faculty co-ordinator of some sort or another, so I was doing sub-administrative work from a very early time in my career here. Doing that kind of work led me, at least indirectly, to getting involved in other nonteaching aspects of the university; it was a college at that time. For example, I served not only on the predecessor to Senate but also to the predecessor to [Administrative] Council, which was called instructional board.

When I left to do my Ph.D. in the 90s, I was incredibly plugged into this institution, . . . but then I just pulled the plug to go away and do my dissertation. When I came back in the late 1990s [with a] Ph.D., I was just going to . . . teach and do academic things, which I did for a couple of years, and then I was asked to take on some coordination [again]. I got involved in the early 2000s with [Administrative] Council – I was elected to [Administrative] Council, and then I was elected Chair of [Administrative] Council.   I could see myself almost

unintentionally being drawn back into that institutional overview of what was still the college. It was probably as Chair that really opened my mind to administration. I was getting, as a faculty member, almost the broadest perspective of the institution because I also served on the college board at the time.

[Now, as a Dean, I'm in] a challenging position; there are many challenging positions at this institution, but as a Dean you're caught betwixed and between . . . between your loyalty, and your interest, and your commitment to the area from which you come and your loyalty, your commitment, and your interest in being a senior-level administrator. You're not at the highest level; you're not a Vice-President. You know you are expected to both represent your area and even more so make decisions and offer advice that's in the best interest of the institution, even if it might not be in the short-term best interest of your area. Therefore, it can be quite challenging at times.

[How I got feedback when I was an instructor] changed over the years. I was trained by the experience of being a student, particularly by being a graduate student, and [my] courses were pretty much structured around midterm, paper, final; three dominant course assessments and that's how I started out. The longer I taught – three big changes took place. They were not instantaneous but they were the evolution of becoming a more experienced teacher. First, I moved to more frequent, shorter assignments. Second, I evolved towards much more student participation in my classes, culminating in a fairly large number of group projects in my teaching. And third, this came at the end, after I had been away from teaching, I probably had one of the most profound revelations when I had returned to teaching in the late '90s and that revelation is embarrassing to admit . . . I had forgotten a lot of what I had taught. I had taught it for years and years, and that led me to believe that if I am forgetting what I am teaching, then what does it say about what my students are learning? That led to a third big change . . . which was less emphasis on content and more emphasis on outcomes. What did I want these students to take away from this class?

[As a teacher], I wasn't dreadful; I was always organized and entertaining, but I think I was oblivious when I first started teaching [to student feedback]. And then you cultivate all those informal ways . . . everything from gestures on their part, which could include nodding heads, smiles, laughter, at appropriate times. You know laughter is not just reacting to humour; it's also that laughter can be a sign of understanding a particular point and laughter can also be the connection between two different points. Occasionally, I would give them non-graded assignments and ask them for their feedback. I would say that I did more of that later on. What didn't work? I was always keen on what didn't work, how we could make this better. And, I don't remember when I started to do this . . . I included an optional bonus question on my final exam for which they got two

marks and the question was quite simple: How could this course be improved? Credit will be given for serious, thoughtful answers.

Overwhelmingly, students took the question seriously. You could get some goofy [answers], but overwhelmingly, they took it seriously. "This assignment is a good one, but it's just too long. I never understood the relevance of this assignment. It would be really helpful if you included a book review or something." I got good feedback from that and it was right at the end of the final, so they were still immersed in the course.

I can summarize my experience with the faculty evaluation process in three distinct categories. First and most important, I was the faculty evaluation co-ordinator for [my division] a number of times. [My division] is different than other parts of the university; [it has] for the most part a functional-based coordination model rather than a discipline- or department-based coordination model, and one of the positions has always been evaluation co-ordinator. [This division] has always had a co-ordinator who visits every single classroom. So you're going in and watching someone teach [communications]; . . . I got to observe my colleagues in a classroom, write those reports, read those student evaluations. [The division] instituted a practice early on that the co-ordinator would meet with the affected faculty member once the classroom visit was done and have a draft report. There's a lot of interaction and it made me a far better instructor to be engaged in that process. I shamelessly stole stuff.

The second big role that I've had in evaluation is that I'm a Dean, so I read every evaluation file in [my area] and I react to the recommendation from each department evaluation committee, and 9.5 times out of 10, I accept their recommendation. It's rare that I have to do something differently because [the Faculty] works quite well. The third aspect of evaluation maybe [several years ago now] I sat on the university side for contract negotiations and evaluation was one of the major items of discussion. We spent hours and hours discussing evaluations and we were seeking ways to improve the current process.

[As an instructor, how did I feel about being evaluated?] Probably more comfortable than many people to be honest because I knew I was a good instructor, . . . and I had the confidence to cultivate an attitude of continuous improvement. Every time I taught a course, sometimes right on the file folder for the course, I'd just jot down some ways in which I could improve the course. Almost all of the time I could approach evaluation that way. And I think it was coming from that fact that I had sat in so many classes that I really didn't mind people sitting in my classes even on the rare occasion that it didn't go all that great. I was fortunate that overall I could approach it as a formative experience; this is a way to improve my teaching. But I came from a place of professional confidence. I knew quite honestly from sitting in so many other classes that I was by far not the best instructor around, but I knew that and I accepted that and it also

encouraged me to improve. But I knew I was good enough to have the confidence to take a continuous improvement approach to evaluation.

Under the collective agreement, the faculty evaluation process is a summative process. That's the strictest interpretation of it. That's not the way it works in over 90 percent of the cases. When it's working very well, and in [my Faculty], it works fairly well, it is a formative process. It is a process by which faculty members can – I can't think of a better word – judge each other and judge themselves and strive to improve.

I [prefer a more] formative method of evaluation, but because I'm Dean, I also have to have that other tool in my kit that allows me to provide for Alerting and Guidance, call an out-of-sequence evaluation when I think it's appropriate, seek additional information from evaluation committees, or under certain circumstances recommend termination. [The purpose of the evaluation process] in the strictest interpretation is summative. You know there are mentoring clauses in the evaluation process; there is a section on formative evaluation, but ultimately the evaluation committee is making a recommendation to the Dean on the employment status of the individual.

[The evaluation process does provide opportunities for improvement in teaching performance] but the Achilles heel is that [the evaluations] are few and far between. In theory an evaluation file is open for the entire five years, and material can be added to that file constantly over the file years, and there are instructors who add questionnaires to their [evaluation] file every year. I usually did that – not every year – but I had more than what was required of me. And many instructors do, so technically that file is open for the entire five-year period, but we know typically what happens is that no one pays much attention until the September of the evaluation year.

I think [the evaluation process does provide opportunities for faculty enrichment – continuous improvement and professional growth for individual faculty members] when it's working well. You get the feedback from a co-ordinator, you get the feedback from a colleague – if you chose to have a colleague – you get feedback from students. I think when it's working well, I think that evaluation is an opportunity for faculty to reflect on their teaching practice, and if they are able to listen, to hear about opportunities for improvement, or as a result of the process, reach their own conclusion about opportunities for improvement.

The faculty evaluation process does not always accurately reflect the teaching performance of a faculty member. The sample size of student questionnaires is too small; that's probably the most glaring thing. Colleague reports tend to be fairly useless – they're puff pieces – and it's tough to write a constructively critical co-ordinator report. I didn't write that many colleague evaluations. I remember a colleague

. . . who was senior to me and I had to write about her and it was a bit tough. I think I approached colleague reports at least with an attempt at more honesty than many people. I may not have always been successful but I tried.

[In terms of whether co-ordinators and colleagues are competent to complete a co-ordinator or colleague evaluation], my answer is "not always." The institution needs to provide training in evaluation. There was a session in the fall that HR was putting on for co-ordinators on evaluation. . . . The training was more about the process they have to follow. Here's what needs to be in an evaluation file; here are the steps to completing an evaluation file. It was more about evaluation files than evaluation. But even that's needed because it is difficult to follow the guidelines of the collective agreement within the [time lines outlined in it].

[I would like faculty to be evaluated] more often, and the only way that we can do that I suspect is to move to a paperless system and that does have some problems. I suppose in a perfect world you would submit student questionnaires to every class every term, well the place would stop if you tried to do it by paper. But there are some problems with doing it online too. Let me . . . give you the advantage of paper first. If you are submitting student questionnaires to a live audience, you are usually getting a 100 percent participation rate of those who are there. That's important. Evaluation can also be voting with your feet, so that is why in [my area] we always commented on the number of registered students versus those in attendance – that's a bit of information right there. But you are getting that participation. When you move to online forms of evaluation, I am told, the participation rate goes down and sometimes you get a different kind of participation.   Again this is not research that I've read but research that I am being told about so take it for that – [you get information from] those at the ends: those that really loved the instructor and those that really hated her. I just don't think that we can get significant improvement in more frequent evaluation without moving to some electronic base.

The evaluation process should change. We tried to change it. First I will repeat what I've just said that I think we need more frequent and more sets of student questionnaires, but I've never believed that student questionnaires are the be-all and end-all of evaluation. They help but I think true formative evaluation is a process of peer evaluation. Frequent classroom visits; I mean if you are going to evaluate someone and encourage them to improve, you got to see what they are doing. You can't just go to workshops; workshops are important, and teaching tips are great things, because I learned so much, as I told you, from sitting in on people's classes. When you take that knowledge and put it in an organized workshop session, there's lots of good that comes out of that, and I would never discourage that.   But if you are talking about Darrell's teaching, someone has to look at Darrell's teaching and Darrell has to be willing

to have them look at his teaching and be willing to listen to what they might have to say. Reverse that – the person who goes and observes Darrell's teaching should know what to look for and that may take some training too.

[The most important component of an evaluation process] is frequency. I hesitated so long because despite our lack of it, I still think we have not a bad system. Obviously peer review is important, student feedback is important, and I suppose in an ideal world, although I have to admit that I'd hate to do it, a reflective piece. Self-evaluation. We have to do it as administrators and I always hate it. It feels funny but it makes you think. You know, we toyed around, and it wasn't my idea, but I think it was a faculty member's idea as a matter of fact, everyone would be required to write a reflective one-page paper every year and then they put it in their desk drawer. It was truly, truly formative . . . you didn't even have to show it to anyone, you just do it. You take it seriously and do it. I think reflection is an important part of the evaluation process. And good instructors do it informally and intuitively anyway often every week, sometimes with every class. You're stuck with that class that's dying in front of you – what am I doing wrong? There was another big change for me [and it was] that shift from poor performance being a problem strictly with the students – I'm talking about poor exam performance – to poor performance at least in part and probably a bigger part than I wanted to admit, a problem with me. They're failing – what's wrong with them; they're failing – what's wrong with me. It's hard to do and it's hard to accept that. Okay, I'm flawed, what do I do? That's where the reflection comes in.

The evaluation process does reflect the strategic directions of the university. It does, and that could be improved and one of the obvious ways that it could be improved is by placing more emphasis . . . on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. It is at least from the administration's point of view; if we are going to have a research direction as a teaching university and the act says research as time and resources permit . . . if we are going to have a research component to our teaching side then the natural direction to go in is the direction of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. I've read some of the literature; I am certainly no expert. The evaluation process supports the strategic directions of the university as a teaching intensive university in the sense that we do commit a fair amount of resources to evaluation, but I don't think we commit enough resources to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. I think also the program assessment process helps too.

[The faculty evaluation process] is a good process – notice I didn't say great; it's a cumbersome process; . . . it's a legalistic process . . . it's a prescriptive process understandably designed to protect the rights of the employee, and it's a summative process. The co-ordinator can't just show up in your class; there are no surprise visits, the faculty member being evaluated choses his or her colleague, there are fairly

narrow restrictions on what can be included in an evaluation file, although they are not as narrow as some people think. The co-ordinator's report can be a very comprehensive report and it can include many attachments, but yes an evaluation file will include the following and only the following. I understand that you don't [include] hearsay; you don't want sour grapes, that kind of thing.

I'd like to make the evaluation process better; I'd like to make it more efficient; I'd like to make it no more time consuming. Get better mileage out of what we do; emphasize the formative continuous improvements aspects of the file while acknowledging that there has to be some summative potential.

[I have seen the evaluation process work]; I truly have seen some people turn around – more than once – a number of times – where the system really did work where a guidance committee was struck; the [committee] worked carefully with the instructor, and the instructor did improve beyond mediocre. There is also that difficulty with our collective agreement: satisfactory or less than satisfactory. And that's all it says. I mean, I was just talking to a colleague about an evaluation file. One direction I was going with the file – yes, it was satisfactory – it fits the collective agreement. What I really mean is it's satisfactory or adequate – just good enough – and I don't think just good enough is what we want to aspire to.

[The form for the evaluation file that indicates satisfactory or not satisfactory performance] is a template produced by HR because it has to adhere to the collective agreement. Nine times out of ten, I just sign it. I most always include a . . . little handwritten note so that they know that I have actually looked at it. I read the file, take that piece of paper, and write a little personal note [on it] – sometimes it's only a few words. [It helps make the form more] personal, less bureaucratic, and it shows, if nothing else, the Dean spent a few minutes on it.

I [would compare the faculty evaluation process] to going to the dentist. I say that not entirely facetiously. Because I did it for so many years as a co-ordinator, I was truly amazed at how uncomfortable evaluation made people feel. And many, not most, faculty have a difficult time hearing constructive criticism, and I use constructive criticism in the best sense of the word. "When you presented your topic this way, I think you could have made it clearer had you added or used an example, or given an opportunity to engage the students." It's not that you're saying, that wasn't very good or clear; you're saying how it could be better.

I know talking to co-ordinators that in some ways it has become even more difficult [to complete evaluations] because they're dealing with a certain clientele who teach like they were taught. Certainly the emphasis in teaching has moved in a much different direction, and that direction is more active engaged learning, less emphasis on

delivering content. That's very difficult for some people and I saw this quite recently in a set of questionnaires, when students found an instructor not very engaging, the result can be that an instructor feels very defensive. They argue that "I'm not here to entertain, I'm here to teach. This is how I teach. Don't tell me how to teach."

Each of my three divisions has a slightly different questionnaire. They're all good, but I can think back to the [one area] where it actually asks the students how often do you attend class, why do you take this course. It does give you a bit more information, and it's funny, students will actually admit they don't go to class very often. There's no reason to admit it but they do. You do see that in some questionnaires, wanting to know more about the students while still allowing them to remain anonymous.

An ideal evaluation process would involve many more sets of student questionnaires. I might not go as far as every section of every class. It would be done much more on a regular basis. It certainly wouldn't be every five years. There would be some form of structured reflection on the part of the faculty member. Maybe it would be some sort of electronic portfolio, maybe a blog that colleagues could contribute to. But rather than a single report, there would be more interaction among colleagues on a more frequent basis. And in an ideal world, I admit it would be predominantly formative. Let's reflect together on your practice.

If the electronic portfolio were for a particular time period, there would be periodic submissions of the faculty member. They might be reflective reports or they might be documented engagement between faculty and colleagues or co-ordinators or even students. I'm envisioning an evaluation process that's a lot more dynamic, a lot more continuous without becoming stale. I don't know how one prevents that from becoming a rigid process, which becomes very precisely defined in a collective agreement. I do understand if you're dealing with a summative process, the necessity, . . . the wisdom of having protection for instructors in the collective agreement. Because as long as the evaluation process has summative features to it, you do need to offer some protection and you have to make sure you follow due process. The problem is it undermines my ideal world, and I don't know what you do with that. I think both sides, the university and the faculty association, have struggled with that one because some really talented people on both sides have worked on evaluation. We've added sections to the agreement. There is a section on mentoring now; there is a section on formative evaluations. The mentoring, at least in my area, gets used sometimes. I don't think the formative sections get used very much though. There's a real problem in trying to create this ideal world in a system that is ultimately evaluating not just one's instruction, but one's job performance. And there's the problem. So you can create an ideal world of evaluation, but how are you going to link that to job performance?

I suppose the first thing that comes to mind [when I think of faculty enrichment] is new techniques of teaching. At least new to the person, doesn't need to be new to the world. More multidimensional approaches to teaching. Certainly now for me, faculty enrichment would be a variety of ways to engage students, different kinds of performance assessments for faculty members, more teaching technologies. . . . I'm not really a techie, but there's a lot you can do with pretty simple technology right down to using document cameras instead of overhead projectors. A new generation of digital ways that lets you do things in a multidimensional approach. That's said, I think you can have a very enriching experience with a single person and a piece of chalk.

In an ideal world I would throw the whole [faculty evaluation process] out and start again, which is easier said than done because you are dealing with contractual language. But in a perfect world, I would get a team of people that I respect, primarily faculty members, a couple of administrators, and roll up our sleeves and forget the collective agreement [and figure out] what would work best for our institution. My number one recommendation is to have another go at [the faculty evaluation process]. Operating in the real world, we would probably strike a joint committee and look at ways we could improve the process. The last time we did this nothing came of it, but I think there's still a lot of goodwill on both sides to improve the process without compromising protection for faculty. But [we need to get] more out of it. We've spent a lot of money on this, when you think about the amount of time that goes into evaluation. Teaching and learning are . . . what we do. The other big thing I would say is to put more emphasis, and that would probably mean more money, on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. We are a university and, while it's not a major component of our mandate, research is mentioned. I think a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is ideal for a teaching intensive university. There's a lot of good work out there.

While we ultimately cannot start from scratch because we have a process defined in the collective agreement, let's put the collective agreement aside, and say, "Alright, if we could, what would it look like?" Come up with what we think the evaluation process should look like and is there a way we could take this and merge it into the collective agreement. I guarantee you now, what you end up with will be different.

I think I probably have sounded a bit more negative today than I might have sounded the other day, but I don't feel negative. I just know that [the process] is tough to change, but that does not mean we shouldn't try. There is a lot of goodwill out there. You know, when you're a teaching institution, and a place that is proud that it's a teaching-intensive university, not a research-intensive university, it's worth the effort.

4.1.1.   Commentary on Darrell's Profile

Darrell's has extensive experience with the faculty evaluation process at the university. As an evaluation co-ordinator in his area, he was responsible for visiting his peers' classes, writing the co-ordinator reports, and meeting with faculty to review the draft report. This approach is not one that is regularly followed at the university, as it is usually the exceptional (negative) nature of the feedback that warrants a conversation with the co-ordinator. Visiting his peers classes tremendously benefitted his own teaching as he saw other approaches to teaching and learning, which he often adapted to his own classes. Visiting the classes of our peers provides valuable learning opportunities for us, but it is an approach that we too often do not take advantage of.

His comment that an evaluation file is open for five years and material such as Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) can be added to it over the five-year period is an important one. Faculty who have passed the probationary period do not have to wait to have SETs distributed in their classes only in the fifth year of their evaluation cycle. However, many faculty members do not think about evaluation until their name appears on the Human Resources list of faculty to be evaluated. It is often when SETs point out concerns in the current round of evaluations that faculty realize they should have accumulated a larger data set of SETs to provide the evaluation committee with more information on which to base its decision. However, as Darrell observes, the sample size of student questionnaires is small. A full-time faculty member teaches eight courses over two semesters in an academic year, although the evaluation process only requires two sets of student questionnaires for the evaluation period (two out of the eight courses). This does limit the sample size and does give full-time faculty significant control over choosing which two courses to have SETs distributed in. Requiring more sets of student questionnaires than under the current model would more likely need to be done online, notes Darrell.

Darrell realizes that there is a formative article in the faculty evaluation process, which does not appear to get utilized enough. This observation is important because this article requires that a faculty member be given feedback on his or her performance prior to a formal evaluation if there are performance concerns. Darrell questions the value of peer evaluations but recognizes the value of feedback from student

questionnaires and co-ordinator reports. Darrell does view the evaluation process as an opportunity for teaching improvement and faculty enrichment when the process is working well, but ideally he would prefer to have the process outside the collective agreement and reconceptualized so as to improve the process "without compromising protection for faculty." Since Darrell views the faculty evaluation process as summative, he understands the importance of protecting faculty rights in the faculty evaluation process and that due process is followed. However, it does "undermine" his ideal world of what faculty evaluation could be at the institution.

Bourdieu's (1993) concepts of habitus and cultural capital (1997) provide insights into how Darrell makes sense of the faculty evaluation process. His habitus developed by his extensive involvement in a number of committees, his role as Evaluation Co-ordinator, and his promotion to the position of Dean allowed him to develop a deep understanding of how the institution as a whole operates. His cultural capital defined by his decades of teaching experience and his educational credentials coupled with his social capital that he has accrued from his years of involvement in the institution give him an important perspective on faculty evaluation. He is ultimately responsible for deciding whether a faculty member's performance meets the standard set out by the university. In the field of CU, which is comprised of organizational and administrative structural relations, the faculty evaluation process acts as a form of symbolic capital against which faculty are evaluated.

His position as Dean places him in what Bourdieu (1989) would describe as a "double bind" (p. 53) – tensions that erupt over how to act and what to do. He must represent and protect his faculty and staff and the programs that are housed within his areas of responsibility, yet he must work collaboratively with the university executive to make decisions that affect the university as a whole and his faculty in particular. Although his position of Dean gives him the final say on each faculty member's evaluation file in the faculty division in which he is Dean, his position only gives him one voice at the executive table, a voice that has to offer advice and make decisions for the whole institution that may run counter to the best interest of his faculty area.

His humble assessment of his teaching performance can be traced back to his habitus, which incorporates his previous educational experiences and their influence on his approach to teaching and learning. He recalls that his teaching became more interactive as he gained more experience in the classroom and developed his teaching repertoire, which is reflective of the recognition that teaching in the field of CU does expect that faculty will engage their students in the learning process in interactive ways, a dominant view of teaching at the institution.

The faculty evaluation process housed in the collective agreement provides protection to faculty to ensure that the evaluation process is fair and that due process is followed. This policy provides a structure and thus structures the actions of faculty, staff, and administrators in operationalizing the policy. For Bourdieu (1977/2004), the policy would serve to produce a "structuring structure" (p. 72). Reconceptualising faculty evaluation outside the collective agreement, which Darrell would prefer, will require the approval of faculties, the faculty association, and the administration. More importantly, high levels of trust must exist among all parties before discussions could begin. To open up this policy to discussion requires a significant investment of social capital. For Bourdieu (1997), social capital is symbolic and accelerates other forms of capital. Social capital, built on a high level of trust and a strong sense of collegiality, embraces a sense of cooperation and collaboration – all necessary to reconceptualize faculty evaluation within the field of CU.

4.2.   [Rachael's] Profile

> [Becoming a teacher was a decision] . . . I originally did my undergraduate degree in [sciences] at [X] and I finished in [1990], and then I went out and worked [in my field] for a few years. I didn't find it to be everything I wanted it to be, so I did some work around what to be when I grow up, even though I was already in my mid-twenties. I decided that I wanted to teach at a university or college, so I went back to do my master's degree with that in mind. As soon as I finished my master's, I worked as a TA for a bit and then I went down to the States and did some work in my field and I did some teaching on the side in the community college system. I built up a little bit of experience mainly [through] volunteering, and then I got hired to teach at a [small community college in British Columbia]. I did that for a year then a position came up here and I applied.

[I became a teacher] because I did a close examination of what I thought my interests were, my skills, and the sort of things that I like to do. I like a lot of change; I like novelty; I like to be challenged. I like that it's a different day every day and there's a lot of flexibility in some ways in terms of how you do it and what you do and what your workday is like.

[As a way of getting feedback on my teaching, I participated in] the [X] survey, which is pretty much the only tool that we have that is supposed to be a non-evaluative survey . . . it prints you out a report; it asks the students to compare the objectives of the course with the progress that they have made on these various objectives. It gives you some feedback about your own teaching and their feelings about their progress.

I do some informal mid-semester evaluations in various forms. This year I did two questions: what are you enjoying the most and what are you not enjoying. I did that across the board this whole term just for my own personal information, but for what it's worth, I had a very difficult school year and nothing particularly went well. The feedback wasn't extremely helpful, but I also have not done a lot of . . . evaluations; I done some of those informal ones periodically but not religiously. And I didn't know a lot about the evaluation process. I have been here a long time but it has never been made really clear to me, but I should have been more proactive about . . . getting those [formal] evaluations done in every course in every term even if you are outside your [evaluation] cycle . . . to build up a bigger data set.

I think the overt purpose [of the faculty evaluation process] is to help instructors become better at what they do, but the implicit purpose is a way to get rid of instructors that are not good. On one hand, I don't see it much as a tool to help people [although] I think that was probably the intent of it.

I would like to be able to say that there is a good feeling involved [with the evaluation process], but there really isn't . . . for me at this point because I know my evaluations weren't good. It's a very nerve-racking process. I would assume that after last year I am going to be on Alerting and Guidance next year.

That's the odd thing because [being placed on Alerting and Guidance] has happened [before] in a way because when I first was hired, they did the first year [evaluation] and I never heard anything, and I didn't know how to submit anything. The way the co-ordinator did that was outrageous in that regard. I didn't know that there was really any kind of evaluation being done; I didn't even know what the outcome of that was until another year later and they said, "Oh, you were actually supposed to be on Alerting and Guidance all of last year" and I never knew that. The co-ordinator realized that she had messed up and she intervened and then I went on a year of mentoring and that brought me up to the last time I was evaluated.

[The mentoring] apparently it worked; there was an improvement and I wasn't terminated. And then basically nothing in between . . . and no one ever talks about evaluation unless you're in the formal evaluation cycle really.

I don't feel that [the evaluation process] is . . . very well explained. I thought that there was one year that you had . . . before you were evaluated. In my case it was one term. I don't really understand why it would be different for some people. There are all different interpretations of the collective agreement and what Human Resources does. I feel like none of it is very clear which leads to a lot of anxiety. You can read the collective agreement if you want to, but whatever co-ordinators are doing behind the scenes, they don't need to share with you. In my case, I was really shocked to find out that going back many years, the co-ordinator had kept records of conversations I had with her in the hall; she had gone and transcribed – a huge long list of little things that I hadn't even known that I had done necessarily, so . . . there is like this secret underground data collection going on.

The way that the co-ordinator's report was written almost refers not at all to any of the classroom visits. It's all about complaints; it's all about procedural errors that I've made. It has nothing to do with my actual teaching ability or what the co-ordinator witnessed as my teaching ability. . . . I find that whole process not to be helpful, and I find it to be demoralizing.

If the co-ordinator gets wind of some problems, she offers you some strategies, some mentoring before those evaluations get done. So that did occur in my case. In some ways I would say yes [the evaluation provides opportunities for teaching improvement], but in many ways I would say no . . . because it is done after the fact – you find out you are on Alerting and Guidance and you have one year to make some radical changes that are going to be full of a lot of pressure and you change everything about the way that you do it in the hope that you will get better. And if you don't, then the next step is termination, so it's not really helping someone be a better instructor along the way.

No, there is absolutely none of that [faculty enrichment]. There is no one helping you develop a plan, what would be a reasonable goal, as far as I can tell, unless it is departmentally different . . . for the most part, I find that although it's supposed to be collegial, people are quite frightened, quite protective of their material; they don't want to share anything, to show you their notes. In fact, in my file were some lecture questions I had given another instructor . . . instead of being used to help her, she was asked to use them to critique my questions from an evaluation standpoint, so without my knowledge, she went through those questions and said they weren't good questions. So, instead of being able to work collaboratively, that was used in my file as an example of how I am not good at what I do.

I don't think [the components of the faculty evaluation process accurately reflect teaching performance]. That's another thing, departments use different questionnaires and some of them are quite far away from what you are supposed to be evaluated on [according to] the faculty collective agreement. That was another thing that I had to research about this process is where do these questions come from? The collective agreement says that these are things that you are evaluated on and . . . half of the co-ordinator's report had nothing to do with how you are supposed to be evaluated.

Every department makes its own questionnaires, and I don't think that – well, it's very hard when you put so much weight on what the students say. I don't really agree with that . . . I am planning at this point to bring out that questionnaire because I got a blank copy and say, I am evaluating you and you are evaluating me. Let's get it all and be clear here. If I'm giving you feedback on your performance, you give me feedback and . . . [you saying] that [you] might get a lower grade as a result, that is not fair to me.

Given my recent experience with how the student [questionnaires] go . . . I'm the wrong person to ask because this particular thing has been very difficult and the co-ordinator evaluation was sort of everything. The colleague evaluations were a small part of that and the co-ordinator evaluation had everything I had ever done in that time frame. . . . I think the student responses have a lot of weighting and I have never sat on an evaluation committee so I don't know what ones they focus most on.

I teach a course that prepares students for a [fourth]-year course at [another university]. Nobody is keeping track – are they well prepared? How did they do there? How did they feel this course prepared them? You could hate everything about [the course] but if it does the job, then it's valuable. I mean that's not the goal for them to hate everything about it, but my goal ultimately is for them to succeed going forward and have some employable skills. And it's learning that should be evaluated. I'm not an evaluation specialist, but I don't think they are getting at the full picture of who I am from this process.

I have done [peer evaluations] but I don't like how it's done; I don't think it's very valuable in that traditional form that you use. . . . I feel competent to evaluate my own teaching, but everyone else has his or her own way of doing it and who am I to say that you're not doing it in the right way. I don't feel that [peer evaluations] are that valuable because you're only getting a [90-minute] snapshot and they see what you want them to see. I don't feel that there's a lot of weight put on those, and I don't think that a lot of instructors tend to get much out of them. I actually would prefer them much more if they were outside the official file, I guess, where the people could be more honest with you and say – rather than for them to have to say lots of good things and one area to work on – where they could really give you more feedback. I know mentoring is a tricky word but for people to do more

on a regular basis than just going and observing; they can take something out of it and you can give something back for it.

[To improve the evaluation process], I think that I could make up my own questions and administer those questions year to year – add and subtract questions and make my own kind of progress report on the things that didn't go well and things that went well in the form of self-submission in a sense. If you had some say in how the questions are worded then you could get at the answers that you were looking for rather than trying to fit a mould that may or may not be applicable to you. But then again, what value would it be if it was just what you designed . . . I don't know how you could do it to make this process less confrontational and more helpful.

I would like to see it change; . . . I would like to see more openness around [it]. Certainly around when people are first hired to know more about what that process is about and what they can do. How they can prepare and to offer mentoring to everyone – better access to that? Rather than having to go through the Co-ordinator and have it associated with a punitive process – just offer it to anyone who is looking . . . More transparency in terms of what you are being evaluated on and what kind of information can be collected about you, so that it's not just co-ordinators who can go way, way back to one extreme or another; there [should be] more guidelines for co-ordinators about what they should be writing in their reports. If they are transcribing conversations, they should be telling the person involved that that is going on. All of these things that are happening can and will be included in that file. That shouldn't be such a mysterious event to be presented with this.

To review my file I met the Co-ordinator in her office . . . and she read the report to me. Everything that I wanted to take with me, I had to photocopy. The original never left her office. . . . It's embarrassing to say so but there were . . . 100 maybe pages of appendices. It took quite a while to photocopy all of that and to figure out how I could challenge a lot of it; some of it's procedural stuff, emails, where she's asked me for a meeting.

Very early on in the term, the Co-ordinator asked me to meet with her and she said there's been a letter that twenty students have signed and it went right to the Dean. . . . She never let me see the letter but she paraphrased some components out of it and said "you better start working on this and I would like to offer you some help.". . . I went to [X] and I asked him for some help and the Faculty Learning Community is the other avenue I chose. She met with me another time and said there were some improvements but later on in the term, [she said] there's still some things [the students] don't like or something – the usual. And then at the end of the term, I delayed the [student evaluations] as much as possible so I could implement as many of the changes as possible but then the evaluations were done

for the fall term and I didn't hear anything else until I got to see the file [at the end of the year] and it was this [two inches] thick.

I tried my version of the flipped classroom. I guess, in retrospect, without anything of what you need to set that up. In this course in particular, there are 1.5 hours of lecture time and 1.5 hours of lab time and the labs are split up into smaller groups so I only have 1.5 hours a week. I subsequently found out that every other program in B.C. offers two lectures a week and a lab, . . . so I don't have very much lecture time basically to convey a lot of difficult material in this course; it's a [science course]. . . . I tried to give them some of the background; I tried to tell them about the research around learning and when you take ownership over it, you learn more. "You know what you can do is do a lot of preparation ahead of time outside of class, read through what I've got and come prepared to discuss it and work through it and do some group activities." . . . I tried to say that I don't want to spend the whole time up here reiterating what's in the textbook. I want you guys to come with your problems and the hardest parts of the readings and we'll work through them in our class time together. Well, the backlash was immediate and ferocious . . . the immediate feedback was apparently that I don't do anything in class; there's nothing going on and then immediately they started to not want to come and didn't know what to study for the exams, so there's mass panic because they won't do well on the exam. I got the Coles Notes of some of these complaints. I read the letter subsequently and half of it doesn't even make sense. So immediately, I basically changed a lot of what I was doing. Initially, I wanted them to sit in a "U" and right away they told me they hated that. Fine, of course, the shape of it doesn't matter; it's the idea that we can work together on some things but one of the comments on that letter was they don't learn anything from group work, so I basically went back to the old style but in some ways the damage was already done. They don't trust me; they don't have any confidence, and I, of course, lost my confidence. It's like a sort of downward spiral; it's hard; it's hard.

It's not like you know exactly or where there's written criteria for how you get a successful evaluation; you don't know – is it 50 percent or 75 percent? . . . It's a little disconcerting, but I have some good strategies for moving forward and support already.

At this point it has been very negative for me as I have already mentioned. Demoralizing, humiliating, surprising, revealing in that I know more – for that reason it's been good to see the student comments – if it could have been left at that but it's gone [on to be] so much more than that.

[This process] revealed that this organization is not very different from others in that you have to look out for yourself; no one is really looking out for you, not necessarily but you have to educate yourself about what your rights are. I've never spent a lot of time reading the collective agreement forwards and backwards, but maybe I should

have taken that on and been more proactive. Even then I could never have known what material had been collected.

Do we know what the strategic directions are? . . . I put that at the front of my self-submission because the institutional goals and the mission statement which are to create independent thinkers and employable individuals, which is a whole other discussion because we are not so much creating employable individuals; is that really the role of universities in general? So I thought it was interesting; some of the things that they are saying – institutional goals – the outcomes that we want to have students job ready, and creative and independent is not what is being evaluated and it's not what's being encouraged really on a day-to-day basis.

There's no way they are evaluating whether someone can do more problem solving. Are they developing better people skills? And those are all things they need to get out of a school-based program. Have they learned more about how to sell themselves, sell their skills, can they think on their feet; can they make their own decisions? It's not something that's in the objectives; it's not something that's being evaluated from what I understand of it.

If the university really believed it was a [special purpose teaching university], it would never have disbanded the TLC [Teaching and Learning Centre]. I don't see how they could say that [they are] a special purpose teaching university with no teaching centre or no teaching resources and no subject experts that can provide you with that. . . . I'm not that experienced with evaluations or with what actually works to create excellent instructors. I just don't know that. I still don't even after all this time; I'm disappointed that I don't have a better handle on it by now. When I first started teaching, they literally gave me the outline and said, "here you go" and . . . "bye, bye." We won't speak to you unless something is wrong. . . . Your evaluation shouldn't reflect every time that you tried something that didn't work. That's not really fair to you.

I already [made a self-submission to my file]; it's already with the challenge committee and then after that it will go to the evaluation committee and then after that a decision will be made, I guess a letter to the Dean, Co-ordinator, and to me saying presumably [I am] on Alerting and Guidance, and a committee will be struck for next fall. [Then] I decide with the co-ordinator who that will be [who will be on the committee]. Then I guess I will be evaluated in every course for the next year and then I guess what they do is – I think that file stays open so they can compare before to this next year to evaluate if you will continue employment. That's my understanding.

[The university] is trying to evaluate performance really. And say whether you're satisfactory or unsatisfactory. And so really they're just trying to get at who is not doing well and give them a warning that they'll be fired, is how I look at it. You've got a year to try and fix

it, I suppose, but then what? . . . What if it takes more than a year to develop and grow as an instructor?

I feel like if [the evaluation process] is something you could avoid, you would. In my personal experience, I think it could have been done a lot differently, handled it a lot better so it wasn't quite so confrontational, kind of aggressively negative and soul destroying. I think it could have been way more constructively, positively framed. A lot could have been built around it, to make it less like, "We're actively trying to get rid of you as an instructor," and more like, "We really want to build and grow you and give you really constructive feedback and precise ideas of what is lacking here." None of that was really done around here and so it does feel really like, "Okay, we're doing this and we're going to try to nail you to the cross."

So the meaning [of going through this process] to me is that I have to use it to find a better end. As I said, I can't let it destroy me. It has to be something I can turn around and use more constructively. You know what, maybe it is something, you know, you kind of have a midlife crisis of some kind and nobody would choose that but it's forced on you. So this is something like, layers have been torn open and I have to be willing to do the work to go in there and sort it out and make sense of it, like I was saying. And maybe that means there are other choices for me. Maybe it's just one of those things that really helps you grow and develop and, you know, there will be problems going forward but nothing of this scale. That's what I would certainly hope; I don't have it in me to go through that again like that.

Well, I certainly understand more about [the evaluation process] from the collective agreement standpoint. Like, what you should be evaluated on and I know a lot more going forward in terms of the challenge process. I still have no idea about some of it. Some of it's quite subjective, it's not really laid out. I understand the process better now, like I didn't know you could have more than one colleague evaluation for each term. So now I think what I'll do going forward is start amassing a bigger file myself – more colleague evaluations, more student evaluations, so I'll do them every term.

[The evaluation process] in my case it does feel like a court of law, because I've had to go through the co-ordinator report line by line and say there's no proof or there's no evidence or it's irrelevant. That's what you do for the challenge. Even though this is not a legal process, it feels very much like I've had to defend everything I've ever said or done in that time period. I would liken it to being on trial.

[The evaluation process should] be part of a multi-year process, where they say "Two years from now," or something, "you're going to be evaluated. Let's think of some ways we can help you as an instructor. Let's do some informal ones. Let's work on areas that you think you could improve." Or you know, "What things have you tried that haven't gone well?" More formal, I suppose, mentoring in the years

prior to that evaluation so that you really can address those concerns before they are permanent and your whole job depends on it. I don't think it should be so surprising, and I think the process should be discussed more openly.

It would be more supportive and less threatening. Less "If you don't fix this in a year you're out of here." More, "We value all the things you bring to the table, just some things could be done differently, have you considered some changes?" or whatever. Like, not everything in your whole career is staked on that. And as I said I don't think some of the stuff . . . of what value is it really? Okay, if the students aren't that happy in that moment who's to say they're not happy two or three years from now when they realize that [the course] set them up for success, or when they realize that they really did learn a lot and that's what they needed to know to go forward and work. I get that. How do you collect that data? How do you find them? How do you ask them? Then they've had more experience right? Then they've been to [another university] maybe, or maybe they've been out in the real world and they see that there isn't as much handholding and they value that. . . . I feel it's unrealistic for them to paint a really complete picture of you as an instructor given the very limited exposure and experience they have.

[Faculty enrichment conjures up] I would say support and opportunities. More collaborative work . . . more of a feeling like we're in it together rather than we're all trying to compete for each other's work, or like other people seeing your notes is the worst thing on earth. It could be more than that, much more than that.

[The university] needs to get the Teaching and Learning Centre up and running again and maybe in a new way. That's pretty critical if you're going to be a teaching university, I think. That they work one-on-one in the years prior and following evaluation, so that it's pretty much continuous – that you evaluate yourself and can be evaluated. I don't know about the weighting of it all, I still don't know exactly how things are weighted in terms of the colleague evaluation, the co-ordinator and the students – which have more of an importance. . . . Some of this stuff I only learned from the union only after the fact, like only when I had my seven days to get it all done. That's too late to learn. So I think the union should be more proactive in educating people about the evaluation process, I guess. What their rights are and what they should be doing in the years prior. Getting as many evaluations as possible. I just didn't really know that all of that stuff was being documented. So people should know that every time you write back to someone in email that's in their records, it's all stuff that they can bring up if they want. It's a little hard. Conversations you have with people can be written down, that can be in your file. You should just tell people, you know, protect yourself and do what you need to do. You can't go about, you know, worrying about being overheard or that people are writing down your conversations. But if you have any

concern about it, I guess you go and write your own transcript of it. But then it turns into a prison instead of an institute of higher learning.

I think, in general, for most people unless they're true optimists, it's easier to go down a negative road than to be positive. Because I guess we're just conditioned that way, to a certain extent. It's almost like a bad habit that you have to say, "Is it actually going to be helpful to dwell here?" We never do think about what happens if you look at all the good feedback and think, "how can I even make that better." Rather than saying, "I don't like B so I'll do A instead," maybe they're like, "I really like A, so I'll do more of A." Take it from the opposite way.

4.2.1. Commentary on Rachael's Profile

Rachael's profile presents a faculty member negotiating the Alerting and Guidance (A&G) provision of the faculty evaluation process. A&G is a disciplinary action that results when the departmental faculty evaluation committee forwards a recommendation to the Dean that the faculty member be placed on A&G because her performance has been deemed less than satisfactory. The Dean usually accepts the recommendation from the departmental evaluation committee. The faculty member's co-ordinator is responsible for convening a three- to five-member guidance committee, which must be approved by the faculty member, to work with the faculty member to address the shortcomings identified in co-ordinator, SETs, and peer reports.

Even though Rachael has been at the institution for more than 10 years, it is through the A&G process that she now learns the importance of building up a substantial database of SETs outside the regular evaluation cycle. The process around A&G for Rachael appears to have been botched from the outset. Her lack of knowledge around how the faculty evaluation process works has placed her in a precarious situation. She admits to not understanding how the process worked and she notes that she did not receive any information about the results of the SETs until a year later.

Timeliness of results clearly becomes an issue here coupled with Rachael's lack of understanding of the procedural aspect of the process, which results in her not taking the proactive steps to find out what information was contained in the SETs after the first round of formal evaluations in the first semester. This admission also points to her lack of knowledge of how to play the evaluation game. Even though she did ask students for

feedback on what they were enjoying the most and what were they not enjoying about her classes before formal SETs were distributed, she found the informal feedback not very helpful or reliable.

The guidance provision works for Rachael after the unsuccessful first formal evaluation, and it is important to note that this guidance provision in Rachael's mind is a form of mentorship, which she recognizes as a tricky word because of its association with its perceived nature within the A&G process. It is in the one-year period of guidance that is critical to her continuing membership in the organization. Rachael wants to see mentorship distanced from its perceived punitive nature because of its association with A&G, even though A&G is a disciplinary process.

Rachael's experience with the faculty evaluation system points to it as a surveillance measure that works to accumulate information outside of the co-ordinator and peer classroom observations. She also comments on the structured nature of the feedback that can be included in the co-ordinator and peer reports and that the evaluation process is unable to assess how well prepared students are for their future studies or success in the workplace. Her experience has her calling for more openness and transparency around the process and for training for co-ordinators on what can and cannot be included in a co-ordinator report.

Again, Rachael's lack of proactivity around seeking out the results of the SETs leave her unprepared for the results that come at the end of the academic year. This situation points to the co-ordinator failing to check the SETs after the first round of SETs and failing to provide Rachael with formative feedback prior to a formal evaluation. If the purpose of the evaluation is to ensure a fair evaluation process for the faculty member and a fair evaluation for the department on the faculty member's performance, this situation has failed everyone involved in the process: the faculty member, the department, the students, and the university.

Again Rachael takes a risk trying out the flipped classroom, which she readily admits she needed more understanding of and support to accomplish, within a formal evaluation period. This again points to her lack of understanding of how to play the evaluation game. By trying out a new pedagogical approach, which the students are

95

opposed to, she takes the risk of being placed on A&G again and faces the real possibility of dismissal.

When Rachael entered the institution as a new instructor, she admits to being given a course outline and basically left to her own devices to figure out the curriculum and how to deliver it. There appears to be no attempt to offer her support along the way from colleagues or co-ordinator. Again, Rachael has conversations with her co-ordinator only when the results of the evaluation are deemed less than satisfactory or when the co-ordinator learns of student complaints. It is the exceptional nature of the feedback that warrants a conversation about approaches to teaching and learning. As she reflects on the challenge provision of the evaluation process, she feels that it is a legalistic process and that she was on trial. She had seven days to prepare a self-submission to challenge the contents of the file, which contains extensive documentation that the co-ordinator included. Clearly, this whole process has been demoralizing for her.

Peer evaluations are also viewed as not very helpful but could be viewed as more helpful if they were outside the formal evaluation process. Of course, Rachael is free to invite colleagues to visit her class outside the formal evaluation process, but she does not appear to do so. She desires to see the process more supportive, more helpful in the years leading up to the formal evaluation, with better training offered to all faculty on what the process entails and what faculty members' rights are to a fair evaluation.

Rachael's profile highlights the shortcomings of the evaluation process. The process is focused on an outcome with little investment by the university to provide assistance for new faculty navigating the faculty evaluation process. This profile also points to the importance of offering mentorship to faculty when they arrive at the institution and to the significance of the probationary period. It is during this period that the university has the best chance of providing a pathway to improvement or a pathway to termination if performance standards are not met. The process is a quality-control measure to gauge the likelihood of continued membership in the organization.

In terms of Bourdieu's (1997) concept of capital, Rachael's cultural capital does not appear to be valued by the institution, her students, or her co-ordinator. Her *pedagogic[al]*[2] *habitus,* defined by Grenfell (2010) as a "set of generative dispositions, schemes of thoughts and practices, which can be actualised consciously . . . and unconsciously in a variety of teaching contexts (p. 92), that she has developed over her 10-year teaching career and through her years of schooling reflect her values, her approach to teaching and learning, and the teaching and faculty development practices that she engages in. However, the faculty evaluation process has her butting up against a system that she slowly begins to decode – she has been a fish out of water, but she gradually realizes through the disciplinary action of A&G how she can protect herself by including more sets of student evaluations throughout the whole evaluation process, not just when she is scheduled for evaluation. Through the uncomfortable process of A&G, she has developed what Bourdieu would call "a feel for the game" in the field of CU. The field reflects the structures of the evaluation process and the evaluation practices that faculty and administrators engage in and why they engage in them.

Bourdieu's (1977/2004) concept of doxa helps to explain Rachael's understanding of her restricted options in terms of her future at the institution; for her the evaluation process has one primary objective: to get rid of instructors who are not meeting performance standards. The evaluation process has alerted Rachael to what is at stake, which is defined by the evaluation procedures and the actions of the individuals that operationalize the process – in other words, what constitutes a legitimate faculty evaluation. The A&G process continues to reproduce existing inequities for faculty who are new to the university. Faculty who are unfamiliar with the process may be shocked, like Rachael was, to discover that their teaching performance has been deemed to be less than satisfactory and that they are facing disciplinary action. Not offering formal mentorship when new faculty begin teaching at the university will ensure that the A&G process will catch them unaware and continue to reproduce inequities for new faculty.

---

[2] Grenfell (2010, p. 92) uses the term pedagogic habitus. I use the term pedagogical habitus. For the purposes of this thesis, these terms should be regarded as interchangeable.

4.3. [Simone's] Profile

[My journey into the world of administration] happened because of two things: One, when I was a faculty member teaching at [X] University, I was coerced into being chair of the faculty senate. I really didn't want to do the job, but it was one of those things, I had to do it. I found after two years that I did it really, really well. So, the administration there saw leadership potential in me and sent me to the HERS Institute because they wanted me to think about becoming an administrator. I said I'm not interested; I'm the wrong person to send; I don't want to be an administrator; I don't fit the prototype and I love teaching. They said, "No, no, go, if you decide not to, it's okay." I went and I actually met a lot of women at the HERS Institute who didn't fit the prototype of administrators, so I thought there isn't a one size fits all, so maybe if I found the right institution or the right job as an administrator, I would want to do this.

The second part of the story was the epiphany in the classroom about the same time I was contemplating this move over to administration. I was still teaching my courses and it was a big lecture hall and I had done a big section on social change and social movements and I will never forget – a student's name I don't know – in this big crowd, raised his hand and said, "Dr. Simone, do you really think that an individual can make a difference?" And the question just sort of stopped me in my tracks and I said, "You have to think that, don't you?" I said, "Look at history. It's usually not an individual – it's a collection of individuals – but people can make impact on individuals, on society, etc." But I never really tested that theory. And so I thought about it for a long time, and I thought administration is really sort of a test of that question: Can you really make a difference in an organization or in the holistic learning of students? Maybe I have to do this or I can never really go in and teach that class again and answer feeling confident in my response. It was one of those moments where there was a calling and you just knew you had to know an answer to that question.

I have never taken a traditional path to administration. I always assumed roles in an administrative capacity in areas that were unchartered territory or cutting edge for a university. My first real job at [X] in the administrative ranks was called special assistant to the provost, which became Associate VP. The portfolio consisted of all these odds and ends of things that nobody wanted. I thought of it as the provost of unwanted things. And all the things that nobody wanted were all those things that were really the future of post-secondary. It was service learning, it was interdisciplinary, outcomes assessment of general education, it was a teaching and learning centre, it was the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; it was the bellwether of all of the next wave and nobody knew where to package it or put it, so I had to invent it all. The new faculty orientation – we had to revamp it – anything that was new I got. And it was really

exciting although it was also really hard work because you are working in a system that has a particular way of doing things, a particular way of knowing, so you are always looking for those early adapters and the innovators in the institution to help advance those things. It's a different skills set that you need and you don't have a nice portfolio of people who report to you. You had to find your support by going across sectors and student life, academic, administration; it was really interesting.

I even taught when I was the VP Academic at [X]. I had an appointment that permitted me to, I didn't have to; I wanted to teach, and I would teach here if the union would let me. All told – if you added it up – all my administrative years I had one foot still in a class or two or team teaching – so probably I have been in post-secondary for about 30 years. I have probably taught for 24 years.

I am old enough to have seen the whole gamut and evolution [around getting feedback on teaching]. When I started my career, I think the way in which faculty were evaluated was more traditional. Students filled out evaluations; those always made a big impact and you would have the occasional peer observation, which I never found all that useful. Well, you know, it was always you are doing fine – [there was] not a lot of good rigorous training to do peer evaluation. It wasn't until I got deeply involved with the Carnegie Foundation – the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning – where I came across schools and colleagues who were deeply engaged in the teaching portfolio approach, which when I came up to be full professor, I decided instead of submitting the standard – here are all my evaluations, here are the peer reviews – I decided to actually model my final movement from associate to full [professor] on the portfolio approach. I spent a lot of time preparing this portfolio – looking at reflective practice of my own teaching, thinking about what those student evaluations really meant, looking at how I had modified my teaching in keeping with feedback and best practices in the field. I found of all the things I've done in terms of my own professional development and teaching that was one of the most useful things I had ever done – to use the teaching portfolio approach. And I think at a campus level, if they could embrace it so your colleagues were using that too, and you had a group of teaching scholars to talk these things through, it would be even richer.

Teaching evaluations are one of those things that faculty care deeply about; I've also taught at a small liberal arts school in [X] and a big research university [X] and a small school in [Europe]. Based on my experience at [X], . . . I know faculty and the faculty senate spent endless hours debating what is the perfect student evaluation form. I can tell you now that there is no perfect form. At [X] they had finally shifted over to a set of three or more different forms that faculty could use – one for small seminars, one for large lectures – it depended on the type of course that you were teaching, but you had to adhere to the standardized form and it was pretty much fill-in-the-blank, Likert-

type scales, then there was always a place at the end to get students to comment. I always found the narrative pieces to be the most interesting and telling pieces. And the Likert scales – what they did if you put those side by side over a series of years, you did see some trends and where you had your highs and lows in your teaching style and you could work on them. I found them useful, but I found them to be quite incomplete because students don't always know what they don't know. And I think if anything students are a bit too kind in their evaluations. If you can engage students and entertain students, you always got good evaluations, but it didn't answer the question are they learning anything, or are they learning any useful information – the kind of information that will take them to the next level. That you can't get in a student evaluation. That's why I think a more portfolio-based approach or working in a community of other learning scholars would be most useful.

And by the way, we were required at [X] to have every single class evaluated – there was no getting around it. When you came up for rank and tenure, you better darn well have every one of those courses in that binder or you were suspect.

The [student evaluations were] your property. You had to share it with your peers when you came up for tenure and promotion for review. We had periodic review; even after you were at the associate level, you were required every three years to go through a complete review. Your colleagues and your department would comment on it. Yes, they [student evaluations] were your property and you had to manage keeping them and organize them for review.

I learned that the kind of end-point evaluation – the summatives – were really not very useful because you couldn't modify or change your teaching – every class is a bit different – so what worked well one time maybe wasn't working so well next time. But if you waited until the very end to get that sort of feedback, it was useless. So, I created my own template to do a more formative evaluation, often just to see if the course as a whole was going the right way, what we could do better. I taught mostly large lecture sessions, so for me that was the only way of getting that kind of feedback.

My experience with the faculty evaluation process at Capilano is a very different experience from what I am used to in any of the other institutions that I have worked in. I have my suspicions, but I can't prove it in data form, that we don't have a very rigorous system here. And I don't think faculty evaluation is about the punitive side of it; I think Cap's approach is a very punitive approach. I really think good faculty evaluation systems are formative; they help you improve your teaching, and they should not be used to penalize people. I had problems with tenure and promotion system where the process was often used for advancing rank and tenure; I think it's a misuse of those evaluative forms.

I am really not quite sure, to tell you the truth [what the purpose of the evaluation process is]. Unless it's window dressing on what we consider a component of a teaching university. I don't think it accomplishes much that has a useful purpose. I see it as a lot of busy work for co-ordinators. If it were left up to me, I would just stop doing it altogether and figure out a totally different way. I think it's a colossal waste of a lot of people's effort with very little benefit.

I have to hope that [the faculty evaluation process provides opportunities for teaching improvement]. I guess, like an evaluative process, people can choose to ignore it – just go through the motions of doing it as a pro forma function. But I would hope that some people would – maybe through the peer review – actually have somebody who was more of a senior teacher or who could at least provide some feedback that might be useful or instructive. I think it might be hit or miss depending on one's own proclivity for accepting feedback and making modifications as well as having the right person in place to do the evaluation. I suspect some good comes from it but I don't know how much.

I suspect [the faculty evaluation process provides opportunities for faculty enrichment – continuous improvement in teaching and professional growth] only for the most reflective and astute. But I don't know – that's why I was such a proponent of the portfolio approach but even more so in the context of a learning community of scholars. To me, that is the ideal model. I don't think it's any more work than what we are investing in the co-ordinator model. I think it actually gives people the tools necessary to be scholarly teachers.

I think we can learn a lot from each other, certainly across disciplines, sometimes there're the richest conversations. I think you have got to figure out an organizational structure in which that happens and give people time to do it. It doesn't happen without a time commitment and a belief that this is actually going to improve. The preparation of becoming a scholarly teacher is a lot like being a research scholar. You don't start out as a research scholar knowing everything or doing your pinnacle work. Your professional development as a teaching scholar should mirror your professional development as a research scholar. If you can't be progressing as a teacher and honing your craft, learning new things . . . I think you're deadwood, you're dead in the water – I would be bored out of my skull.

My first inkling that there was something wrong with the faculty evaluations is when a faculty member who was respected and well established . . . talked to me about when she came up to her five-year teaching review, she was sick in the bathroom, and I thought what kind of system does that to people. There has to be a lot of uncertainly built into it and a lot of punitive outcomes or people wouldn't be reacting that way. I never felt that way because I felt I had more control because I could provide more evidence of scholarly teaching through student evaluations and peer review; it was a better

system. Sure, you always worried that a colleague might have it out for you. But any system that gives people that kind of reaction, there is something wrong.

I think every component [of the faculty evaluation process] is a piece of the mosaic, but the whole mosaic really isn't there unless you really get people to engage in reflective practice on their own teaching and try to assemble it in a meaningful way and set some goals. It's an incomplete process to just get the feedback and not give us a place to make sense of it all. It's the meaning making of it that's missing. To me, one of the greatest pleasures I had as a teaching scholar was to be able to take those component pieces and see patterns and you think, "Okay, I could improve here," and it gives you something to go towards. I have to say that one of the biggest letdown moments in my life was after about 12 years of teaching, I got the outstanding teacher of the year award at [X], which is a very coveted award because there is only one among a faculty of 600. You know you have to be doing something right to get that. But after I got it, I thought is that all there is? If this is the statement that this is the best that I am ever going to be, when I knew in my heart of hearts that I could be better and the technologies were changing and I needed to manage and grasp those technologies. I thought this . . . is one of the reasons why I went into administration too [because] I could see on the horizon the need for a university to create places and spaces for faculty to continue to develop professionally in teaching.   And I thought, well, I would like to do that; I would like to figure out how to do that. And we did; we built a really great teaching and learning centre, some faculty fellowships, programs where they could work collaboratively, learning communities, some conferencing. We got heavily involved in the Carnegie Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; we created a Teaching and Learning Academy where faculty and students actually had dialogues about learning. So, there was a lot of work to be done.

I think [whether faculty are competent to complete a co-ordinator and/or peer evaluation] it's probably hit or miss. I think some probably are but I don't think – I might be out of the loop on this, but I have never seen any advertisements for real progressive training. I think the only place I have seen it is their PD days – midyear and end year. There's a little bit but not enough and I certainly heard enough grousing from co-ordinators who feel ill-prepared and also not empowered to really help or make the kind of recommendations that they feel really forced to make. That must be an uncomfortable situation as well.

The most important components of a faculty evaluation system are certainly a lot of opportunity for reflective practice and interpretation, a space for you as a teacher to review the component pieces that comprise the evaluation. I think more multiple data points are really important and then a place to reflect on. I do like the idea of not doing it in isolation but doing it with a group of peers who are not

there to evaluate you but to help you to advance. Take it out of the whole notion of monetary rewards, rank and tenure. We don't expect people to do research that way, why would we expect them to do teaching development that way? Those are really important pieces. I think one of things that I would definitely axe here would be the Alerting and Guidance system; [it's a] bad idea because . . . it carries such a public stigma around it. We take the people who are academically struggling . . . pull [them] out of [the] classroom . . . without some support mechanism to help [them] upgrade.

I think faculty evaluation should be seamless and continuous. I hate this notion of this five-year or this ten-year or this three-year [evaluation]. I think you should have your student feedback [student questionnaires]; I think it's your property. If you are doing faculty evaluation for the purposes of continuous improvement, we should encourage people to join communities of teaching scholars – perhaps around the pedagogies of what they want to improve upon or learn more about. Let's say, for example, that you would really like to hone your skills around building teams around classroom assignments, so you work for a year with a group of faculty from other disciplines who share their best practices and what worked and didn't work. I think that we should allow faculty to take a lot more risks in the classroom. That's why the quantitative – somebody's at 4.5; someone else is a 3.5 – 3.5 isn't as good as the 4.5 – *no*, because maybe that faculty member at 3.5 is doing some really gutsy things in those classrooms. You have to give people the space to explain why the evaluations came out the way they did. We've all had failures in classrooms. I think that's part of the learning process too as a teacher. I remember last year at Faculty Orientation telling new faculty to take more risks in the classroom. You learn from your mistakes; you'll do it better the next time, and your learners learn too when you take risks as long as you are up front with them. I don't think we should be punitive for taking risks as long as we learn from our mistakes and improve. There has to be an element of forgiveness built into the evaluative process.

When [I used the word seamless I meant] faculty evaluation isn't something we have to do at the end of a course or at the end of three years; it has to be part of our everyday practice. It won't look the same for everybody. That is why it always troubles me that there is this very rigid – you know, this is the form that you must use – these questions don't work so well for somebody else. But as long as there are some processes in play that they can look over time and see their improvement. I think we have got to let people tailor it to their disciplines and build it into their everyday practice of teaching. Maybe we don't have to share every bit of data with everybody, so if at the end of a class period, you want people to take a minute and write down on a piece of paper what worked for you today in class and what didn't. That's for your information for you to use. So very seamlessly we should collect this information.

The [adjectives I would use to describe the faculty evaluation process] are cumbersome, antiquated, and punitive. I don't think it's learning-centred; it's teaching-centred. I would really like it to move to a learning-centred approach.

I think that the real test of a good teacher is not how you teach or the teaching etiquette, which is so much of the evaluative process; it should be focused on what are your students learning. That doesn't mean we do standardized tests to see who is passing at a certain level; it means that a student comes in at this level and goes out at this [higher] level. That's the important thing because all of the learners are different in terms of where they come in and how they are getting there. But a better way is knowing if the most salient outcomes in those courses are really being mastered by the majority of students. That's to me the proof of a great teacher.

The process around faculty evaluation should change; there is no doubt about that. How is a hard question. What makes it hard here is because I see a fair amount of it embedded in the collective agreement and that is a very difficult document to modify. It should have never been put in the collective agreement. This is not where it should live. I think it should live in the faculties themselves. That each faculty should have a policy – and they might look different and that's okay; there's nothing wrong with that. But the faculty should develop their own evaluative processes and follow them and they should be the gatekeepers of those things. The Deans are obviously there in terms of being a guide but they are not the punitive gatekeeper. It should really be a more peer-managed system.

[The faculty evaluation system does not support the strategic directions of the university] and that's a problem. I think our merging collective vision is that we have the potential to be one of the finest learning universities in B.C., but I think our evaluation process is a real barrier, a stumbling block to that. We should actually blow it all up and put in place a model that's progressive, based on best practice, fluid because best practices change and that really fits the needs of our learners today – it's learning-focused not teaching-focused. I think that looks quite different from what we have got right now. To me, faculty evaluation means continuous improvement and professional development in teaching and in understanding learning.

I think the experience of a faculty member going through the evaluation process – the reality is – and I'll speak from my former experiences as a faculty member where the evaluative process was mostly used for promotion of rank and tenure, there's a lot of politics involved in it. You collect this data – student questionnaires and observations – but it always takes on a political element within the context of that department in terms of people's perceptions of what is good teaching? What is teaching? I think back to a colleague of mine who was doing a lot more group work and collaborative learning – this was way before it was even thought much about at the university level

– and her department chair (it was her three-year review), he was scheduled to observe her classroom and he came in and she knew he was coming and he said, "I'll come back when you're really teaching." These are the things that you deal with in departments because sometimes the people who are the evaluators are not state of the art or very progressive or open [to other approaches]. Besides, there are all these issues around grade inflation and popularity, so it gets ugly because I think it is so closely aligned with the reward structure. This is bizarre. It's also the case [this isn't so much here] but my experience at [X] which is technically a teaching university – it's not a flagship teaching university – within most of the academic departments, the emphasis was still mostly on research and it was impossible, really, to move through the tenure and promotion process if you couldn't do research. You could be a terrible teacher and get by.

I don't think we have a very logical system; it's a punitive system; it's a system that doesn't achieve, as I said in my opening statement, . . . professional development and continuous improvement. It doesn't do that. The means don't match the end at all.

Unfortunately, the faculty evaluation process sends the message that these are the bureaucratic hoops that one must jump through in order to fulfill the progression of a career. But they are bureaucratic hoops. Again, I think it sends a really bad message to faculty. And faculty set up bureaucratic hoops for the students so we are inundated with all of these tick points that are meaningless. We spend so much time and energy on these checkpoints that really contribute nothing to the learning of the students or the professional development of the faculty.

An ideal faculty evaluation system – the more you can distance it from the reward structure – of money, promotion, all of that, the better. The more it is controlled by the faculties themselves – the peer model – I think is the best way to go. I think there has to be opportunities for people to take risks, to innovate – it's like research. You don't do research in isolation; you build on a body of knowledge. And you have to know that best practices body of knowledge, build on that, try new things. It's an iterative process.

An analogy for a faculty member going through the evaluation system . . . I think it's like making sausage. There's bits and pieces thrown in there and it's all ground together and in the end you get an end product that isn't exactly what you had anticipated it to be.

[Faculty enrichment means] professional development and it doesn't happen just in the process of being rigorous and scholarly in teaching, but I also think that if we are really going to be a learning institution, we got to find ways to find more resources to send faculty to professional development opportunities outside of Capilano. We definitely need a bigger pool of funds. I would definitely love it if we had a fund where people could apply – not by seniority – [but] based

on what they want to study or learn. To go to some conferencing around scholarly teaching outside of their disciplines if possible or within disciplines, it doesn't matter. There are so many of those conferences out there. Capilano gives nobody an opportunity to take time out. Our teaching load is actually too heavy; it makes it difficult to be a good teacher with the teaching workload we have here. I bet faculty would be surprised to hear me say that, but it's too big. I think we also need to find a way to give people sabbaticals earlier in their career. You want to give that sabbatical opportunity in year six or seven. That's when you need it.

I think the best way to approach [faculty evaluation] it is to start a task force; the Senate could strike a task force and it would have to have students, certainly faculty, a couple of administrators and vision what they think – forget what we've got – stop trying to fix what we've got and park that. In a perfect world, if we could start from ground zero, what would this thing look like? Build a parallel system and try to get the union to take out all that language in the collective agreement that pertains to evaluation. There shouldn't be in a collective agreement any language about evaluation – it doesn't belong in a collective agreement because it is so cast in stone that you have no flexibility. As I said yesterday, it's probably not going to be a one size fits all; it might look different across faculties. I'm very open to that, but I think if we thought creatively about it we could create a framework around it that would be an opportunity to develop certain parameters within the box. . . . You fix it; it has to be on a progressive basis. You tell us what that looks like and what works best for your faculty. I don't want it so labour intensive that it burns people out.

Sometimes I think the evaluative process no matter how good [it is] gets in the way of good teaching. It's an irony, isn't it? Because you need the evaluative process – I would never want to be in an institution where there isn't some mechanism. But every time you use the word evaluation, it's "warning, warning." It's the way in which it has evolved that makes it almost counterproductive to be innovative, to try new things in the classroom and to really excel as teachers. How do you disassociate so much of the baggage of the evaluative process – the fear in it? And that's part of it – that there is this whole emotional piece wrapped up in it and you strike a task force and, oh my god, the fear of it. The notion that administration wants to do bad things; it's like *stop*. Believe it or not, we are trying to help here.

In the future, there is going to be greater and greater pressure put on by government and the public. You see it in the high schools and the elementary schools already in terms of the accountability piece of what are students learning. Wake up, universities, because this isn't going to be our isolated kingdom any more to do exactly as we please. I hope I don't see the day when government enforces standards around this because they won't be the right standards.

106

4.3.1.   Commentary on Simone's Profile

Simone views the portfolio approach for her application for full professor at another institution as one of the most useful professional development activities that she has undertaken.   The portfolio approach emphasized reflecting on her practice, understanding what the feedback from the SETs meant, and tracking how she "modified her teaching in keeping with feedback and the best practices in the field."   Taking this approach to the next level would allow for a group of teaching scholars to learn and collaborate together, which for Simone is the best approach to continuously improving and developing professionally.

She has found that the typical SETs are incomplete because students "don't always know what they don't know" and she learned more from the narrative comments on the SETs that students provided. The SETs were her property to learn from. Simone recognizes the importance of formative evaluations and values them much more than summative evaluations, which offered her no opportunity to incorporate students' suggested changes because they came too late in the semester.   SETs under the current model at CU are not the property of the faculty member; in fact, faculty often wait far too long to view the results of the SETs for them to inform any changes to practice during the academic year in which the SETs were distributed.

Simone clearly sees the approach to faculty evaluation at CU as punitive and the evaluations of little benefit.   Her example of a well-respected and well-established teacher sick in the bathroom when she is undergoing an evaluation makes her wonder what is it about the system that results in people reacting that way.   She suggests eliminating the A&G system because of the public stigma around it.   These comments also reflect the fear factor that resides in the current model of faculty evaluation and align with many comments from other participants in this study. Simone's observation that "the evaluative process, no matter how good [it is], gets in the way of good teaching" highlights the challenges that faculty evaluation processes must deal with. The process needs to encourage, not discourage, faculty innovation in the classroom. However, the fear factor that encompasses faculty evaluation is real largely because the current model is a summative model that gauges an instructor's membership in the institution.

Simone encourages new faculty who attend the New Faculty Orientation to take risks in their classrooms and to learn from the risks they have taken. If the quantitative results from the SETs are less than desired, the faculty member should have the space to explain why the results came out the way they did. This advice is very good advice; however, since new faculty are not familiar with the faculty evaluation process, they may learn that taking such risks might mean that their results on the SETs and perhaps from the observations included in the co-ordinator report, which is based on the SETs, may result in a less than satisfactory evaluation. This approach to evaluation could, therefore, be perceived as punitive. Although a faculty member is given the opportunity to submit a self-submission to the file to provide context for the results of the evaluation, the faculty member does so to provide a broader perspective of his/her approach to teaching and learning. However, it is quite likely that the new faculty member would not be aware that the departmental evaluation committee could choose to place this member on Alerting and Guidance and the faculty member would not be aware of the public stigma that is attached to it. Consequently, it is essential that new faculty attend an information session that explains the purpose, procedures, and possible outcomes of the faculty evaluation process.

Simone's administrative and pedagogical habitus enable her to compare the current CU model to other models that she has experienced at other institutions; her cultural capital is demonstrated in her descriptions of various approaches to faculty evaluation, her knowledge of faculty evaluation processes, and her clearly stated preferences for how she would like to see faculty evaluation reconceptualized. Her preferences for changes to the faculty evaluation process are reflections of her cultural trajectory, her habitus.

Viewing the current faculty evaluation process as a barrier to the university becoming one of the finest learning universities in the province has Simone envisioning an evaluation process that would reside in the faculty divisions; these divisions would be charged with developing their own policy and implementation. Since Simone's power depends on her administrative position within the field of CU and the amount of capital she possesses, her ability to change evaluation practice can only be done in relation to the structures that exist at the institution. Moreover, it is social capital that accelerates

cultural capital, and change depends on the social capital of the administration and the faculty within the institution. Social capital must be built on trust in order for change in faculty evaluation to even be considered thinkable or doable at CU. Simone has the desire to be a change agent and to stretch the parameters of what is considered thinkable and doable regarding faculty evaluation. Her heterodox views on faculty evaluation bump up against the current orthodox view of faculty evaluation and challenge the natural, taken-for-granted assumptions about the faculty evaluation process. For example, Simone would like to see the removal of the A&G provision in the collective agreement. She points to the inequity of placing faculty on A&G; faculty are disadvantaged by this process because of its public stigma, which is a form of symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Since A&G diminishes the cultural value of an instructor's pedagogical habitus and since new faculty have limited social capital, which restricts their access to resources and to information on the faculty evaluation process, placing instructors on A&G could be viewed as a form of symbolic violence because it can limit their aspirations of a teaching career at the institution. Simone has the desire to dismantle this form of symbolic violence and to challenge the orthodox view of faculty evaluation at the university. The faculty evaluation process is based on the concept of collegiality – that faculty can improve their teaching performance, develop their pedagogical habitus based in part on the guidance of their colleagues. Simone values the collegiality and collaboration that communities of teaching scholars can provide as a vehicle for faculty members to continuously improve and develop professionally. In addition, her desire to remove A&G from the evaluation process, her belief that SETs should be the property of the faculty member, and her bold suggestion that faculty divisions be given the responsibility to design and implement their own faculty evaluation process signal her desire to reconfigure forms of capital and to challenge the orthodox, taken-for-granted assumptions regarding faculty evaluation at the institution.

4.4.   [Sandra's] Profile

> When I was 21 years old, I started teaching. I taught school for three years, and in those three years I taught private school, public school, rural school, urban school, and I taught elementary school and junior high. I found that I enjoyed the teaching aspect, but really was not fond of children and parents. I was in the wrong place and I also did

not find it stimulating enough. I went back and got an MBA in finance and accounting, and I never had any intention of coming back to teaching. When I first went to work after my MBA, I was doing operational auditing, which is looking for cost-savings in an organization, with a Fortune 100 company. I did that for three years then I went through a divorce, moved back to Canada and ended up working for a Canadian retailer. With that retailer, I also did auditing for a short period of time, then became inventory manager, then controller of that particular company. While I was there, I did a lot of leadership activities while teaching different store managers . . . on how to manage their inventory in a better way, how to make more money in their bonuses and all those kinds of things. There was a lot of my educational background tied into what I was trying to get these store managers to do and include in their day-to-day operations. I never really felt that those two were separate. I had a large staff of about 30 young people working for me, doing a variety of activities, straight accounting, and inventory management, different kinds of things. Then I moved on to do consulting for a period of time for a large consulting firm, and then I did it privately.

My husband saw an ad in the newspaper for an instructor at a [satellite] campus of Capilano, and he said, "Hey, why don't you apply for this job?" I thought I could do it for four months, no problem, and I've been here for 20 years. Getting back into education was not really the plan, but it was at a funny juncture in my life because I had stopped working, because I had young babies, and I knew that I was going to have to get back into [the workforce] and teaching was a good thing for me to be doing – it wasn't by design.

From my first experience teaching at Capilano, I really enjoyed it. There were only about 14 students in the program that fall so it was a very manageable experience for me. I taught four different courses (there were five courses in the program). I was there full time, and everybody went away happy and I did a good job. After that I then had some opportunities teaching in North Vancouver, at the main campus. There were bigger classes. I did have one class that . . . I did poorly, but every class I've taught since then, I've done a good job.

I have been teaching at Capilano for 20 years. At Capilano you can build up your workload doing different kinds of things, I taught a variety of different courses. My career here at Capilano has progressed over the years. It wasn't through planning that I became convenor or started to be responsible for the recruiting and curriculum design for a course or program. It just happened that somebody left and I was the person teaching the courses who was interested, so I became the convenor of those courses, responsible for recruiting and curriculum. It was pretty similar to the way I became co-ordinator. The previous co-ordinator was having some personal issues and he wanted to step down for a year. I'm a bit of a control freak and I thought I could do a better job than the other person who was putting

his name forward so I seized control. I've been [coordinating] for five years now.

[Since] evaluation is a large part of co-ordinating, I'd like to talk about how evaluations were done when I was working in business. When working in industry, there's a different format to the evaluation process, so as a controller there would be annual evaluations of all employees, there would be times for informal evaluations throughout the year, and opportunities for feedback on an ongoing basis. My boss, who was VP at the time, he would provide me with ongoing feedback on my performance and my areas that required development. In many ways there was a lot of opportunity for growth and for recognizing my strengths and weaknesses in contrast to the process that's used at Capilano, which is a very formal process with fewer opportunities for informal feedback. It's very structured feedback.

For me as an instructor, I really don't know how often I get evaluated, I think it's every three years [it's every five years]; it's not very frequent and enough time passes between that I never know when the next evaluation is going to occur. What happens during evaluation as an instructor is someone comes into my classroom to observe [my teaching] the class, generally for only a portion of the class, and then writes up an evaluation with a couple of comments on my participation in the department and in the university. For each time that I've been evaluated at Capilano, with the exception of one time, I've never had a sit-down conversation about my evaluation and what areas of improvement I have [to make] and how I could improve my contribution to the university. I'm somebody who is relatively hard on myself . . . but I think I would have improved more if I had ongoing feedback conversations about my instructional ability over the years.

I want to talk about the one time I did have feedback. I mentioned before that I taught a course [math] where I did a terrible job. And during that time I did get some feedback because I was so surprised that my evaluations were so negative. I was surprised about the importance of this evaluation in the scheme of things. Because I had thought that since I had done so well in the previous term, that one course out of six [was] not such a bad rate. But I didn't realize how strongly this would affect my ability to continue at the university.

I was really perplexed about the lack of information I had on the importance [of this evaluation] but I also had not had any feedback during the term when this course had been going poorly – because I think others had known that things weren't going well. I was kind of not really paying attention; I just wasn't into that course; I did deserve to be skewered because I did a poor job. But at the same time, no one really took me to task during that time period and said, "You need to do this" and I was hired at the last minute. I was not a [math] instructor, I did not have the tools to be an [math] instructor, and I should have been helped in that process.

I would have been quite willing to have accepted assistance and taken advice. If somebody had said, "Sandra, you're not doing so well," I would have been happy to say, "Well, what could I do, what suggestions do you have for me?" That was a missed opportunity for my education, but at the same time I'm perfectly happy being told I can never teach [math] again.

This was the one time, when at the end of evaluation process, I think people were surprised that I was upset and concerned and wanted to do a better job. At that point, another instructor sat down with me and told me I could have done this, should do that, and how I could respond – how to look after my reputation more or less, from an evaluation point of view. Less [about] how to improve my teaching . . . I had no idea that [the evaluation] mattered so much.

My evaluations for the last 20 years have been good. [My evaluation file] gets signed off by the evaluation committee, it goes to the Dean, and . . . a couple of times the Deans have written back nice notes, "Thank you for the contribution," and mentioning something specific. But the funniest one I got was addressed to *Mr.* Sandra, which was similar to, "Dear occupant, thank you for your contribution," and it was signed by the Dean, so it really wasn't the recognition for having done a good job either.

As a co-ordinator, I have tried to make sure that the information in the evaluations is pretty practical and nobody can test it in a grievance. Make sure it's in line with what the students have said in their evaluations as well as what I've observed in the class. Usually, I make sure those two things are there and I support it with comments from the student evaluations. Certainly, I know that I have a bias when I go into the class. In the past, for three of the five years, it had been my understanding that I could only go into the class once during the year of that evaluation, then I was told I can go in twice, and I think recently I was told I can go in a lot more than that. But it is unclear to me what my rights are as a co-ordinator as to how many times I can go in, how involved I can be in the teaching. Generally, I have a strong sense if this instructor is working out prior to going to the class that I'm observing. If the instructor does not do a good job on that particular day, I think, "Well, my goodness, they can't be bothered to put on a good show for that particular day." It's only one out of 26 [classes] for that particular course. It makes me think they haven't put the effort in the other days either or even less of an effort. I don't think one day or two days or three days is a very good representation of what goes on in the classroom. I think it can provide a confirmation of what I have seen in the student evaluations, but it's not the same as the other kinds of ancillary pieces of information that I've heard from conveners and other students.

If I know that an instructor is not working out well, . . . I heard through conveners; I heard it through the person who handles the program; I heard it through some students. [For example, I knew]

that an instructor needed some assistance right away, so we were able to get her to do a "how am I doing" type of evaluation in her class. She got the feedback, and she shared that feedback, which wasn't positive, and we got her involved in some mentorship to help her with her teaching. She has received some support that way; she was a bit resistant but I think she did learn some things from that process. The evaluation process is completely separate to what has been happening on the side. I know that she has struggles and I'm trying to deal with that before I have to sit down and do an evaluation. I haven't gone into her class formally. I've gone in once and I'll be going in again in the next few weeks. At that point, I'll sit down and compile her student evaluations, which I've already looked at, and then I will write it up. But hopefully it won't be as much of a massacre as it would have been if I had just done what I'm supposed to do, which is go in once or twice, accumulate student evaluations, write down my observations, and that's that.

The formal evaluation process I don't think will provide much assistance to this faculty member, not nearly as much assistance as the other activities we're providing, which had much more value for her. I'd also say that in the evaluation process I spend a lot more energy on the ones where the instructors are weak either trying to build a case so that they won't be able to stay at Capilano, or I'm trying to put it in a way that they're really going to learn from the process. But either way I'm trying to build enough information in it so that the person could ultimately be shoved out the door if necessary.

[For example], I think back to the way it was for another instructor whom we did build up a case for. She committed all sorts of crimes. She would write weird emails to students; she would rearrange classes. She broke lots of rules, and by breaking the rules that information is accumulated. She behaved inappropriately, said threatening things. So those kinds of things were built up separately – separate from the evaluation process, although there were lots of things in the student evaluations that would also support it. But it was built up enough so that she was not able to become regularized when she had been an instructor for five years which is a whole other story because she should not have passed the probationary period because of her evaluations. In her evaluations, she was only teaching a couple courses that she was very familiar with. She was good at those courses; it was her area of expertise. She passed the probationary period, then it was like me and [math] where the instructor was put into teaching courses she was not familiar with and then she was not successful in teaching those courses. But because it was past her probationary period, she was not undergoing another evaluation for another block of time [five years].

Generally what I do is after I've written up the text of the evaluation, I go through it generally with some of the new instructors. With the old instructors, I see less value in that, and I know that everyone has developmental areas and I should have sat down, but it's

uncomfortable for me to do that because it's not something that is normal.   If somebody is a weak instructor and not supporting the department, I would be more likely to take them on.   It's hard because of our collegial model; I find it really awkward to be able to call people on some of their issues.   I'd say an issue with one instructor is that he missed many meetings.   As a person responsible for a program, he should not have missed any, even if it's scheduled on a day he would like to have for doing prep at home.   But I didn't call him on that because we're friends, and I think it would have affected future working relationship and his willingness to contribute to the department in the future.   I'm weighing those things out, with a bit of a lack of professional honesty in evaluating people.

Colleague evaluations, I think, are worth almost nothing.   Generally they're where an instructor asks a friend to come to the class and then provide a list of glowing comments on how well the class is taught and the person's very important contributions to the department.   I almost never refer to the colleague evaluations in the co-ordinator evaluations because I think they're worthless.   Occasionally, the colleague evaluations are done by the person responsible for the program.   For example, a convenor went in and did a colleague evaluation and linked it to the various points in the collective agreement, and that provided a very strong case as part of the co-ordinator evaluation.   That was a powerful one, but generally I very rarely see ones that have any meaning whatsoever or can be used in a meaningful way.

I very rarely get feedback on my teaching.   I have students who come to talk to me.   I do it on a very informal basis and I try to stay attuned to what's going on in the class.   I never use those informal evaluations that I ask all other instructors to do – I don't use them.   I'm always very anxious about the student evaluations, partly because I don't do those informal evaluations so it's sort of a gamble.   I think, "Ha, oh well.   I hope it works out okay." And it always has because I don't change in the year that I'm being evaluated, although can I just say that I think some instructors do behave themselves more in the year that they're being evaluated.   I've observed that.   But for me, I am what I am, and I think I the students accept that I'm there to help them.

When I go back over the evaluation, I always focus on the negative and whenever somebody has given me a low rating on something I think, "How could that happen, how did I do that, what do I have to do?"   In previous times, I used to be able to do handwriting analysis on the evaluations and I'd know who it was, and then what I would try to do is mend the relationship.   I know the reason we don't get to see the evaluations now is because we're afraid that the instructors are going to take it out on the students.   But I like the idea of trying to mend the relationship and deal with whatever those issues are specifically with that individual [student].   Sometimes it's salvageable, sometimes it's not, but I want to remedy the situation.   And with the evaluation itself, I can't really say that I've read anything meaningful,

well, I've said that I think the colleague evaluations are a waste of time, and the co-ordinator ones never came back with anything really worth discussing. I can tell you about one. There was a suggestion at one time that I thought was a very funny suggestion. It was suggested that when teaching a computer class, because I'm short, that I stand on a stool. So I've kind of always thought of all these recommendations I've received, and very few constructive suggestions, that one it sort of fits in with the value of all of the others ones: not worth hearing.

My overall experience is that [the evaluation process] has not contributed to me as an instructor or had any influence on my involvement in the university. I think the faculty evaluation process at Capilano is simply a bureaucratic process. Every institution has to have an evaluation process. I think the objectives are that faculty will have the opportunity to be evaluated, to receive some feedback and improve, but I don't think it's happening. Those objectives are not being met. And I think it's quite well recognized that those objectives are not being met. . . . I think it just has to be recognized as being a bureaucratic process that is being complied with.

I still view it as a very big responsibility. Not for the really strong teachers like the [Jillians] of the world, but I do view it as a large responsibility when I'm going through all the other evaluations. I think it is my job to provide that feedback and I think the evaluations that I write have more content in them than most evaluations I've seen written by any other co-ordinator. But still I think that they're not being used as fully as they could be. It's an opportunity that's being missed.

I think the evaluation process does provide opportunities for teaching improvement when you're a new instructor. I think there's a lot more opportunity to provide feedback and to help with changes. One new instructor in her first year's evaluation simply stood up and used PowerPoint the entire time and didn't engage the students and was kind of frazzled. It was just not a good experience. However, at the same time, she has very many other characteristics that are important for Capilano instructors. She has empathy with the students, she understands and is a very good role model in many ways for the students, she's very interested in Capilano University and being here at Capilano and helping be part of the long-term direction of Capilano. However, her teaching was below standard. Because of the evaluation process, she was evaluated last year, received the feedback and then she took the opportunity to really work on her teaching over this past year by participating in the faculty learning community and incorporating many techniques that she learned throughout the year. Her student evaluations improved substantially over the year, and when I went into do my classroom visit, it was a different instructor in the class. So in that particular case, I think that the evaluation was very effective.

In contrast, looking at another faculty evaluation I did this year where I made comments on being more interactive, do I think that it is going to be implemented in her course next year? I don't think there's a hope. So it really is a matter of readiness of the individual and the openness of the individual to be part of a self-changing process.

As an instructor I haven't seen opportunities for teachers for continuous growth and professional development. I don't really think as a co-ordinator I have dealt with too many things that deal with a person's professional growth. There is not a box for it on the faculty evaluation form. There isn't a section that says, "This is what I think as co-ordinator you need to be working on for the next year to five years." There is no opportunity for that. It is something that I could have added, but I haven't added. It's certainly something that just as a co-ordinator I've talked to various people about getting their degrees, or advanced degrees, just as a matter of course – more as a strategy for survival within the institution – completely separate from the evaluation process. As an instructor, I have never seen any opportunities for me personally where anybody has made any recommendation for professional growth for me. And I had provided few recommendations, other than fixing up problems, which I don't regard as professional growth. I've provided almost no recommendations [for professional growth] within the framework of the evaluation. Maybe with the exception of an instructor who, in her evaluation I put in, "You promised to finish up your degree and you haven't done it yet, so here's another nail in the coffin." It was more adherence to an employment requirement, not as a separate comment on her professional development that she might be interested in doing. In terms of continuous improvement, to seek out these opportunities, it's something faculty could choose to do in terms of self-evaluation.

I actually don't think [the components of the faculty evaluation process accurately reflect the teaching performance] very well. As a co-ordinator, I'm only in the classroom once or twice; it's very limited time for observations. What are supposed to be used in the evaluation are the student evaluations, not the things I've heard offline or different conversations that I've heard. I'm not supposed to use hearsay.

I do feel competent to do complete a co-ordinator evaluation. Do I feel comfortable? No, not necessarily but I feel competent to do it. I feel competent because of my background in business where as a controller I had a large staff and did evaluations. It's more from that background, and yes I know that Capilano has a different process, but I feel that I follow that process and actually I think I do a better job on evaluations with more content, and fact-based content, than most evaluators.

I attended a joint session last year on preparing a co-ordinator evaluation, a joint session with the union (CFA) and HR. It was about how to write an evaluation that would stick. I don't remember coming

out [of the training session] with anything outstanding. Always at these sessions I learn something or other, but I feel I had learned more just by doing it and by providing evaluations to the union for review and by providing evaluations to HR for review before giving them to the instructor. I was trying to use the resources around me in order to develop an evaluation that would not result in a grievance.

I'd rather not be evaluated because, you know, I don't like constructive criticism or non-constructive criticism. I guess it depends on whom it comes from. If it comes from somebody whom I respect, I value those comments, but often times I've not had a lot of confidence in the person writing the evaluation for some of those years, so I just discount some of those comments.

I think when I write an evaluation, the new instructors value some of my comments and I think that there's some value to that. Okay, for me, how would I like to be evaluated? I guess I would want the evaluation to be multi-dimensional. Not just as an instructor and doing a good job in the class; my job involves so many different kinds of things. The side of recruiting students, the curriculum development, as co-ordinator, how I do my job, how I represent the department in the university. I think that if I am being evaluated, I should be evaluated overall for my contribution in all of these areas. I don't know how it could be done. It could be done by a Dean or could be done in combination with the department, but it's a much broader job. I think I'm probably [up for] evaluation next year or coming up soon, so it'll just be a regular instructor one, which is not too valuable.

Okay, so how do I think instructors should be evaluated? Well, I think that for new instructors we should really be involved in their classes from the time the classes start to assist in the development of the courses and the teaching materials. To help set the stage for success, right? And it's less of an evaluation where if successful, you pass; if unsuccessful, you fail – you leave the university. It really should be looked at in a developmental way.

The evaluation process needs to be repackaged in a positive developmental way so that we are there to help you be successful and provide those tools. We don't have those tools; we're all really busy and don't provide that type of assistance that new instructors need. I think that needs to be a richer process as well. And for the long-term ones, well waiting every five years is not appropriate. It would be really good to have feedback on an ongoing basis. You know every course, how have you done? Do I really want everybody to be looking to see how I did on [subject a] versus [subject b]? Maybe I would prefer if student questionnaires were just confidential for me to look at so that I could see how I've done. Maybe other instructors would want that too. I guess I'm less interested in the stick aspect of it and more the development of individuals. Right now it's sort of used as a stick, but the evaluation process is not a positive developmental tool.

The faculty evaluation process needs to change. It's just that making anything change at Capilano is – there's just way too many difficulties making any changes. It's a very contentious environment with the union and faculty are very resistant to change. It's . . . just dealing with the collective agreement is way too complicated, so I think that the process of making a change would be very difficult. Do I think there should be a change? I think that faculty as a rule don't view it as a very valuable process, and I don't think administration view it as a very valuable process. Given the number of man hours associated with it, it's really unfortunate, because that same number of man hours could be used for providing more useful information. Ongoing development . . . having a different structure where, as colleagues, [we] provide support for each other with development.

Rebranding the university as learning-centred is a fantastic initiative, but I think there are only a few pockets of the university that really are learning-centred. That most of the university still is chalk and talk, even though they say they're not, I would say the bulk of the university still is. When I walk around and look in classroom windows, that's what I see, or I see PowerPoints, lights dimmed, the instructor standing in the front of the class.

The evaluation process does not support the directions of a special purpose teaching university. I'm saying that special purpose teaching university really means learning-centred, and the evaluation process has nothing to do with being learning-centred. Because we don't have a definition of learning-centred, what it looks like for a faculty member or a way to figure out does that faculty member demonstrate that.

[Considering the components of the faculty evaluation process], I think the co-ordinator evaluation is the one that's important because it combines more of the departmental activities. The student questionnaires are important; they show whether the instructor teaches that particular topic. But the department fit is only addressed in the co-ordinator evaluation, and that's very difficult to incorporate in there. Even to deal with issues that have arisen – it's really challenging to put that in. So it's not just the evaluation process – it's the position of the evaluator. If you look at a department as a business unit, as an operating unit that has to function well, then we need to maximize the fit within that unit. People are not called on the fact that they're never in the office. If their teaching is going okay, no complaints, they're not called on the fact that they are not there three days a week, because they're teaching online or doing something that they can do from someplace else. [If] you're not there, you can't contribute to the mentoring of new faculty, you're not part of the ongoing business of the department, you're not there to collaborate on topics as they arise. That's not in there [the faculty evaluation process], so it doesn't work from both points of view.

[This evaluation process] is time-consuming, bureaucratic, lacking depth, [and] one-dimensional. Not really focusing on development.

It's not moving things forward. It provides an incomplete picture of an instructor's ability and involvement in the university, and opportunities for their growth. It's incomplete in identifying their shortcomings. It's just incomplete all around. It is a snapshot on a day that is flushed out by some student evaluations, anecdotal items. For example, I had to evaluate [a co-ordinator]. I attended his class, looked at his evaluations. However, he has other major contributions as a person leading the [department], and I'm not really evaluating his role in doing that. And that is where he is having a huge impact on departmental operations, and I'm not commenting on how he can be doing that in any improved way. I'm just saying his responsibilities are much broader, and I think that he could do a better job but I don't even focus on that. I don't even think about it. I'm focusing on the teaching part and I'm saying thanks for taking on this thankless job [of coordinating]. But I'm not evaluating him on [coordinating], but it really should be part of the whole picture. When I say not moving forward I'm thinking of [this co-ordinator]. I'm irritated by the fact that he's skipped all those meetings, and I'm just not dealing with it, which will continue being an issue, but I'm not addressing it. And I guess also, not moving it forward, I'm thinking I'm not providing developmental suggestions for him on being a co-ordinator that would make the operations of the [department] go better.

One thought that I had was how the evaluation process really was very external to something that happened this year when really it should have been part of the solution. So what happened this past spring was that I had a faculty member who was borrowed from [another department] to teach a course. He was not in a period of being evaluated; even if he were, I would not have been contributing, because he was assigned. And what happened was that he was teaching an [English] course, and again a situation where he probably shouldn't have been teaching the course but I thought it was within his abilities. The teaching didn't go well; he first of all didn't spend time learning the material and because of that he wasn't able to answer student questions, wasn't able to teach very well, all those kinds of things. And we had to react relatively quickly to get him out of that situation. The evaluation process, I would have thought, would have been able to help us in that situation but that would have been way too slow and the time would have been lost for the students. And so he was spoken to throughout the time he was teaching, working with him trying to get things fixed up . . . letting him know what he needed to know before going to class. But it just wasn't happening. And then it came to a point where we really needed to make a decision. I met with him and we discussed this and we came to the joint conclusion that it was best for him to step aside and have another instructor take over, so this was probably at about week seven or so in the term, maybe week eight. My point . . . this was a critical situation and the evaluation process that we have at Capilano was completely separate from what was going on and did not provide any assistance – when in my mind, it really should have been an integral part of this process.

119

And so I'm saying the evaluation process, because it wasn't involved, really failed me in this case. It couldn't be used as a tool.

[Faculty evaluation] means a huge amount of writing for me as a co-ordinator with not a heck of a lot of value. There is, as I said the other day, value in the evaluations for the newer hires where there's an opportunity to influence, but for the others I don't see much value in it at all. And so I see that from cost benefit, there's the cost to me spending all that time writing [which] far exceeds the benefit in many cases. And for me personally, I've really not had anything of value said to me in any of the evaluations. I'm not seeing that it had much value, other than being told not to teach [math] again, which I buy. You know, I learned something from that. That you have to know what you're teaching before you can teach a course. And so for me personally I would not [teach] something I didn't think I could do, but that hasn't stopped me from hiring people to teach courses they can't do. But I guess, arguing my way out of that one, I would expect most people would put some energy into doing a good job to make sure that everything went well.

[Faculty evaluation] should be an opportunity for developing an instructor to improve the instructional ability, to help guide the instructor in their own professional development in their field as well as an instructor and also the instructor's role within the department and within the university itself. I think the only place where we spend any time is looking at [the] failings of how the instructor is [teaching] now, with very little on the other components.

Well, I've always had a problem being evaluated by someone who I don't necessarily think is qualified to be doing it. So that always makes me . . . question the validity of the evaluation if I don't think that the person is capable of doing it. I don't think any of the individuals who have evaluated me over the years were in any way capable of providing the evaluation of me, as instructor or of my contribution. I guess I go back to being told I should stand on a stool while teaching computers, which, you know, you have to put in a constructive comment and if that's the constructive comment well, let's find something else, I'm going to throw the whole thing out. For me it's not just having evaluations at Capilano – I know I felt the same way in previous careers. When I was in consulting, I didn't have a lot of respect for my boss, so what he wrote down in the evaluation I thought was not worth really considering too much. But other times I've really respected my boss. When I was a controller, I really respected his comments and have thought about them through my life. So those kinds of things, to me I know that I can learn well from an evaluation process if I have respect for the person who is giving me the evaluation, who I think is qualified to provide valuable suggestions.

What makes somebody qualified to give you suggestions? Somebody who is an excellent teacher. [I'm] not suggesting that I'm an excellent

teacher, but somebody who I think is an excellent teacher, who I think is a better instructor than me or as good an instructor as me. I just think of an instructor who doesn't connect with students, doesn't seem to like students – why would I think that he could do a really good evaluation of me? I'm not questioning the information that comes from the students. I accept that their feedback is important and I don't have any doubts about what their feedback is and their suggestions are always worth considering. The other stuff is a waste of time.

I think people should be trained to do evaluations. I think that co-ordinators should know how to write evaluations; I think we need to know what to look for. But wouldn't it be great if there was a person who actually knew how to, who could come into our classes for limited times. . . . It'd be good if you and I could sit in a classroom, we both could do an evaluation together, and you could provide me with things that I didn't consider and maybe could do it again, so that my ability to observe would also be improved. But I'd also like to see a more open process so other things are taken into consideration. I guess I think of a less litigious environment where if there's something that goes on in the department, I have to document it, but usually if I document it, it doesn't happen to be in the year when a person is being evaluated. I can't use it three years later although it's still an ongoing kind of issue. You know there's also the structure that needs to be revised but anyhow, I do agree that being trained would be really beneficial.

One of the values of the evaluation system is that it can be used as a reason not to have someone be regularized or possibly not to get beyond the probation period. And in order to do that it has to be an ironclad case, so I've learned more about using it as a stick rather than a carrot.

I'd compare the experience of going through the faculty evaluation process to having your teeth cleaned. Sort of an irritation that you have to do, and you know, grin and bear it, it's going to be over, and that's that. The Dean might send you a note saying, "Dear *Mr. Sandra*, thank you for your contribution." A non-event. A non-event for me, more just a bit of an irritation with limited value for me personally. You know, I think that I contribute as an instructor and a member of the university and all that sort of stuff. It just doesn't get reflected in the evaluation process.

An ideal faculty evaluation would have . . . some sort of consistency in the evaluators. The ones doing the evaluating should have a bit more sense of what to look for. What is the definition of a good instructor, and what are we looking for, what is going wrong in this class. What's going wrong in this class? Beats the heck out of me. I have a bit of a sense but it's more of a gut sense than anything else. I really don't know, so there's that side of it. [We need] more of a clarification of what the expectations are – for what the evaluators are supposed to

look for in the class as well as within the department. I think that's a huge grey area. And the person being evaluated also needs to understand what the expectations are. There certainly is lack of clarity on what are the expectations for an instructor. Is it okay to pile up all your marking and then give everything back after the midterm? It would help if it was specified what the expectations are for everyone. It seems intuitively obvious to me for a lot of those things, but I'm sure there are things that I'm missing out on as well. But I think also, the five years doesn't quite work . . . it should happen all the time. I guess we all need to have an attitudinal shift in this, including myself, where we welcome opportunities to grow rather than resist. How we do that is another story. I don't think you'll be able to do it with me. It's the whole attitude towards that. It [the evaluation process] needs to be separated from the collective agreement, because I think the tie to the collective agreement makes it seem more like a legal process we're going through rather than one that really has to do with human resource development.

I'd also like to have feedback from the department on individuals' contributions within the department. You know, it would probably just turn into a "Well, if I give you a 6/10, I have to give you a 4/10." I don't know, I think that there should be sort of recognition within the department that we all need to support each other. And also probably from the program unit . . . on the contribution to the program unit and how things are going for the whole group because I think that would be an important part, and the frequency should just be all the time.

Faculty enrichment is . . . different opportunities rather than getting stuck in a rut. As you know I've been teaching the same courses for a hundred years now, maybe not a hundred, maybe ten. Yes, thinking about some other kinds of things, other ways of teaching new material was definitely an enriching opportunity for me. So I guess different opportunities, either as teaching assignments or responsibilities as convenor, as co-ordinator, maybe these things could be shifted around so other people could grow from those experiences.

I'm not the most positive person about certain kinds of changes. I think that Capilano is a very challenging environment, mostly because of the collective agreement. And I'm not saying we shouldn't have the collective agreement, but just because of that and difficulties of making revisions, I think it would be very hard to do. And doing it within the constraints of the collective agreement, I don't know how to do it. But I think for Capilano to move to actually being a learning-centred university, a huge part of the success in achieving that would be changing the faculty evaluation process. I don't have a clue how you'd go about doing that.

I have another idea. Having a departmental session on faculty evaluations and how we could get more out of it if we were just a little bit more open to development. So I think that making a change just within our program area, then having success here, you could do it

within the [department]. . . . Maybe just doing it in a limited area – that may change some of the attitudes throughout the university. So I support that process. Even though I'm probably coming up for evaluation soon, I think it would have to be outside the formal process.

It's been very interesting for me to think about the evaluation process, and have the conversation. . . . Thank you for giving me the opportunity.

4.4.1.   Commentary on Sandra's Profile

Sandra's experience with the faculty evaluation process reflects her position as co-ordinator, peer, and teacher. She highlights the exceptional nature of having a conversation with faculty regarding teaching performance, which is likely to happen only when problems with teaching performance need to be addressed. Likewise, she recognizes that new faculty do not seem to understand the importance of faculty evaluation to their continuing at the university, an understanding that came to her early in her teaching career at CU when she taught a course that did not go well. She knows that her peers were aware that things were not going well for her, but the co-ordinator waited for the evaluation process to highlight concerns rather than intervene to offer her help and guidance. This example highlights the importance of the timeliness of the feedback and its importance to shaping future teaching performance. Although she recognizes in this particular instance that she did not have the expertise to teach the course she was assigned, she admits to hiring faculty who lack expertise in a subject to fill teaching positions at the last minute, which did not work out well for them either.

For Sandra, it becomes evident that training is needed to complete peer and co-ordinator reports. The uncertainly around how the process is implemented becomes clear when she shares that she understood that she was only permitted to enter a peer's class once per evaluation cycle to observe, then she is told she can go in twice, and now she is being told she can go in more frequently. To provide a peer with feedback that is formative, it is obvious that more classroom observations would be beneficial.

Sandra's initial experience of teaching a course that did not go well seems to shape her actions as she invests her time and expertise helping new instructors in her department. What becomes clear is that she needs to intervene quickly to assist new

instructors to enable them to have a successful evaluation and remain at the institution or build a strong case for their termination during the probationary period. The probationary period is a critical time to ensure the right decisions have been made for the university – to allow faculty to continue who demonstrate satisfactory performance and build a strong case for termination for faculty with less than satisfactory performance. Consequently, Sandra has learned to write an evaluation that will not result in a grievance and has come to view the evaluation process as more of a stick than a faculty development tool.

Her example of a faculty member who had passed the probationary period and was doing well until she was assigned courses that she was less familiar with highlights the lack of opportunity for formal feedback when a faculty member has passed the probationary period and is on a five-year evaluation cycle. This example demonstrates how faculty can manipulate the system by choosing the courses to be evaluated in that are going well rather than receiving feedback on the courses that are proving difficult for them. However, the Dean could have called for an out-of-sequence evaluation if she/he was alerted to concerns regarding teaching performance, but the faculty member is the one who chooses a minimum of two courses (per academic year) to have SETs distributed. This example also demonstrates the importance of having departmental competency guidelines for the assignment of courses. Allowing faculty who do not have the competencies to teach a specific course and failing to put a support system in place to allow for success is unfair to the faculty member and to the students. Moreover, Sandra admits to a lack of professional honesty regarding the evaluation of her peers. Because of the collegial model on which the faculty evaluation process is built, she avoids confronting issues such as attendance at departmental meetings for peers who are responsible for program offerings because she does not want to risk affecting their working relationship. This admission coupled with her observation on how faculty members "behave themselves" when they are scheduled for evaluation, indicates again that the evaluation process provides an incomplete record of faculty performance.

The faculty evaluation process, for Sandra, is a bureaucratic process that is being complied with, and as a process that resides in the faculty collective agreement, a difficult, if not impossible one to change. Her preference is to see the process moved

outside the agreement. She takes her responsibility to prepare a co-ordinator report very seriously. The process does assist new faculty members with teaching improvement but when it comes to continuous improvement, Sandra notes that it is up to faculty to self-evaluate. She would prefer to see feedback on every course on an ongoing basis with the feedback going to her. From her perspective, the five-year evaluation cycle for non-probationary faculty is inappropriate.

She recognizes the inherent bureaucratic nature of the faculty evaluation process but believes that co-ordinator and student questionnaires are the most important components of the current system. She also notes the failure of the current process to provide feedback on her roles outside of teaching; for example, student recruitment and as a representative of the university on a number of committees. For Sandra, there needs to be an attitudinal shift around faculty evaluation, which should welcome opportunities to grow professionally.

From a Bourdieusian perspective, Sandra realized early in her career at CU the importance of symbolic capital – her reputation had to be protected after a round of evaluations revealed that she was not equipped to teach a "math" course. She did not possess the institutional cultural capital to prepare her to teach this course; moreover, she does not seem to possess the institutional cultural capital to evaluate senior peers in terms of her willingness or ability to offer suggestions for improvement. Institutional cultural capital comes to the forefront again in Sandra's desire to have competent qualified peer evaluators.

She has gained from the lessons she has learned as a new teacher when the evaluation process did not go well for her, as a co-ordinator trying to build iron-clad cases for dismissal, and from her involvement in committees across the institution. How she sees the evaluation process and her place in it is a lens into her habitus. Writing detailed, fact-based evaluations is her attempt to define what is a legitimate stake (evaluation) in her area of responsibility. Her habitus is shaped by the structural arrangements of the evaluation process and her position as co-ordinator. The cultural capital that she has acquired through her university degrees coupled with her business

and teaching experience enable her to compare the university evaluation model to one that is used in the field of business.

Interestingly, her social capital interferes with her ability to do the job of co-ordinator in a disinterested way – her friendships make it difficult for her to provide feedback to peers who would benefit from her suggestions for increased administrative accountability and/or teaching improvement and so she avoids making these suggestions because of the effect it may have on her personal relationships with peers.

Clearly, in the field of CU, there are winners and losers. The evaluation process has many explicit rules as outlined in the collective agreement, but there are also many implicit rules that are important to having a successful evaluation at CU. The winners are those faculty members, particularly new ones, who have been guided through the process and have departmental mentors in place; those who may not suffer from not knowing the implicit rules of how the evaluation process unfolds at the institution. The winners are also individual faculty members who, according to Sandra, behave themselves during their evaluation year. The losers are those who may not have a mentor in place and stubble through the process unaware of the procedural elements of the evaluation process and the steps they can take to improve their chances of having a successful evaluation. For example, faculty who are new to teaching may not be aware of the value of distributing formative evaluations prior to the summative evaluations (an implicit rule of the faculty evaluation process) so that they have an opportunity to respond to student concerns prior to the formal distribution of SETs in their classes. Sandra attempts to improve the chances for a successful evaluation for new faculty in her department by providing them with a mentor once she hears grumblings from colleagues and/or students about an instructor's performance and by visiting the faculty member's class a few times before preparing a formal co-ordinator report. Lastly, Sandra points to the importance of individual faculty to have a sense of agency regarding faculty evaluation, which she refers to as a readiness and openness to be part of a self-changing process. Faculty's actions and sense of agency are shaped by their personal histories, their professional histories, their positions, and relationships with peers; in other words, it is their habitus that provides the means for them to make a space for themselves at CU.

126

4.5. [Linda's] Profile

I have been teaching for one year at Capilano, but my desire to be a teacher started in my childhood because of my ability to connect with children. I loved to be with them and I had an effect on them. In a culture of no nannies or babysitters, I babysat all the children in my apartment building – with no pay – just out of pleasure! Of course, my father is a professor so that influenced me as well.

I went to the teacher training college at the age of 14, which I finished in five years. After graduating from college at the age of 19, I could teach up to Grade 4. I went on to post-secondary in [1990] and my major was in pedagogy so that I could become an instructor for a teacher training college. Although I graduated in [1994], I didn't feel prepared, as I was not happy with the education I received and with the old material that was used to teach us. I needed something else, so I got a bursary to study in [another country] for six months – that opened my eyes – I had access to newer information [about the field of education], which made me very happy. It was at this time that I met Professor [Smith] at a talk in [Europe], and I loved what he talked about and decided to do a master's in education in Canada. I did my master's from [1993-1996]; I defended in January [1996] and I went back to [my country] to open my own little school that offered preschool, daycare, and kindergarten all in one. In April [1996], I opened a foundation called Foundation [Hope] and in September [1996], I opened the doors of my own school with 17 children coming from orphanages, very poor families, and some children of my friends as well. It operated until [2008]. I was principal of the school while my husband led the foundation; this arrangement allowed me to concentrate on the pedagogical part of the school and provide teacher training for the teachers at my school. But in 2008, because of world financial problems, our sponsors stopped [their financial support], so we had to come up with a plan to make money for the school.

My husband suggested that I hold workshops for other teachers because it worked so well with our teachers. And I tried it out and it worked excellent. I could bring in new pedagogical information combined with my experiences in the school with children; I could share my own strategies and my methods that were based on [cooperative] education. The workshops offered a good toolkit to teachers to go and refresh their love of teaching, and the workshops helped us financially because we were asking a minimal amount of money but because of the huge number of participants, we could keep the school alive.

In [2006], my husband and I had invited Professor [Smith] to speak at a conference and we started to talk about a Ph.D. and because things in [my country] were going from bad to worse, from the point of view of corruption and the impossibility to change anything, we decided that for our family and for our future, it would be best to continue with the

Ph.D. dream. And that's how we got to Canada in September [2009]. And because of my experience, of teaching teachers, I thought it would be a wonderful fit to actually teach post-secondary. I applied for some online instructor jobs and sessional instructor jobs at [at a local university] successfully, and I started to gain experience in teaching post-secondary. Then I found out about the programs at Capilano University, which attracted me a lot. I liked how the courses were organized and I started to find out more about job opportunities there. So in nutshell, this is how I got to be interviewed by Capilano University for a job opening for an auxiliary instructor. First of all it was like a dream come true that I got the job. Because after the interview, I was told that someone internal had applied, so I was not accepted. After a few weeks, I got an email telling me that there was a new opening and that they were considering me and wondering if I would be interested. And of course, I was jumping with happiness.

What I like about Capilano is that you can design your own courses. You have the course outcomes, and you can bring in readings and your experiences and use materials, articles, books, lessons learned into the undergrad classes at Capilano. It came very natural for me to teach what I learned myself. What I really like is that this gives me the possibility to really share my practical experiences so I am not teaching theory – every single part of theory is combined with an experience (successful or not) that I can share with students. And I like the interaction and the questions students ask about how did you do it. And I think that this is an asset; it's like I have this bag full of experiences – very different experiences – and every time I need one I can just pull it out and share it with my students. And I think that gives me more credibility as well. I talk from experience – since I have been there, I've been in classrooms, I taught for so many years, and that helps me a lot and my students as well.

When thinking about how I get feedback on my teaching, I normally like to get feedback from students right away. After a class, I ask them for feedback, have questionnaires for them to fill out, find out what they would like to do more of, what they feel was missing or if it was too much information. It's continuous feedback from the students and, of course, the emotional feedback I get from their eyes, which tells me right away whether I am doing right or wrong. I don't like students to be bored; I like to involve them in a game or an activity. It is continuous interactive feedback I get from them. If I get the same reaction from more than one student, in regard to they need more or they need change, I consider it seriously and I shift my teaching in the direction to fill that gap. If it's only one student, I would have a conversation with that student to see why he or she felt that way and then I would open a conversation with the whole class about it. I am not afraid of these conversations.

When it comes to getting formal feedback on my teaching at Capilano, I have had one experience. I had no idea about the faculty evaluation process until the co-ordinator announced that she would come to my

class. I had no idea why she would sit in. I welcome anybody anytime. I constantly invite my colleagues to come – and many colleagues come and just sit in on my class. At this time, however, the co-ordinator said she has to stay from the beginning to the end of one of my classes. I had no idea why, so she sat in on my class once. I was just happy she was there, so I didn't even ask her afterwards what this was about until she came the second time and sat in on another class and then I started to be suspicious; is something wrong? And then she told me that this is the process; she has to sit in on a few of my classes and evaluate me and then ask the students to evaluate me. I taught the class and then I had to leave the class for a few minutes, and she gave evaluation forms to the students.

This happened three times [classroom visits] before I realized this is a formal evaluation process. I was not given anything, no paperwork to read, and I was actually happy about that because I think that I would have been way more stressed. And this way it was just like one of the visits that I was getting from my colleagues.

Just last week I had to tell one of my colleagues who is being evaluated and who has been here for six years about the evaluation process. She told me, "Look, it's taking so long – and how do I find out – do I talk to the co-ordinator about it?" I had to tell her the steps that I went through, as she had no idea what was happening and she was getting panicked that the co-ordinator did not come to share those evaluations with her. Here is what happened to me; the co-ordinator had to write a letter, a kind of conclusion to what she learned from the student evaluation forms, the colleague evaluation, and her own observations, and I was invited by the DDA (divisional assistant) who had the file in her office to go through every page together with her, which I thought was very nice and transparent. I didn't think at first that I had access to those evaluations, so I sat down with her and went through it and luckily everything was just fabulous. Otherwise it would have hurt me a lot.

Emotionally, you know how it is when you have 99 positive evaluations and you have one bad one, you go home with that bad one in your head and heart. So I didn't have that. And then it was over; the Dean had to sign the final paper and it was filed. A good year went by if not more before I actually saw my file. I cannot put a number on it, but it was long. I forgot about it because I had absolutely no idea what was coming next.

Because of my enthusiasm, I enjoyed the process; I enjoy having colleagues in my class. I know that is not the case for everyone – I know from my colleagues. For me it was just a natural process; positive from the point of view that I didn't know too much about it. I know it sounds strange, but for me personally it was okay to not know too much about it, so *I could teach just naturally without being stressed*. Because of the students and the co-ordinator who works very closely with us, it didn't feel like an artificial process. It was a

natural process, which I didn't expect; I didn't know about it, still I could adapt to it.

I am guessing that when it comes to the purpose of the evaluation process it's to maintain the quality of instructors; . . . it has to do with us as educators and keeping the standards up.

I think the process would provide opportunities for improvement in teaching performance if the period would not be so long before I see my file. If something is lacking in my practice, I should find out right away. I should find out the next week but I only found out after one year. I think if you have gaps or make mistakes, this evaluation process as it is now does not help you improve. You need to know right away; you should be told right away this is something the co-ordinator or colleague saw lacking in your teaching – we just want to let you know. And then you have the possibility to improve. If I find it out one year or more afterwards, it has absolutely no value.

The opportunity for faculty enrichment through this evaluation process where faculty can continuously improve and grow cannot be witnessed here because of the long time gap between being evaluated and seeing the evaluation file. Again if the feedback were given to instructors right way, if you had a conversation with the one that observes your class right afterward, it would help a lot. It's not continuous as this point. Reading my evaluations after one year, of course, they made me happy because they were happy thoughts and made my passion go on. Nevertheless, I really think that the timing is wrong and stops continuity and faculty development in this way. I don't see it happening; it is more like a formality; it is just paperwork – it does not influence your practice as it is right now.

The components of the faculty evaluation system do, I think, accurately reflect teaching performance. Except maybe the evaluation of your colleague because you can choose your colleague who is maybe your best friend – that is biased a little bit. I would actually like an external to come in to get an objective view, but when colleagues visit my classes, my classes mirror exactly who I am.

I am comfortable completing a colleague evaluation because I knew a lot about my colleague, I witnessed her teaching, I even co-taught a course, so I could give quite objective comments but positive comments. It would be difficult to give negative comments because you know your colleagues, you collaborate, you help each other and mainly that your colleague sees what you are writing on the paper. I could not find anything negative – sincerely, nothing negative about my colleague.

If it was a close colleague of mine that I knew personally, as there are not that many instructors in the department, I might even refuse to do the evaluation if it's part of the formal process. However, I would have a conversation with the co-ordinator about it and about my

opinion and I would ask for help from other instructors maybe to come and observe. I would personally refuse to give a bad review of my colleagues unless, of course, I would see something very, very wrong, which is not the case in my department. Yes, I would definitely have a conversation with my colleague where I would share what I would do differently and why I think some other strategies would work much better and would make her life easier.

I would not give a negative evaluation because it's a formal process and there is so much more to that person than a piece of paper, in my view. Because I only visited her class once, it could be that she just had a stressful period, that she just heard some shocking news – so many factors could be involved in that class on that day. And I feel that just a piece of paper cannot reflect that. By not having a conversation, by not hearing her part of the story, I feel that it would be an artificial piece of paper that just reflects my observation of that day of that class. It would not be the reality and that's why I would refuse.

I have never received any training to complete a colleague evaluation at Capilano. I think in general we need to know more about the evaluation process when you come to work at Capilano University, because you have no idea. Even now if I were to search the university's website, I would not find a lot about the evaluation process as a new instructor. What if we all got training about how to observe someone's class? I got this training in one of my university classes in my home country, how to observe a class. We would have a workshop about it once a year, how to observe a colleague, because that would improve yourself as well. If you know what to observe in others then you know what to observe in your own practice. If someone should be trained in doing this, I think all of us should – absolutely all of us, including administrators. Offer that workshop, concentrated only on this for everyone, then we can all observe each other and we can all trust each other's opinion.

When it comes to being evaluated, first of all, I see two kinds of evaluation: the real evaluation and the formal evaluation. The real evaluation should be ongoing. We should have the possibility to visit each other's classrooms, which we actually do. We are not made to do it, but we are doing it out of a natural willingness to get better. I believe in this natural evaluation, which can also be documented even if it is not formal. And the other side is the formal evaluation, which I wish we would know much more about the moment we enter the university as new instructors. To know exactly what is going to happen during this academic year, you will have a period when the co-ordinator and other colleagues will observe your teaching and this is why. To have an understanding – is it for you to improve, or is it to get you fired?

I would like to see the definition of the word "evaluation" at Capilano University. What is it? What is evaluation? Why is it done? Where?

How? All these questions need to be answered. I would love for evaluation to be described as an aid to you becoming a better teacher. Bringing new strategies, asking new questions, which makes you develop professionally. I would erase the stress factor, which does not help instructors to do good teaching if they are under stress by being evaluated. I would actually change the word evaluation. It has kind of a negative connotation, controlling connotation. I cannot think of another word right now to replace it.

I would like to see more transparency in the evaluation process and more information given to new instructors. I stress this because as a new instructor I did feel lost many times – not knowing what was happening. What's interesting is that my colleagues who were at Capilano for years didn't know the answers to my questions. They themselves are going through it right now, and they don't know the answers so I don't know how to make it more transparent, more personal, with the possibility of discussing issues, getting feedback from a conversation and not from a paper. I didn't have a conversation with the co-ordinator in regard to the final results of my evaluation. For my evaluation, I had a meeting with the DDA [Departmental Divisional Assistant] – I don't know if it was part of the process or the choice of our co-ordinator to do it this way, but I think it was the formal way to meet with the DDA. I don't see how the instructor can learn from this process as it is now. I really wish to have a conversation – even with all my colleagues and co-ordinator about my evaluation. It would be nice to have a conversation not just end with a signature – you agree or not.

I didn't feel supported at all by this whole process. It was just something that had to be done. It was not personal; it was really formal. And I don't think it helps the image of the university as a special purpose teaching university; I don't think it aids that reality at all as it is done now. It is there to find out if there is something wrong with you. It's not there to help you improve at this point; it just to check out how you are doing, if you are still suitable for the university, but it is not there to help you improve. And I wonder if those evaluations would have been bad evaluations, what would have happened? Of course, you think the worst – I will be fired. But it should not be the case. It should help you improve; everybody makes mistakes and everyone has a certain image about teaching and it might not be the same that others hold.

To me this evaluation process at this university is cold, impersonal, unknown, stagnant, unnatural and biased, biased because you would not give a bad evaluation to a colleague. Unnatural because of the time gap before you see your file.

The whole process should improve an instructor's teaching. At this point I think it doesn't. When it's all good, yes, you keep on being all good, but if there is a problem, if there would be a problem, I don't think the process as it is now would help improve the quality of the

teaching. It was a boost in my self-confidence, that was one, and I think the process afterwards is personal to the instructor. You decide that you want to keep the same level of quality or even get better. But this is an internal process; it's not triggered by your evaluation. It's your decision as a person, "I do well; I really want to continue doing well." But the process itself, I don't think it helps you to improve as it is right now.

Specifically at this university I think it's checking up on quality, and that's okay, it should be done. As an instructor, it has this hierarchical feeling – that you are evaluated by somebody above you. And it's interesting because usually, mainly now in the university, there's such a nice collaboration going on, at least in our school, that you don't feel that there is any hierarchy. But during the evaluation, it's a wake-up call. It's a little bit scary as well. These are the moments where you say, "Oh my goodness, what if it's not such a good evaluation? Am I gone or?" You know, these feelings. Sometimes rational, sometimes irrational. I would have liked it to be more of a conversation, where you can explain yourself. If you have negative feedback from five students about the same issue then you should have the right to discuss that with somebody, to have a conversation about it with somebody. But as it was done in my case, I don't know if that's possible. I didn't have negative feedback, it all went well, I signed the form, bye-bye. But what if I really needed to talk to someone about that one issue which repeated itself. I have no idea what would have happened; I don't know the process well enough.

It's almost like the airport checkpoint. When you bring your luggage and they check if you are legit. If you're not, they take you into a room and check you and if it's all good, they let you go. Maybe this would be a metaphor, a crazy metaphor. I would not know how to define it in any other way at this point when I think specifically of our kind of evaluation.

What going through this evaluation process means to me is that it was just another experience. At this point, it was good, not too scary for me. The main word that comes into my mind is "unknown." You don't know enough, and that's somehow good, and somehow bad as well.

The form that I received telling me my performance was satisfactory was very official. I think the term satisfactory should be changed because it connects a lot to our marking system and satisfactory is not a very good grade in our minds as teachers, as instructors. Satisfactory is somewhere at the low level, then comes good, very good, and excellent. It transfers to my language as insufficient. You could see that it was the standard form, which they just fill in [with] your name. So it had actually nothing to do with you. That's what I feel when you get those standard forms. It was not personal. But our Dean, she feels the fact that that form doesn't mean a lot, and she added a sticky note to mine, I don't know if she does it for other people. But that part's so good, it's still on my door at home. It's just

a simple congratulations for a great evaluation, and it said, "You bring joy inside and outside the classroom," and she signed with her name. I think that was amazing, this yellow sticky note that was on my official letter. I think that was such a beautiful gesture on her part to show emotion, to show appreciation. Genuine appreciation, not just a formal letter. So I guess she does feel that that form is just a cold "okay" form that has nothing to do with the person, and the sticky note did it all for me. I sent it to my family; I took pictures of it. It made me really, really proud of myself and appreciative. It was wonderful. You felt not only appreciated, you felt noticed and you felt there is emotion in this process, even if it's hidden by the paperwork. It meant so much more than the official letter.

What I have come to understand about the faculty evaluation system is that it's a very well defined step-by-step process. It starts in the same way for everyone, continues, and ends. So it has a structure, steps. The intention behind the evaluation, it's not clear enough. For me it had to do with my chances to stay at the university or leave. That's how I understood it. They are checking up on me to see if I am good enough for the university, and if I'm not, this is the process that will get me out. It had nothing to do with improving my work. That was my understanding. It was not a process. It was a step-by-step . . . structure, which had to begin and end. But the end results do not help improve the quality of teaching. It's like marking a paper. Just putting a number on a person, and leave it there without feedback. It's like writing a paper, giving it to your professor, waiting for a long time for his feedback, getting it back in the end of the course just out of the blue. It has been marked with absolutely no feedback. I had papers like that, coming back with only a grade on them and it leaves you in limbo. I think the feelings are very comparable when expectations are not met. You're expecting feedback because you need to know for next time what to do.

It leaves you with that feeling like when you want to run somewhere, but you don't have a direction. You're ready to run, all of us want to improve, wish to improve. It's like parenting, you always feel you're not perfect, you want to learn, you want to hear how others do it. So you're ready to run, and there's no direction to run.

Ideally, a faculty evaluation system should define its intention collectively, with instructors, administrators. To see what is the intention, why have an evaluation system. If the intention is not clear then the decision might be, "let's not have it." The university needs to have an evaluation process. It's part of the university, or ours at least. We need to come up with a good intention, so everyone decides together why to do it. And I'm pretty sure if this would happen, if this conversation took place, wonderful ideas would come out, and most of them would be related to improving teaching, improving relationships, improving classroom atmosphere, improving quality of materials you bring to class, and so on.

So set that intention, describe it and let everybody know why faculty evaluation takes place. The next step, also in a group, not just at the executive level, decide the steps. How to do it, how would everyone feel comfortable and yet properly evaluated, and objectively evaluated. Not have only people in your own department evaluate you, have them come from other departments. People who don't know your content, people who can actually concentrate on your teaching. Work on the evaluations forms that you give to students. See what feedback from students would help the most, from the instructor's point of view and from the administrator's point of view. Leave space for students to express not only opinions but feelings as well, emotions as well, and give them space to offer constructive feedback and practical examples of how they would you like it to be done.

[Faculty need to know] what happens when it's all over. We should be given scenarios, like if you get 88 percent positive feedback from your students then you will get the letter from the Dean and you can go on as you are. If it's less than 88 percent then a group of colleagues should have a committee and try to improve the teaching openly. I would not be ashamed if somebody finds a fault, and this just might be my personal feelings but, if I am doing something wrong, first of all I would want to know, because I'm not aware of it otherwise I would not do it. I want to know and I really want to sit down with my colleagues and discuss it; how do you do it, how is it done best, let's try it out, does it work for me or not and so on.

Have an open conversation. If open conversations would happen often we would not be ashamed, we'd become comfortable sharing struggles like we did in our other group of faculty. So just do not be ashamed of having faults because we all have them, and not hide them because they just grow. If we hide them and they only appear once in two years when this evaluation happens, it doesn't help you at all. And I don't think it helps the administrators either because okay it's not such a good one but it's not bad either, whatever. And you don't want the whatever. You go all through this process with an intention if it's correctly made and to change something so the process should change something for everyone.

I learned this from my colleagues, from our conversations outside the class, that we don't use "disabled children" anymore – we use "children with disabilities." These are such important core concepts of teaching that we should share constantly with each other. This is what I found out, let's do it all the same way. I think that's so important to have that time and space for instructors. I think the evaluation process could trigger nice conversations if it was out in the open. "This is your problem; let's try together to correct it." First try yourself, see how it goes, then involve colleagues, ask advisors because it could be just a very small reason, just not knowing a small detail that triggers this wrong activity or wrong strategy. If this is not

135

out in the blue, if it's not discussed, if it's not known, it can only hurt your future at the university but it cannot improve your teaching.

To learn from each other . . . I would not even call them mistakes, bumps in the road. Allow the space to have the conversation with the co-ordinator and colleagues. At this point it has only a one-sided meaning, which for me is, "Do you have a future in this institution or do you not?" It's as simple as this. I don't see anything else. Maybe something related to you advancing in your career within that university. I have to pass this evaluation in order to be eligible to apply for a new job and so on. Using it in reference letters for example. If the evaluation is good you can use it later on. But what do you do if it's not good, that's my question because I think that's an issue.

For a real evaluation, it should be random; they should just walk in. You know you teach and prepare differently when you know you have inspection. So they should tell you an hour before, "Can I please come enter the classroom?" and they would come in. In my case it was actually like that because the schedules were so full from both sides that we just needed to decide fast, "Okay I'm teaching today, okay come." That was it. It should be genuine, should be natural, should be an everyday course you're teaching. First of all, choosing 50 percent, okay, what criteria do I use? If I like 50 percent of my courses more than the other 50 percent, then why am I teaching the other 50 percent, you know? You should be proud of everything you teach. I would not even know how to select the 50 percent. Maybe just in terms of "Oh, I have this wonderful great interactive activity in one of my classes," but it doesn't define that course itself, it defines that hour of that day.

Allow co-ordinators and at least two instructors from other departments to view your teaching from another lens. Not content-wise, just as an instructor, your ability to transmit knowledge. To interact, to feel your relationship with your students, to feel the atmosphere in class, and relate it to what you're teaching. It would be interesting to get that feedback in a conversation right after the class, to sit down with them, have a coffee, and say, "What did you think? Where can I improve? Which part did you like the best?" I think that would be open and sincere and, again, if it happens over and over again, you'll become comfortable with it so it's not an artificial kind of process anymore.

Faculty enrichment conjures up for me definitely professional development, lots of collaboration among faculty, enriching each other. Again, I'm talking from the experience we have in our group, the Faculty Learning Community (FLC), how wonderfully that worked just to bounce ideas off each other and react to them sincerely. Enrichment as well is a process which never ends – should never stop. Everyone should know you can never reach a level where you don't need to enrich anymore, where you don't need to improve anymore.

Enrichment to me could as well mean your personal enrichment. Bringing in new research . . . new readings, having a common database where you can collect ideas, strategies, activities, put them all together. Again, I think of our group, the FLC. What if that would happen for the whole faculty, the whole school? What a rich database we could have. "Do you have a way to teach this concept?" "Oh, yes, I did this; this is how it worked." What if we would all have access to a kind of database, a blog, a website, where we could record ourselves teaching. I think [it] would have enormous value. I know it did for myself; I would record myself teaching and watch it later and reflect and identify my own faults. So what if we would share little videos of how we would teach certain types of concepts or strategies and have access to [them]. I think that would be really enriching. I would love to see my colleagues teaching. We've seen the results in the FLC group. We've seen people start to relax and breathe – just because they felt comfortable with sharing struggles. It's a human thing. Why not bring that human thing into your professional life? This is how I see faculty enrichment.

For new instructors, let them know the evaluation process. Not just handing them the faculty handbook. We know how we are – we flip through it fast and put it on a shelf. Have a conversation, have a workshop about it. We had orientation workshops in the beginning; I would love for us second- and third-year instructors to be invited to those workshops because I did learn a lot. Before starting an evaluation, everyone should know what it entails exactly. "This is how it's going to happen." I didn't have this information. Have it more openly done. It is a formal process, but have an informal feeling to it because then it's more genuine. Have the administrators know that what our Dean did to me was a life-changing experience, with just a sticky note. It's not effort there; it's just your real feelings on that form. Erase the standard form and have a personalized form written to that faculty member.

See the evaluation process as an enriching process. See it as helping the instructor and not just checking on him or her. Involve the instructor in her self-evaluation. Ask for a self-evaluation; I was not asked for one. Just by sitting down and being motivated to do a self-evaluation, I think it's enrichment because you sit down and reflect and you identify struggles you have. Those struggles might not be seen in that class you're teaching on that certain day and hour when someone comes to watch you. It would be so much more real if you could self-evaluate yourself. Have the choice to let us submit a video of a class we're really proud of. Connect internal evaluation with external evaluation. I talk about the feeling you have being evaluated and being an evaluator. It's too much an outside process. The instructor himself or herself is not part of it. And if they're not part of it, it will not improve their practice.

Imagine a tram, going downhill, full of people. The tram has a good direction; everyone knows where they're going. But you as an

137

instructor are outside, flying in the wind with that tram. This tram has your name on it and is all for you, but you're not in it. That's the image I get. You're flying, holding on to that tram, it's all in your name but you're not in it. So making it more personal means being able to contribute by conversation to what goes on the form. Be given time to read your evaluation and respond to it otherwise it's not part of you. It's your evaluation but you're not in it. Make me part of it. I self-evaluate, I have time to reflect on how others evaluated me, I have time and space to respond – to respond to my co-ordinator, to respond to my colleagues and get feedback. Not just be a passive spectator of your own evaluation. Be part of it. That's why I talk about the process, the effect the process has on you. Being informed of your feedback is improving your practice automatically. I would like evaluation that actually helps practice.

4.5.1.   Commentary on Linda's Profile

Linda appears to be unfamiliar with the faculty evaluation process, which is not surprising since she is a new instructor at the institution. When the co-ordinator announces to her that she will be visiting her class, Linda is not aware of why she is coming. It is only when the co-ordinator comes a second and third time that Linda grows suspicious as to why she is there and is informed that she is being evaluated. Lack of knowledge of how the faculty evaluation process works highlights the importance of providing information sessions to new faculty on the purpose and procedures of the faculty evaluation process. Linda's lack of knowledge around the process seems to work well for her because it does not allow the fear factor to emerge, which can be a significant element of a faculty evaluation process.

Linda guesses that the purpose of the evaluation process is to maintain standards, yet notes that the lack of timeliness of the results of the evaluation is a concern because she has to wait too long to see the contents of her evaluation file, which would not allow for responsive changes to approaches to teaching. In addition, she notes that faculty enrichment cannot accrue from this process because of the lack of timeliness of the results. The time lag between the evaluation being conducted and Linda's access to the contents of the evaluation file is concerning. The faculty member should have access to this information in a timely manner; not providing access to this information results in missed opportunities to be responsive to the feedback presented in the file and signals the process is a quality control measure.

Linda questions the value of the peer evaluation but defends her right to not include a negative evaluation of a peer. She sees the value in providing training for peers to complete a classroom observation and welcomes more opportunities to work collaboratively with peers outside the formal evaluation process. Since the contents of Linda's evaluation file, which included SETs, a co-ordinator report, and a peer evaluation, were positive, she never has a conversation with the co-ordinator about her evaluation; the process ends with Linda's signature on a form indicating that she will not challenge the contents of the file. She ponders what would have happened if her evaluations had not been deemed satisfactory by her departmental evaluation committee because the process is unknown to her.

Linda also questions why the form she received from the Dean determines that her performance was only satisfactory, which connotes to her that her performance was insufficient, which is not the case. The collegial model on which the evaluation process is based provides for only two conclusions to an evaluation file: satisfactory or less than satisfactory. She recommends including a self-evaluation into the process as a way of involving faculty in the process and as an aid to having them reflect on their teaching and improve their practice rather than the current model that positions faculty as a "passive spectator" of their own evaluation.

In terms of Bourdieu's (1997) thinking tools, it is clear that Linda's embodied cultural capital has developed from the values of her family, a family that values education. Also, her desire to be a teacher is formed in childhood and influenced by her father's position as a professor. Her pedagogical habitus develops from a young age – from her early years of schooling to her desire to go to graduate school in Canada to opening her own school and offering pedagogical workshops in her home country. She is able to convert her cultural capital, pedagogical habitus, and social capital through her workshops into economic capital as a means of keeping her school open in the face of difficult financial times.

Even though Linda lacks cultural capital in terms of how the evaluation process at the institution works, she does expand her cultural capital though her successful evaluation and the note from the Dean, which both work to increase her self-confidence

139

and her reputation at the institution. Interestingly, her social networks (social capital) at the university do not help her to understand the evaluation process. She looks to more senior faculty for an explanation of the process but they are also in need of information. Keeping the results of the evaluation from faculty for prolonged periods of time prompts the question – why, in the field of CU, is this a common practice among departments? The answer is quite likely that in most cases the waiting is indicative of a successful evaluation. Otherwise, the co-ordinator should have contacted the faculty member once the SETs indicated concerns. Withholding this information is indicative of the lack of cultural capital of faculty members who do not realize that they can ask to see their evaluations and also indicative of the power differential between new faculty and co-ordinators. This observation reflects Bourdieu's (1990) theory of practice wherein practices such as waiting for prolonged periods of time are reflective of how the process structures the actions of co-ordinators and continues to reproduce the structure of the evaluation process through their social practices. Throughout Linda's narrative it is clear that she desires to make a space for herself at CU that is based on her desire to help others, her desire to always work on developing professionally, expanding her pedagogical habitus and accelerating her social capital.

4.6. Conclusion

These five profiles allow a deeper understanding of the participants' lived experience with the faculty evaluation process at Capilano University to unfold. These first-person profiles/narratives highlight the complexities of the process through the voices of a new instructor, a senior instructor, a co-ordinator, and two administrators. The next chapter will present the results of the analysis and coding for themes from focus group and interview transcripts.

Chapter 5.   Interpretations

Faculty evaluation is a complex process that attempts to balance accountability measures with opportunities for faculty growth and development. Throughout the focus groups and in-depth interviews that I conducted with participants, the complexities around Capilano University's faculty evaluation process emerged in the voices of my colleagues. I share the following interpretations, which capture the tensions, opportunities, and contradictions of this process.

When it comes to the faculty evaluation process at Capilano University, the participants had no trouble coming up with adjectives to describe it. And although a repeated adjective was punitive, a variety of other adjectives also provide an introductory glimpse into the process: unknown, flawed, impersonal, unnatural, adequate, antiquated, ineffective, time-consuming, cumbersome, legalistic, quantitatively focused, bureaucratic, incomplete, toothless, cyclical, nerve racking, the opposite of motivational, demoralizing, teacher-centered, good-intentioned, exciting, revealing, empowering, and anecdotal.   This plethora of adjectives provides only a cursory glimpse into the complexities and incompatibilities of Capilano University's faculty evaluation process.

While the adjectives provided a glimpse into the process, the analogies that participants used to describe this process also proved enlightening; for example, participants compared the faculty evaluation process to getting their teeth cleaned or going to the dentist, to giving birth, to having a paper you submitted midterm returned at the end of the term with a grade and no feedback, to coming before a court of law, and to going on a date.

Crowley suggests,

> I might compare it to going on a date. There is some level of anxiety, but you're entering with some prospect that something good will come out of it or you wouldn't be there in the first place. In terms of an

anxiety scale, there's a certain tension, but there is the prospect of something interesting coming out of it. I don't get super nervous with evaluations . . . I sort of hope for the best, but as most human beings, we tend to tense up a little bit (FG2, p. 25).

And Darrell notes,

For some it's like going to the dentist. I say that not entirely facetiously. Because I did it for so many years as a co-ordinator, I was truly amazed at how uncomfortable evaluation made people feel. And many, not most, faculty have a difficult time hearing constructive criticism. And I use constructive criticism in the best sense of the word (p. 13).

5.1. Tensions

The primary theme that emerged from the interviews and focus groups was the tensions that arise from the faculty evaluation process and the participants' experiences navigating that process. Tensions emerged regarding the purpose of the evaluation process, the usefulness of peer evaluations, the public stigma around the Alerting and Guidance provision, and the challenges of change.

5.1.1. Purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Process

The purpose of a faculty evaluation process is the "cornerstone of every faculty evaluation program," according to Seldin (2006); the purpose informs the data sources, the "kind of information gathered, the depth of data analysis, and the dissemination of findings" (p. 4). Consequently, the question of what purpose the evaluation process serves is critically important in considering the design of a faculty evaluation program. One common purpose is to improve faculty performance, another to make personnel decisions, and a third purpose is to provide data to government "agencies and accrediting bodies" (Seldin, 2006, p. 14).

A noteworthy revelation regarding the purpose of Capilano University's faculty evaluation process appeared throughout the interviews and focus groups: The purpose of the university's faculty evaluation process, for participants in this study, appears to be a mystery. Silence prevailed for most participants when I asked them to consider the

purpose of the process. Eventually, they did venture a variety of purposes with the most common one being it served as an accountability measure to ensure that teaching standards were being maintained. As Felicia suggests, the purpose is "to determine the level of competence in the classroom and hopefully to support instructors who might need that support" (FG3, p. 5). Jacquie provides an observation on what the purpose should be "for us to become better teachers," whereas Crowley proposes it is "to provide students with the best education possible" (FG1, p. 8; FG2, p. 9). In a similar positive vein, one administrator participant deems the purpose of the process is "to let me know those [instructors] who go above and beyond the call. It was an opportunity for me to write to my best teachers and to thank them and acknowledge that they had done great work" (FG4, p. 5). And Pipi offers what the purpose of the process should be:

> To build a culture of improvement, a culture of critical perspective, to get multiple points of access for not only about how you're teaching but about how your students are learning. To be able to build collaborative relationships among the faculty, to try to support teachers who need improvement and to occasionally counsel out people who shouldn't be teaching. To be one key component in the whole university system of accountability (FG4, p. 5).

While most of the previous comments relate to what the purpose should be, Minnie declares, "I think by default what [the purpose] has become is to catch the most egregious" and Cranston agrees, "it becomes its most valuable tool when we are finding the worst [teachers]" (FG5, p. 5). Sandra has an equally cynical view of the purpose: "I think it has to just be recognized as being a bureaucratic process that is being complied with" (p. 12). But I leave the final observation to Darrell: "The strictest interpretation is summative. You know there are mentoring clauses in the evaluation process; there is a section on formative, but ultimately the evaluation committee is making a recommendation to the Dean on the employment status of the individual" (p. 6).

One reason for the uncertainly over the purpose of the faculty evaluation process may be that the document is a procedural document, which explains how the process is executed but does not provide any explanation for its purpose.

5.1.2.   The Usefulness of Peer Evaluations

One of the key research questions for this study deals with how satisfied participants are with the components of the evaluation process. The process requires full-time faculty, who would teach eight sections (courses) annually to include student questionnaires from a minimum of two of their courses, a co-ordinator report, and a peer evaluation that may be waived once a faculty member has passed the two-year probationary period (Article 11.5.3.2.1 – Article 11.5.3.2.5, Appendix C). Faculty members are able to choose the colleague who will evaluate them. Faculty and administrators who participated in this study were definitive about the questionable value of peer evaluations.

Emily states,

> You are going to choose someone who says something nice. We had an instructor who had a lot of issues [and] for whatever reason, the colleague report was glowing. . . . When I wrote a colleague report for someone this last term, I was told by the [department] chair you need to be honest and put down what you really think and she gave me samples of how to offer ways to improve, and it was really hard for me because I thought, now I am going to turn this in – is the colleague going to come after me? But I just read one evaluation now for a faculty member who is new whom we had a lot of problems with and the colleague evaluation was completely glowing and you would have had no idea. . . . The colleague [evaluation] – I don't really see the point to it (FG1, p. 9).

Meanwhile, Crowley comments on peer evaluations and questions whether the faculty member being evaluated should be permitted to choose the colleague who will complete the peer evaluation,

> One thing that I always thought was a little curious was that the faculty being evaluated gets to choose their own colleague. That's very nice but, as you mentioned, you are not going to get the person who may know the terrible truth. That wouldn't be a big tweak (FG2, p. 28).

Davina shares the difficulty she has getting colleagues to complete peer evaluations that are useful.

I cannot get, for the most part, [faculty] to do colleague evaluations that are useful – they see it as just another task that they have to do and some of them will literally give me just two-sentence answers for each of those four items on the form. So, they don't take it seriously. They all go to class dutifully for an hour and then just look at last year's evaluation that they did for someone else and just plug in sentences. . . . It's not useful (FG2, p. 3).

Sal describes handling situations where the peer evaluations were not through enough.

My evaluations tend to be several pages and fulsome in order to give the evaluation committee something to work with. The hardest thing we do when we are reviewing the files is that the colleague [evaluation] . . . [is] so thin and so skimpy and so friendly and their colleague is always their best friend and it doesn't serve either the faculty member or the process at all. The evaluation comes across as an opinion rather than a review or a constructive evaluation. Yes, everyone has to sign off, and it's really easy to sign off when the whole page is [only] five lines long. As chair of the evaluation committee, I have actually turned back a file and sent the report back to the person who wrote it and said that this is insufficient for what we need to do – if you are the chosen colleague, you need to do a real review even if you have to redo it, even if it means sitting back in the classroom. . . . It's very frustrating. We have also felt that it is toothless. You can't do anything with it (FG2, p. 5).

Colleen raises a concern around peer evaluations as well.

One more thing that I see is that it's more than just the evaluation in the classroom; it's what kind of a colleague is this? If they have a really challenging personality, nothing gets put in the file. It's very rare where something gets put in the file. This person needs to be more collegial; they need to volunteer more – just basically have a better attitude and contribute more. Then some people say you've really got to look at this file now and we're not happy with this person and the evaluation committee says we can only look at what's in the file. You didn't submit something to the file; in fact, you wrote that they were a delightful colleague and the evaluation committee has no choice but to rubberstamp it. That's a real shortcoming of the system and I think the answer to that is education (FG3, p. 6).

I leave the final comment to Linda who states quite forcefully her unwillingness to give a negative colleague evaluation.

Because it is a formal process and there is so much more to that person than a piece of paper, in my view. Because I only visited her class once, it could be that she just had a stressful period, that she just heard some shocking news. So many factors could be involved in that class on that day. And I feel that just a piece of paper cannot reflect that. By not having a conversation, by not hearing her part of the story, I feel that it would be an artificial piece of paper that just reflects my observation of that day of that class. It would not be the reality and that's why I would refuse (p. 11).

These reflections on the value of peer evaluations echo the research. Arreola (2007) recommends excluding them from the evaluation process for the reasons participants noted; however, they are a useful instrument in guiding an instructor to improvement but should not be used in summative evaluations (Arreola, 2007, Zakrajsek, 2006). Arreola (2007) recommends and Chism (2007) and Millis (2006) concur that the following guidelines for peer observation of teaching be included in a faculty evaluation process:

- Develop a checklist of best practices to highlight the characteristics and behaviours the peer will be focusing on

- Train a team of peer observers who would individually observe the teacher multiple times throughout the term

- Introduce students to the system of peer observation

- Arrange for a formal observation of the teaching only after the peer team members have visited the class a couple of times

- Compile a report of the team's observations

- Follow up with a post-observation debrief

From my experience, and from the experiences shared by the participants in this study, none of these guidelines are commonly followed at CU. A post-observation debrief is sometimes included, at the discretion of the observer or at the behest of the instructor who is being evaluated, but is not a guideline that is adhered to at the institution for peer evaluations. Peer evaluations at CU may be waived for faculty who

146

have passed the two-year probationary evaluation cycle, which suggests that the university deems them less useful after the probationary period has ended, a point that Zakrajsek (2006) and Seldin (2006) support when they note that newer members of the department benefit from them most.

Nevertheless, at CU, faculty members are encouraged to conduct formative evaluations in each of their courses each semester, but it is up to the instructor to initiate this process. CU faculty who are being formally evaluated often distribute formative evaluations early in the term that pose a number of general questions such as, How am I doing? What do you like about the course? What would you like to see changed? What additional comments would you like to add? These informal formative evaluations remain the property of the instructor and are not shared with administration.

5.1.3. Alerting and Guidance

At the end of the evaluation cycle, a departmental evaluation committee reviews the faculty member's file and can recommend Alerting and Guidance (A&G) if the committee deems that the faculty member's performance has been less than satisfactory (Article 11.5.5.1.2, Appendix C). Part of the process requires that the co-ordinator convene a three- to five-member Guidance Committee to assist the faculty in the coming academic year. The faculty member must approve the membership of the Guidance Committee. The participants were eager to share their perspectives on A&G.

> [T]he Alerting and Guidance system, which has a stigma attached to it unfortunately – which says now you have this label, you didn't make the cut and you have to have the committee working with you. It's a very negative experience. I am working with four people right now and all of them are quite reluctant and fearful; they want to continue working here. . . . It's a very intimidating experience; it's not useful; and it's a barrier you have to work through (Colleen, FG3, p. 6).

Since the term Alerting and Guidance has developed a stigma, Cindy recommends it be changed. "I would like to see the words 'Alerting and Guidance' changed. Making it a less scary thing – a more supportive thing – changing the culture and people's feelings around Alerting and Guidance" (FG2, p. 27).

147

Donald offers this perspective on the Alerting and Guidance process:

Utilization of mentoring is seemingly the issue. It's a good tool but we can't apply it properly. We can't even apply it sometimes because people resent it and reject it because they see it as punitive. There is a big ego issue attached to the whole [Alerting and Guidance] process (FG5, p. 18).

Alice comments:

Going back to my previous comment about Alerting and Guidance, I describe it as a blunt instrument. I think it would be helpful [if] other options were available that would address the nature and the scale of the need for some kind of correction. Alerting and Guidance as it stands right now is almost like you are out the door if you don't do better. And yet how did [we] allow them to get like that without some kind of earlier remediation (FG5, p. 17)?

Meanwhile, one division in the university is attempting to take the stigma out of the process as the following example demonstrates.

We just had someone who was on Alerting and Guidance (A&G) and I was on their Alerting and Guidance committee last semester. As I wasn't their co-ordinator evaluator, the instructor was shocked when we went over his evaluation with him. He needed a lot of help and support. The instructor just got taken off Alerting and Guidance this semester and he sent this amazing email saying, "Thank you for all your support." . . . And he is very thankful for going through the (A&G) process. We've seen quite a number of instructors who weren't hearing what the students were saying. The students were complaining to convenors or co-ordinators that so and so was not doing that properly, and we could tell them that but until the instructor went through the official process, that instructor didn't do anything about it until they were put on Alerting and Guidance. So I think for me I have seen a lot of success come out of there in terms of improving our faculty; it also makes people very nervous (FG2, p. 7-8).

However, Davina counters this example with what happened in her department. "We've had the opposite happen where the Alerting and Guidance person just shuts down and becomes an even worse instructor than before" (FG2, p. 8).

Simone suggests axing the Alerting and Guidance provision and thinks this process is a bad idea.

> [N]umber one, it carries such a public stigma around it. . . . It's the fix-it shop. The horse is well out of the barn before you decide to intervene. That is not the teachable moment" (p. 9).

These observations provide a lens into understanding the complexities around Alerting and Guidance. It is a process that has a stigma attached to it, yet faculty have benefited from the process as it served to alert them to the need to make changes in their teaching behaviours in order to continue at the institution. Nevertheless, as Davina noted, some instructors react by doing less well, which may reflect their lack of confidence in the process, their belief that their teaching behaviours are good enough, or their reaction to how demoralizing the process is.

I have spent countless hours on Guidance Committees working with faculty to guide them to improvement – visiting their classes, having them visit mine, meeting with them on an ongoing basis throughout the year to talk about pedagogy, to try out new teaching ideas, and to build trust between us. I truly felt that I was participating in a mentor-mentee relationship and that together we were engaged in a mutual learning relationship. I found my participation in Guidance Committees, for the most part, enriching for both of us. However, after working on a number of Guidance Committees, I have learned that the most important aspect of this process is the building of trust – because without it, there is no moving forward – defensiveness takes hold, the process stalls, and the opportunity for progress evaporates for one primary reason: the faculty member is often gutted by the process.

And although I have experienced my membership on guidance committees as an opportunity for mentorship, the process of Alerting and Guidance process is a disciplinary action. Consequently, I would equate Alerting and Guidance with supervision and surveillance. From the comments of participants in this study, it is clear that A&G is viewed as a punitive process that affects a faculty member's confidence and his/her personal and professional investment in the process. As Schaffner and MacKinnon (2002) assert, performance evaluation criteria "that are not aligned with

faculty development are generally perceived as punitive and serve to inhibit faculty confidence and faculty improvement" (p. 6).

5.1.4. The Challenges of Change

Faculty and administrator participants offered a plethora of ideas about how to improve the faculty evaluation process at Capilano. For example: strike a task force of primarily faculty and a few administrators, expand the opportunities for formative evaluation, include self-reflection and goal setting, and move to a more learning-centred approach to evaluation. However, participants invariably expressed concern over their ability to effect change because the faculty evaluation process resides in the Faculty Collective Agreement. Simone shares her perspective:

> What makes it hard here is because I see a fair amount of it embedded in the collective agreement and that is a very difficult document to modify. It should have never been put in the collective agreement. This is not where it should live" (p. 11).

Sandra also alludes to the difficulty of effecting change:

> Yes, it [the faculty evaluation process] needs to change; it's just that making anything change at Capilano is – there are just way too many difficulties making any changes. It's a very contentious environment with the union and faculty very resistant to change. . . . Dealing with the collective agreement is just way too complicated, so I think that the process of making a change would be very difficult (p. 18).

Nevertheless, being restricted by the Faculty Collective Agreement did not deter some participants from envisioning changes that would improve the process by improving mentoring, training, and formative evaluation outside the collective agreement. A faculty participant who has been with the institution for more than three decades concludes,

> I don't think we are going to change the process; the process is what it is right now. Could we do something on our own before that [the formal evaluation process]? Changes around the current process would have to be negotiated with the union. I don't know [if] there is a will for that (p. 24). . . . The faculty evaluation process will stay the same, as far as I am concerned. But can we make it richer and a

better experience for the employee by doing other things? That doesn't mean that the evaluation system needs to change (FG3, p. 27).

An administrator participant also agrees that changes could be made outside the current collective agreement that would make the faculty evaluation process more effective.

[Faculty evaluation] is so entrenched in the collective agreement, but there are some additional things we could do – I think some of the suggestions that you came up with – the faculty sits down on their own or with someone and says, 'What am I working on? What's worked really well for me? What do I need to improve? What am I not going to do anymore?' We need to think about what that looks like. We could do that really easily within the collective agreement. And I think we need to figure out how do we get flying squads [groups of peers] to go in and help people. We've had people here for years and it's kind of like, 'I need a refresher. Mary, come into my class and give me three new ideas' (p. 24).

In summary, the theme of tensions captures the questionable value of peer evaluations, the uncertain purpose of the evaluation process, the punitive nature of the Alerting and Guidance provision, and the challenges of changing the process because of it being embedded in the faculty collective agreement.

5.2. Opportunities

The theme of opportunities emerged in relation to the value of formative evaluation, the desire to lessen the inherent fear factor associated with the evaluation process, the recognition of the importance of SETs and co-ordinator reports, and the benefits of offering mentorship to new hires.

5.2.1. The Value of Formative Evaluation

Participants shared a variety of ways that they elicit feedback on their teaching outside of the formal evaluation process – from giving out informal feedback forms in the first half of the term to putting a bonus question on the final exam asking for feedback on

the course. The participants communicated their preference for more opportunities for formative evaluation to be included in the current faculty evaluation process. The value of formative evaluation surfaced as an avenue to provide support for instructors and to build opportunities for collaboration. Although participants were clear the current peer evaluation process was ineffective, both faculty participants and administrator participants saw peer evaluation as an untapped source of formative evaluation.

Esther wondered about the possibility of soliciting peer feedback outside of the usual formal evaluation process.

> Wouldn't it be great, from a self-development point of view, to have your class videotaped and have a group of peers sit around with you and say what could be done? We don't have time to do that obviously, and many people would not want it done, but it might be a great way to learn like you do in the IDP [Instructors Diploma Program] (FG2, p. 25).

Karley expresses a similar desire to collect feedback outside the formal evaluation process.

> I'd love it if someone would come in and watch a couple of classes and give me feedback – not even as part of the formal evaluation – but that doesn't seem to exist, so this thing that they've got in place, they are just ticking boxes off a list (FG3, p. 6).

Although administrator participants also questioned the value of peer evaluations, they also saw their potential. "You might be able to make some really good progress if you created small teams and the teams visited each other. Just the same way when you build trust within a student group (FG4, p. 21). According to Darrell, "[T]rue formative evaluation is a process of peer evaluation . . . frequent classroom visits; I mean if you are going to evaluate someone and encourage them to improve, you got to see what they are doing" (p. 8). Simone reflects on both summative and formative evaluation.

> I learned that the kind of end-point evaluation – the summatives – were really not very useful because you couldn't modify or change your teaching – every class is a bit different – so what worked well one time maybe wasn't working so well next time. But if you waited until the very end to get that sort of feedback, it was useless. So, I created

152

my own template to do a more formative evaluation, often just to see if the course as a whole was going the right way, what we could do better (p. 5).

But it is through Sandra's example of providing support to a new instructor that we get a glimpse into the value of formative evaluation as a means of helping a new instructor have a more successful formal evaluation.

> [W]e were able to get her to do a "how am I doing" type of evaluation for her class. She got the feedback, and she shared that feedback, which wasn't positive, and [we] got her involved in some mentorship to help her with her teaching. She has received some support that way; she was a bit resistant but I think she did learn some things from that process. So the evaluation process is completely separate to what has been going on on the side. I know that she has struggles and I'm trying to deal with that before I have to sit down and do an evaluation. I haven't gone into her class formally. I've gone in once [informally] and I'll be going in again in the next few weeks. At that point I'll sit down and compile her student evaluations, which I've already looked at, and then I will write it up. But hopefully it won't be as much of a massacre as it would have been if I had just done what I'm supposed to do, which is go in once or twice, accumulate student evaluations, write down my observations, and that's that (p. 7).

What is interesting to note is that the faculty evaluation process calls for mentorship to be offered to any employee "whose student questionnaires in the first term of the evaluation year warrant mentoring in the opinion of the Co-ordinator" (Article: 11.5.9.1, Appendix C). Moreover, the formative section of the faculty evaluation process indicates that a faculty member "should not be subject to an evaluation without prior direct feedback on his/her performance related to the evaluation criteria" in terms of relation to students, to assignments, to his/her subject or area of specialty (Article: 11.5.8, Appendix C). Considering the information just outlined about the importance of formative feedback prior to a formal evaluation, Sandra's comment suggests that she has moved beyond what is called for in the faculty evaluation process. She did not wait for the first round of student questionnaires to indicate concerns before she offered mentorship, although she visited the instructor's classes and provided feedback prior to the first round of formal evaluation, which is what the formative evaluation principles in the faculty evaluation process suggest. As noted in the faculty evaluation process, "formative evaluations are for the faculty member's use only" and "all employees can

benefit from feedback on a regular basis" (Article: 11.5.8, Appendix C). Interestingly, the formative evaluation principles have been part of the faculty evaluation process for a decade or more, but it appears to be an underappreciated provision in the faculty evaluation process. Many times in my role as co-ordinator or peer, I chose to return to an instructor's class for an additional classroom observation before writing up the formal co-ordinator or peer report. I also held a debrief with the instructor after each classroom observation to suggest alternative ways to consider presenting material or engaging students, for example. But I will readily admit that I was unaware of this article in the faculty evaluation process until I began this study of the evaluation process at my institution.

5.2.2.   Removing the Fear Factor

Participants recognized the inherent anxiety factor in the process of faculty evaluation but wanted to see the fear factor reduced. Pipi offers these observations:

> Part of the problem is that it shouldn't be an evaluation – the word itself is pejorative and punitive; it should be an opportunity for faculty improvement – it should be a faculty stocktaking, an awareness exercise, and 18 or 20 years ago we would say this was an effort to achieve the gestalt of teaching (FG4, p. 20).

Linda suggests,

> I would like to see the definition of the word evaluation at Capilano University. . . . I would love for evaluation to be described as an aid to you becoming a better teacher . . . bringing new strategies, asking new questions, which makes you develop professionally. I would erase the stress factor, which does not help an instructor to do good teaching if they are under stress by being evaluated. I would actually change the word evaluation (p. 12).

Simone offers her perspective on the word and poses an important question.

> Every time you use the word evaluation, it's "warning, warning." It's the way in which it has evolved that makes it almost counterproductive to be innovative, to try new things in the classroom and to really excel as teachers. How do you disassociate so much of the baggage of the evaluative process – the fear in it? (p. 19).

Minnie opines,

> I would like to say . . . that part of the problem is that it is so
> frightening for people. We have not been able to get to a place where
> we see the evaluation process as something that is about helping
> [faculty] become better educators. It's still very much about, 'Am I in
> or am I out? Am I going to hear bad things?' (FG5, p. 2).

Alice concurs,

> The nature of our evaluation process is that it is fear-based, not
> supportive, and not embracing the positive aspects of an instructor,
> which is not helping them identify goals and expressing themselves in
> a way that might actually help get them to a new level. Even if they
> are very good, they need to know that we have support so that they
> can do something more. And I don't think that we give that (FG5, p.
> 2).

These observations on the current faculty evaluation process highlight important insights regarding the value of connecting faculty evaluation to opportunities for faculty development. Arreola (2007) recognizes that faculty view evaluation as punitive when they perceive that its main purpose is to collect evidence for disciplinary action and when they perceive that the process is not connected to faculty development programs. The comments of these participants are illustrative of the view that the faculty evaluation process is regarded as a punitive process rather than an opportunity to develop professionally which is one of the main reasons for the fear factor that surrounds the current faculty evaluation process.

5.2.3. The Value of Student Evaluation of Teaching (SETs) and Co-ordinator Reports

While participants in this study clearly questioned the value of peer evaluations, generally they recognized the importance of including student questionnaires (SETs) and co-ordinator reports in the faculty evaluation process. At CU, instructors may take advantage of the feedback that they receive from informal formative evaluations that they administer to make changes prior to the formal summative evaluations that may be distributed after 40 percent of the course material has been covered. The departmental

assistant or co-ordinator is generally the person who distributes and collects the SETs but it is the divisional assistant who tallies the results and places them in the faculty member's evaluation file along with the peer and co-ordinator reports. One student questionnaire that is used in the Faculty of Business and Professional Studies, which is the second largest faculty on campus, includes a self-assessment section for the student to elicit their appraisal of their participation, preparation, and effort, and it also asks students to rate the textbook and course material, and how well assessments align with learning objectives for the course. The evaluation also includes 13 statements related to the instructor's ability, one of which is, "The overall teaching ability of the instructor is excellent." The scale provides these choices: Always, Mostly, Sometimes, Seldom, Never, and Not Applicable. Students are also asked to provide written comments in response to the questions: What do you think the instructor does well in this course? What do you think the instructor could do differently to improve his/her delivery of this course? and What motivated you to register for this course? (See Appendix E.)

This widely used student-evaluation form at CU compares favourably in some aspects with the IDEA Centre's Survey Form in that it has students provide feedback on the effort they are putting into the course, asks students to assess a number of typical teaching behaviours, and includes the important statement, "Overall, I would rate this instructor as." However, other questions on the IDEA form are "Asked students to help each other understand ideas or concepts" and "Formed teams or discussion groups to facilitate learning," which indicate an expectation of a more student-centred approach to teaching. The IDEA form also asks student to rate the difficulty of the course, the amount of work and reading required, and to rate their progress in the course related to other courses taken at the university in terms of course learning objectives. Seldin (1993) notes that if the purpose of the rating form is to "elicit evaluation of specific teaching behaviours," then "20 [to] 30 diagnostic questions is appropriate," but if it is for summative purposes, "four to six questions for overall ratings" of faculty performance is appropriate (p. 2).

SETs are commonly seen as an opportunity to give students, the educational consumer, a voice in the quality of teaching deliverables. Cindy offers her perspective on SETs.

I also think that members of the department evaluation committee put much more emphasis on the student evaluations. They are our customers so that makes sense. But there are other things in my co-ordinator's evaluation that are really important. Someone may not be the strongest teacher, but they have done all this stuff for the department. There are all sorts of factors to consider, but when people have issues with students, that's what really is the highlight, which it probably should be, but it diminishes the other ways that we can evaluate people (FG2, p. 4).

And although the participants may have been generally satisfied with the inclusion of student evaluations and co-ordinator reports, they offered a number of suggestions to obtain a broader perspective on faculty evaluation. Recommendations included a self-reflection that would allow faculty to consider their year in review and to set goals for the coming year. Simone suggests,

I think every component is a piece of the mosaic, but the whole mosaic really isn't there unless you really get people to engage in reflective practice on their own teaching and try to assemble it in a meaningful way and set some goals. It's an incomplete process to just get the feedback and not give us a place to make sense of it all. It's the meaning making of it that's missing (p. 7).

Meanwhile, a trend toward including more documentation in the evaluation file seems to be underway with one faculty division appearing to lead the way. In this department, the faculty, staff, and Dean are invited to submit feedback to a peer's evaluation file. This approach to inviting feedback had been a practice in this division for a long time and compares to the 360-degree approach to evaluation that Buller (2012) suggests in his text, *Best Practices in Faculty Evaluation*. I have learned by reviewing the faculty evaluation process that the Dean or President can only add material to the file based on "personal contact, investigation, or observation" (Article 11.5.3.2.5, Appendix C). A follow-up interview with the co-ordinator participant revealed that although feedback is invited, he recalls only one time when feedback was received. This feedback came from a small group of faculty in a particular discipline who wrote a memo to the file outlining why a recent hire should not be hired back (Interview, April, 2014).

Only two faculty participants suggested that the student evaluations should remain in their possession and only one administrator shared her past experience with

student evaluations being the property of the instructor. This observation is most likely a result of the historical fact that student evaluations have always formed part of the faculty evaluation process at the university and that the evaluations primarily serve a summative purpose. Arreola (2007) suggests that the "faculty evaluation system be constructed in such a way that detailed, frequently gathered data are provided in confidence only to the faculty member for diagnostic and feedback purposes . . . [and] specified formats for summarizing the detailed data be developed" (p. xxix). The faculty evaluation process at CU provides feedback to probationary faculty each year of their two-year probationary period (Article 11.5.1.1, Appendix C). Typically after the two-year probationary period, faculty are evaluated every five years unless the Dean calls for an out-of-sequence evaluation (Article 11.5.1.3; Article 11.5.5.1.1 Appendix C). For any faculty member being evaluated, the peer evaluations and the student evaluations are included in the evaluation file along with the co-ordinator's report. (These documents are the property of the university. The evaluation file is kept in the university's Human Resources Department; previously the faculty evaluation file was kept for two years and then destroyed, although a faculty member could request it at the end of the two-year period. However, as of 2011, the files must be kept indefinitely as determined by the accrediting body, the Northwest Commission of Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). A faculty member can access his or her evaluation file by contacting the Human Resources Department to arrange an appointment to view it.

Typically, peer observers and co-ordinators do provide faculty members with a copy of their reports and the divisional assistant provides a summary report of the student feedback from the SETs to ensure faculty have copies of these data.

Administrator participants were clear that they need access to the contents of the whole file to make an informed decision on the faculty member's performance.

> Students will only write negative stuff if it is really negative. They don't like to be really hard on someone unless that person has really gone right over the top and has been inappropriate and you really need to know who those people are as well. And you need to know the incident when someone didn't show up for a midterm exam and students write that and you might not find out in another way about that inappropriate stuff and you have to intervene . . . so that's my feeling that you really do need a supervisory pair of eyes to look at

these kinds of comments and then absolutely give them to the person being commented on. . . . The way it is here, those comments go in and the instructor gets to look at their file and then the file goes to the Dean's office. But I think it's important that you look at the whole file because you pick up nuance; you can become aware and arrange an intervention to help somebody (FG4, p. 20).

And although faculty participants and administrator participants were generally satisfied with the inclusion of student evaluations in the faculty evaluation process, the administrator participants and, to a lesser extent, co-ordinator participants indicated the importance of having more sets of student evaluations on a more frequent basis to gain a more thorough picture of the instructor's performance. Darrell suggests that "we need more frequent and more sets of student questionnaires. But I've never believed that student questionnaires are the be-all and end-all of evaluation" (p. 8). An instructor's performance can only be accurately assessed "several times over several semesters by several evaluation sources before it is accepted as reliable data" (Seldin, 2006, p. 18).

And lastly, while the participants observed that SETs addressed teaching performance, several faculty and administrator participants questioned why student evaluations did not address student learning. As Rachael points out, "I don't think it's necessary basically for them to love you as an instructor and every way that the course is designed for them to still learn . . . and it's learning that should be evaluated" (p. 13). Longitude studies have been conducted to assess SETs results and their correlation to student learning. Wienburg, Hashimoto, and Fleisher (2009) found that SETs were "strongly related to grades and that learning, as measured by future grades, was unrelated to SETs" (p. 254). The key research question remains, how do you evaluate learning through the vehicle of a faculty evaluation process? Simone suggests,

> Well, I think that the real test of a good teacher is not how you teach or the teaching etiquette, which is so much of the evaluative process . . . it should be focused on what are your students learning. That doesn't mean we do standardized tests to see who is passing at a certain level; it means that the student comes in at this level and goes out at this [higher] level. That's the important thing because all of the learners are different in terms of where they come in and how they are getting there. But a better way is knowing if the most salient outcomes in those courses are really being mastered by the majority of students. That's, to me, the proof of a great teacher (p. 10).

5.2.4.   Unofficial Mentoring

Providing support for faculty throughout their teaching careers at the university was another central theme expressed in the interviews and focus groups.

Sal describes a mentoring process that his area has in place to assist new faculty.

> When you were talking about the oft-used mentoring, what we do no matter who is new, they are given a buddy who is a long-term instructor who teaches a similar topic and then they work together because it is going to take that new person a long time to learn what our system is; it doesn't come easily; it's cumbersome; you could fall over yourself trying to figure out what our bureaucratic system is and all the different levels of reporting and assessment. But the buddy system is really working because the mentoring starts on the first day they are in the school. Getting your office set up, what do you need, where is the library, what are our materials, where are our resources, all of that kind of thing. So that has been working really well (FG2, p. 6).

Crawly shares a suggestion for increasing mentorship starting from the New Faculty Orientation.

> Wouldn't it be great if you could require it, in fact – maybe a bridge could be built from orientation right into evaluation and pedagogical training – because some of what we have been referring to earlier as mentoring should be covered under orientation. Maybe there could be a continuity between orientation and mentoring (FG2, p. 25).

Colleen also talks about the importance of mentoring.

> If we had a real mentoring program and an orientation when people are first hired or just even on an ongoing basis where the focus is improving instruction, which is everyone's mandate . . . just anybody who leaves their door open to their colleagues to sit down and tell you about this experience I'm having – it's not great, what should I do? - it's very informal. I think most new instructors are a little bit reluctant to walk in and say I'm having trouble, and the students don't look like they are having a good time, or they've told me this or that. They are reluctant to do that because their job is at stake and maybe we have created unintentionally not a very safe environment because we haven't put as much focus on mentoring as we have on the evaluation forms (FG3, p. 6).

Rachael offers this comment,

> I would like to see more openness around [faculty evaluation]. Well, you know, certainly around when people are first hired to know more about what that process is about and what they can do. Like I said – how [faculty] can prepare? and to offer mentoring to everyone – better access to that. Rather than having to go through the Co-ordinator and have it associated with a punitive process – just offer it to anyone who is looking (p. 16).

Participants in this study seem to envision mentorship as a process that includes "collaboration, challenge, critical reflection, and praxis" (Daloz, 1999; Galbraith, 1991; cited in Langer, 2010, p. 26) and that provides a mutually enriching learning experience in a space of safety and confidentiality in a nurturing nonjudgmental environment. Hiring faculty who are new to teaching clearly requires that they have supports in place within the institution to develop professionally in their new roles as educators, and mentorship is key to helping them transition to their life in this new role at the university. But as the participants have pointed out, mentorship should be available to all faculty members, not just to those who are new to the institution or to the profession. Mentorship should be viewed as an opportunity to develop a reciprocal learning relationship but, as noted by Rachael, it is often associated with a punitive process that comes after a Co-ordinator steps in when SETs results indicate that teaching behaviours need to be improved. This approach to mentorship is based on a deficit model and associates the mentorship offer as a marker of not measuring up. As Colleen has noted in the above excerpt from the Senior Instructors' Focus Group, the institution has unintentionally created an unsafe environment by stressing the importance of the results on the SETs more than creating a safe environment for faculty, and in particular faculty who are new to the university, to seek advice and guidance when they are facing challenges in their classrooms. Colleen's desire to see mentorship offered to and arranged for new hires at the New Faculty Orientation and to see mentorship available to all faculty on an ongoing basis will continue to echo throughout the university until individual faculty members, co-ordinators, and administrators take on a leadership role and choose in ways both large and small to make changes to the way that mentorship is offered and viewed at the university.

The theme of opportunities is expressed in the participants' desire to view formative evaluation as an untapped resource at the institution, to lessen the inherent fear factor that encompasses faculty evaluation, to continue to value the feedback that students and co-ordinators provide, and to increase possibilities for mentoring at the university.

5.3. Contradictions

Contradictions as a theme emerged in the need for improved access to the results of an individual faculty member's evaluation, for increased training for co-ordinators and peers to complete their reports, for better recognition of a successful faculty evaluation, and for a broader understanding of whether the process leads to improved teaching performance and professional growth.

5.3.1. Timeliness of Results

The analogy of a paper submitted midterm and returned with a grade and no feedback at the end of term reflects a key theme: the timeliness of evaluation results.

Timi notes that the results of the evaluation come too late in the process to be helpful. "The soonest that we get to see the results is when the course is over. How is that going to help me? It's already done, finished, and sealed. I can't do anything about it anymore. It is reactive …" (FG1, p. 5).

Similarly, Karley questions the length of time to it takes before the results of her evaluation file are made available to her.

> Five years later I'm in the [evaluation] cycle, so they had me wait an entire year before I got to see those evaluations. My impression was that we can't show you these ahead of time because it might skew how you grade the students, so the question is how is this helping me in my practice (FG3, p. 3)?

Colleen also questions the timeliness of the feedback.

Where [are] instructors learning the most about the experience that [students] are having in the classroom and when are they learning that? If they are learning it after the term is over, you might be able to learn for next time, but to impact the [students] who are currently in the classroom, it's very late feedback (FG3, p. 6).

Linda also comments on the timeliness of evaluation results:

I think it could help if the period would not be so long. So, okay, I made a mistake; if something is lacking in my practice, I should find that out right away. I should find out the next week but I only find out after one year. I think if you have gaps or make mistakes, this evaluation process as it is now does not help you improve in my view. You need to know right away; you should be told right away this is something the co-ordinator or colleague saw lacking in your teaching – we just want to let you know. And then you have the possibility to improve. If I only find it out one year or more afterwards, it has absolutely no value (p. 8).

As noted previously, the purpose of the evaluation process is fundamental to how the faculty evaluation system operates. These comments are indicative of the uncertainty over whether the purpose of the process is based on the need to make personnel decisions or based on the need to inform faculty of their performance. Seldin (2006) asserts that, ideally, formative and summative evaluations would be conducted separately since formative evaluation impacts summative evaluation, but he recognizes that institutions often combine them. Arreola (2007) notes that faculty evaluation systems designed to provide feedback for development and growth are almost always included in serving a personnel decision as well. "Sooner or later a faculty member will submit evaluation data as part of the evidence in support of a promotion, tenure, or merit pay decision. Or conversely, an administrator will ask for certain evaluative data to assist in making a difficult personnel decision" (p. xxix).

What may come as a surprise to some of the participants in this study is that the faculty evaluation process does not limit faculty from having access to the information contained in SETs, co-ordinator reports, or peer evaluations. "The evaluation file is open to the employee at any time during business hours, but the file must not be removed from the office in which it is kept" (Article 11.5.3.5, Appendix C). This observation is a startling one considering the information that participants shared. Why faculty are not

being given access to the information contained in the SETs likely revolves around a department's attempt to protect the anonymity of the student comments by having the support staff type up the comments, which can be a labour-intensive process. Another reason for lack of timely evaluation results could be due to the fact that it is the co-ordinator's responsibility to review the results of the SETs and alert faculty to concerns that the SETs raised. This approach echoes "Management by Exception" where intervention happens only when performance standards are not met. Consequently, if the SETs do not raise concerns, there is no priority placed on informing faculty of the results of the SETs.

These insights into the faculty evaluation process are only possible because of my extended association with the institution and my experience with the faculty evaluation process from a variety of positions within the institution. My role as a participant observer requires me to be aware of what participants in this study may not be aware of regarding the faculty evaluation process, as noted in the above observations and in the following example of my recent experience with the procedural elements of the process.

On March 4, 2014, a co-ordinator distributed SETs at the beginning of my intercultural business class while I was not present. The students took approximately 12 minutes to complete the SETs. The co-ordinator took the evaluations to the office of the divisional assistant, where they remained until the divisional assistant was able to type up the student comments and provide a summary of the ratings for each of the items on the SET. In late April, approximately six weeks later, I received the summary of the SETs. I never saw the originals due to issues of student confidentiality. Ordinarily, I would go to the divisional assistant and ask for a general sense of the feedback from the SETs, but I knew this individual was working full speed just trying to cope with workload issues and demanding faculty. I did, however, get a copy of the co-ordinator's report and the peer evaluation shortly after they visited my class. I received a copy of both to review before they were placed in my evaluation file, as per Article 11.5.3.1, Appendix C. The faculty evaluation policy states, "When the file is complete, the employee will be notified in writing accordingly" (Article 11.5.3.1, Appendix C). When my evaluation file was ready for my review, the divisional assistant contacted me. I reviewed my file in her

office, signed it, and it was forwarded to the Dean's office. I requested a copy of the summary of the SETs, which the divisional assistant sent me via email. This process never involved me – it is a bureaucratic process that took place with me on the outside looking in.

5.3.2.   Opportunities for Improvement in Teaching Performance

A key purpose of a faculty evaluation system is to provide opportunities for improvement in teaching performance. CU's current faculty evaluation process, according to the participants in this study, provides limited opportunities for faculty to improve their teaching performance. One of the main reasons provided for this observation was that faculty who pass the typical two-year probationary period are then placed on a five-year evaluation cycle. A key research question of this study aimed to determine whether faculty enrichment, which the study defined as a plan for continuous improvement and professional growth, was inherent in the university's current model of faculty evaluation. The response to this question by the vast majority of both faculty and administrator participants was a definitive "No." As Cindy explains, "Especially when it's five years apart, it's not really continuous improvement. For most faculty . . . they get their feedback and they might improve then, but then it's forgotten" (FG2, p. 13).

Pipi notes,

I think that once every five years is criminal, frankly. I don't think it serves the purpose of faculty evaluation, I don't think it serves the faculty member, and I don't think it serves the student. However, if it were augmented with learning evaluations at every course level on a regular ongoing basis that would perhaps be a nice complement.

He then goes on to share the following analogy regarding the current faculty evaluation process,

Let me just respond to that once-every-five-years idea. 'Would you eat at a restaurant that was only inspected once every five years? With foreknowledge, with warning, and with being good friends with the proprietor (FG4, p. 8, 9)?

Research into faculty evaluation indicates that faculty evaluations are commonly held every three to five years for tenured faculty (Licata, 1986; Atkinson & Hunt, 2011).

However, one administrator participant is cautious about the need for faculty enrichment.

> We have people at Capilano who are really extraordinary educators, and in all of the component evaluations that you are talking about and in the whole teaching delivery structure as such, other than the fact that they are always scanning the horizon for new stuff to add to their courses to keep it current, they are already doing an extraordinary job and I think you have to be careful with maintaining this quality improvement as opposed to those people who have been practising their craft for 10 or 15 years and are really bloody good. They just have to stay on that trajectory (FG4, p. 8).

And finally, while Deans were clear that faculty enrichment is not part of the current faculty evaluation process, one Dean participant noted, "In all that we talked about in how the evaluation process is situated here, it's 'Are you in or are you out?' And it doesn't matter if you are marginally in or marginally out. It [faculty enrichment] is not [faculty evaluation's] purpose" (FG5, p. 9).

Darrell offers this view of faculty enrichment:

> Even if the evaluation process is not oriented toward continuous improvement and enrichment, individual enrichment and continuous improvement certainly takes place here. I think people are very reflective about their teaching practice; it is just not part of the evaluation process. You teach a course and at the end of the semester, you make some notes and you say, "Oh, man, that sucked. How can I make this better?" That's reflection – that's trying to continuously improve but it is not necessarily part of the evaluation process (FG5, p. 10).

Alice challenges this perspective, as the following comment indicates:

> But I think the nature of our evaluation process is that it is fear-based, not supportive, and not embracing the positive aspects of an instructor, which is not helping them identify goals and express themselves in a way that might actually help get them to a new level. Even if they are very good, they need to know that we have support so

that they can do something more. And I don't think that we give that (FG5, p. 2).

One participant described the faculty evaluation process as anecdotal. Anecdotal? "The definition is making an instance audible or visible but it's only an instance. There's a difference between anecdote and evidence. What we have is an anecdotal evaluation system. There is absolutely nothing about it that would lend itself to any ongoing improvement" (FG4, p. 20).

Although the participants in this study do not see faculty enrichment as a component of the current faculty evaluation process, faculty enrichment would be an expected outcome of a faculty evaluation process. Nevertheless, faculty are able to gather formative feedback from their students and their peers outside of the formal faculty evaluation process to improve their teaching effectiveness if they choose to. Setting goals and documenting a plan for continuous improvement and professional growth is clearly outside the purview of the existing process.

5.3.3.   Satisfactory versus Less than Satisfactory Performance

Faculty shared their concerns regarding the form they receive from the Dean informing them whether their performance has been deemed satisfactory or less than satisfactory, while administrators shared their methods for attempting to humanize the form. Faculty also wrestled with the meaning of satisfactory. Davina suggests it means "just enough" while for Crowley it means "the threshold has been exceeded, but it doesn't say by how much – it could be just on the tip or it could be way above" (FG2, p. 14).

Margaret shared her use of sticky notes, which she attached to the form, as a way of providing feedback to the faculty member.

> So what I did was get stickies, and I would handwrite on the stickies, 'I am blown away by what the students write and thank you so much on behalf of everyone . . . and then I would stick it on that form and I would have to photocopy that and then I would have to ask permission to put it in someone's file.   And the same if someone had done

something great, you would write them a letter and then say, 'Can I have permission to put this in your personnel file?' (FG4, p. 10).

The choice of deeming a faculty member's performance as either satisfactory or less than satisfactory does not sit well with Deans either.

> You get this report back [from the Dean] that says you are satisfactory, and you say, 'No, I'm really good. How did this turn into satisfactory?' or 'I'm really bad. I'm glad I snuck this satisfactory through.' It's unfortunate the process doesn't capture the range of possibilities that exist in teaching (Cranston, FG5, p. 3).

Alice shares her experience as an instructor when she received the form letter from the Dean indicating her performance was satisfactory.

> When I got my first letter from my Dean saying I had a satisfactory performance, it was the most deflating experience I could imagine because I had quite a bit of interaction with the Dean so I couldn't understand why it was this very sterile kind of comment, but I also saw what was being done in terms of the faculty evaluation process. It wasn't used as a way of talking to me about my work (FG5, 1).

The struggles over interpreting the terms satisfactory or less than satisfactory are shared in this excerpt from Darrell's profile:

> There is also that difficulty with our collective agreement: satisfactory or less than satisfactory. And that's all it says. I mean I was just talking to a colleague about an evaluation file. One direction I was going with the file – yes, it was satisfactory – it fits the collective agreement. What I really mean is it's satisfactory or adequate – just good enough – and I don't think just good enough is what we want to aspire to. And I said that as a faculty member; I haven't changed. Is that what we really want – [just] good enough? (p. 10).

Margaret points out the need for categories to define performance:

> [T]here is nowhere in between satisfactory and Alerting and Guidance. We need more degrees in there. There's a lot of very good – not excellent. And there's some satisfactory [instructors]. Actually given my previous experience, we have very good and excellent, and we have very few in the unsatisfactory and we don't even have a very big group in the satisfactory, but you want to be moving people up – more

gradation so I think that's something that is needed. More gradations allow your co-ordinator to be more honest (FG4, p. 23).

I leave the final comment to Linda as she describes the effect of receiving a sticky note from the Dean attached to the official form alerting her that her performance was satisfactory.

> I think that was such a beautiful gesture from her part to show emotion, to show appreciation – genuine appreciation, not just a formal letter. So I guess she does feel that that paper is just a cold "okay" paper but has nothing to do with the person, and the sticky note did it all for me. I sent it to my family; I took pictures of it. It made me really, really proud of myself and appreciative. It was wonderful (p. 20).

5.3.4.   Training

Although only one of the questions posed in the interviews and focus group asked whether training had been provided to faculty to complete co-ordinator and peer evaluations, participants returned to the topic frequently. Fortunately for Crowley, he had a strong support system in place when he took on the position of evaluation co-ordinator for his division.

> The process that we've got – in broad strokes – the structure is good, but I'm wondering [if] . . . not all the individuals involved perhaps themselves are supported and trained enough [to complete peer and co-ordinator evaluations]. In my area, quasi-informally, I got a lot of pretty good guidance and support but that's not universal (FG2, p. 23).

Emily asks,

> Are we trained? Do we know how to evaluate? Are we trying to make someone feel good? Are you trying to beat them down? Those are extremes, but I think if peers were trained on what they are supposed to do, it would help (FG1, p. 13).

Suzan notes,

169

I do want a peer to evaluate me, but there needs to be some guidance around who gets chosen and maybe three or four people are trained on how to be a peer evaluator and that's who you choose and that's who's available this year (FG1, p. 14).

Co-ordinators are elected to their positions and one participant notes that training is needed because of the turnover in these positions and because when a co-ordinator is not available, a co-ordinator designate is assigned the task of observing a faculty member's class and preparing the co-ordinator report.

Cindy makes this observation:

There is such turnover in these positions; we have people doing co-ordinator designate evaluations as well. I learn something new every time I talk to someone about evaluation . . . so we need continual training and feedback on our own ways of doing these [co-ordinator] reports (FG2, p. 19).

Linda offers this advice:

What if we all got training about how to observe someone's class? I got this training in one of my university classes in my home country, how to observe a class. We would have a workshop about it once a year, how to observe a colleague. Because that would improve yourself as well, if you know what to observe in others then you know what to observe in your own practice (p. 25).

Administrator participants agree training of evaluators is needed and that training is needed on the intent of evaluation as well (FG5, p. 16). Linda, a new instructor participant agrees.

For new instructors, let them know the process. Not just handing them the faculty handbook. We know how we are – we flip through it fast and put it on a shelf. Have a conversation, have a workshop about it. . . . Before starting an evaluation, everyone should be let known what it entails exactly. 'This is how it's going to happen.' I didn't have this (p. 27).

Co-ordinators and Dean focus groups did note that the university had offered training on evaluation. Sandra, a co-ordinator participant, notes,

Always at these sessions I learn something or other, but I feel I had learned more just by doing it and by providing evaluations to the union for review and by providing evaluations to HR for review, before giving them to the instructor. So it was trying to use the resources around me in order to develop an evaluation that would not result in a grievance (p. 16).

From the research in the field of faculty evaluation (Arreola, 2007; Seldin, 2006; Persson, 2002; Chism, 2007; Iqbal, 2013) and from the information shared by participants in this study, it is clear that training should be a priority to increase the success of a faculty evaluation program. However, training needs are often overlooked in the implementation of a faculty evaluation program. The importance of being evaluated by qualified evaluators is essential to an effective faculty evaluation process, and although faculty resistance to evaluation often stems from their concern that they are being evaluated "by unqualified people," the participants in this study also wanted to receive an orientation to the process included in the New Faculty Orientation while co-ordinators stressed their need for training to support them as they prepared evaluations that placed them in difficult positions with their peers. Seldin (2006) prefers that training be provided to evaluators and that the training include these components: "what to look for, how to use the evaluation instruments, how to work together with other evaluators, how results will be used, the function and responsibilities of the evaluators, how faculty evaluation leads to professional development, the mechanics of the program, and recent research findings of faculty evaluation" (p. 28).

The contradictions that emerged from the interviews and focus groups centre on important concerns regarding the process and outcomes of faculty evaluation. It is a reasonable expectation that faculty would want to see the results of their evaluation in a timely manner so that they could make changes based on the feedback received from co-ordinators, peers, and students. However, since the system appears to operate more as a form of summative evaluation, it complicates the process and the timing of results. Using the "satisfactory" versus "less than satisfactory" scale to assess the results of a faculty evaluation is demotivating for faculty while training is identified as a need that has the possibility of improving the credibility of co-ordinator and peer reports.

171

5.4. Guiding Principles for a Faculty Evaluation Program

In Chapter 2, I outlined guiding principles for faculty evaluation programs drawn almost exclusively from the work of Arreola (2007). Although I have referred to many of the guidelines in the interpretation of themes, a summary of my findings for each of the guiding principles is presented in the following paragraphs. On a cautionary note, as both Arreola (2007) and Seldin (2006) have noted, there is no one faculty evaluation system that works best for all colleges and universities.

1. The results of an evaluation are a judgment, which may be expressed in words such as excellent, very good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, fair, good, poor. That judgment is based on a measurement, a number that will involve some aspects of faculty performance such as student ratings, peer evaluations, chair reports (Arreola, 2007, p. xvii).

   The results of the evaluation at CU are expressed in the words satisfactory or less than satisfactory. This judgement is based on a measurement that involves the results of student questionnaires. The judgment is also based on the contents of the peer evaluations and chair reports, which should follow the guidelines set out in the faculty evaluation process regarding the following evaluation criteria: the employee in relation to students, the employee in relation to assignments, the employee in relation to subject or area of speciality, the employee in relation to other members of the university community, the employee in relation to the university, the employee should make a continuing contribution to the objectives of the university, employees should adequately perform approved professional development (Sections 11.5.2 – 11.5.2.6.3).

2. The process of evaluation is subjective, although measurement "should be obtained as objectively and reliably as possible"; consequently, true objectivity in a faculty evaluation process is unattainable (Arreola, 2007, p. xvii).

   The value of peer evaluations is questionable in the present process because of the general unwillingness of peers to document areas for their colleagues to improve due to the primarily summative nature of the faculty evaluation process. Consequently, peer evaluations are viewed as subjective while SETs and co-ordinator reports are viewed as having more credibility than peer evaluations.

3. All measurement data should be interpreted "by means of a predetermined, consensus based value system to produce consistent evaluative outcomes" (Arreola, 2007, p. xix).

This guideline is difficult to assess. The evaluation process has clearly defined criteria (as noted above in guideline 1), and it is expected that the criteria and procedures should be applied in a similar manner to all employees (Article 11.5.2.1, Appendix C).

4. "Faculty evaluation systems must be linked to professional enrichment programs for maximal self-improvement effect" (Arreola, 2007, p. xxii).

   The evaluation criteria states that employees should adequately perform approved professional development (Article 11.5.2.6.3, Appendix C) and the university's professional development committee does offer a wide range of workshops and lectures for faculty especially during the month of May. However, there is no direct link between the faculty evaluation process and the professional development program offerings.

5. "Successful faculty evaluation systems must provide meaningful feedback information to guide professional growth and enrichment and evaluative information on which to base personnel decisions" (Arreola, 2007, p. xxii).

   The contents of the evaluation file do provide evaluative information on which to base personnel decisions; the process may provide opportunities for improvement in performance if noted in the co-ordinator report and/or peer evaluation and the SETs. However, guiding professional growth and enrichment are not identified in the current faculty evaluation process.

6. The faculty evaluation system should be woven into the organization's mission, values, goals, and strategic directions of the organization (Buller, 2012; Seldin, 2006b; Arreola, 2007).

   Reviewing the current mission, values, and strategic directions that appear on the university's website, there are no explicit indicators that faculty evaluation is recognized as an institutional priority. Although faculty evaluation is not explicitly mentioned in the following strategic directions, the emphasis on faculty retention, recruitment, professional development, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, and innovation in teaching would indicate that the faculty evaluation program should be vital to advancing these directions. [http://www.capilanou.ca/Vision-Values-Mission-Goals-Strategic-Directions/]

- Recognize that we are all learners, and provide professional development opportunities for all employees.
- Recruit and retain faculty who have a passion for and commitment to teaching and learning as well as their discipline.
- Develop a Teaching & Learning Centre that supports exemplary instruction, use of educational technology, and classroom innovation.
- Encourage the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
- Support activities integral to providing relevant, authentic and innovative education, including faculty professional engagement, appropriate research, and scholarly and creative activity.
- Maintain excellence by incorporating appropriate assessment and accountability processes into our ongoing review and planning processes.
- Undertake evaluation of services and programs based on defined outcomes.

7. The faculty evaluation process must include information from a variety of sources such as peers, self, administrators, and students (Arreola, 2007, p. xxvii).

This guideline is met by the faculty evaluation process at the institution. The evaluation file contains a minimum of two sets of SETs for a full-time faculty member; a peer evaluation, which can be waived for non-probationary employees; a co-ordinator report; materials, including a self-submission, relevant to evaluation and added by the faculty member; materials relevant to the evaluation added to the file by the appropriate Dean or by the President. These materials must be based on only the Dean's or the President's personal contact, investigation, or observation. (Article 11.5.3.2.1 – Article 11.5.3.2.5)

8. The purpose of the faculty evaluation system serves as "its cornerstone" and "influences the sources of data, the kind of information gathered, the depth of data analysis, and the dissemination of findings" (Seldin, 2006b, p. 4).

The purpose of the faculty evaluation process is not clearly defined although the process outlined in the evaluation section of the faculty agreement would indicate that the purpose is to ensure that a faculty member's right to a fair evaluation is protected and that the department's right to fair evaluation of its faculty is protected.

9. Training of evaluators should be a necessary component of a faculty evaluation program (Seldin, 2006b).

Co-ordinator training is provided by the Human Resources Department in conjunction with the Capilano Faculty Association. The handout entitled "Evaluation: Joint Co-ordinator Training" was distributed at a training session held on April 4, 2014, and provides a clear overview of the workshop. The topics, which the document refers to as "Evaluation Hot Spots" include principles of faculty evaluation; the timing of evaluation; mentoring guidelines; file contents; information on preparing co-ordinator reports; the need to review the draft of a co-ordinator report with faculty member; guidelines around communication – ensuring faculty know as soon as possible that they will be evaluated; and the role of the evaluation committee. Time in the workshop session was put aside for co-ordinators to practice writing a co-ordinator report that includes information relevant to the evaluation and supported by evidence.

- The handout indicates that the training included important principles for faculty evaluation such as the need for early feedback, support for improvement, the need to make tough decisions during probation, failure to evaluate results in a performance that is deemed satisfactory; termination of non-probationary faculty after adequate Alerting and Guidance.

- The workshop also reviews mentorship and thus the need to do student questionnaires in the first term, and covers the need to review results to determine where mentoring is required to be offered, and important aspects of the offer of mentorship. This training session, as outlined in the handout,

would prove valuable for co-ordinators, who have significant responsibility in how faculty receive feedback on their performance.

CU's approach to faculty evaluation meets the majority of the guiding principles that I have used as a conceptual framework for this study. What is of significant import is that a faculty evaluation program can meet the majority of the guidelines as set out in a conceptual framework and still fall short due to the inconsistencies of its application and the lack of knowledge of its constituents around how the process is expected to operate as outlined in the faculty evaluation process. As I have learned more about the faculty evaluation process through this study and reflected on it, I am struck by how the concept of Management by Exception lives in this process. Management by Exception can be active or passive. Actively, "managers watch and search for deviation from rules and standards and take corrective action"; passively, "managers only intervene if standards are not met" (Langton, Robbins, & Judge, 2010, p. 426). And it is this later explanation that dwells in the faculty evaluation process.

Mentoring, for example, is required to be offered based on less than satisfactory results of student questionnaires in the first term. Although there is no direct consequence for faculty who have passed the probationary period and decline mentorship, faculty on probation who decline mentorship will be evaluated each term during their probationary period. In the formal evaluation process, mentorship is offered when there is an indication that performance standards are not met, which highlights CU's passive Management by Exception approach to mentorship.

The self-submission component of the faculty evaluation process is used primarily by faculty when they choose to challenge the contents of their evaluation file. It is the exception to include this document in the evaluation file. The self-submission, therefore, aligns with the concept of Management by Exception as action is taken by the faculty member when performance standards come into question.

Management by Exception prevails in the Alerting and Guidance provision. Since it is a disciplinary action, faculty are first alerted "in writing to the shortcomings that have been identified in the evaluation and for which guidance is required with respect to the criteria of 11.5.2 (in relation to students, assignments, subject or speciality area,

members of the university community, the university) and will specify the improvement expected" (Article 11.5.6.3, Appendix C).

Co-ordinators "should make every reasonable effort" to have a meeting with a faculty member to discuss the co-ordinator report relating to an unsatisfactory performance with respect to the criteria noted prior to finalizing the draft and submitting it to the file (Article 11.5.3.2.3.1, Appendix C). Again, when the co-ordinator report notes that performance standards need to be addressed, a co-ordinator meeting with the faculty member is essentially required. Co-ordinators are therefore not required to meet with faculty who do meet performance standards. In this sense, a co-ordinator meeting with a faculty member to discuss the report gestures to the exceptionality of the meeting and suggests that the performance standards were not met. On a personal note, in my 36-year association with the university, I have never had a co-ordinator sit down and review the co-ordinator report with me. This observation signals that my evaluations have met performance standards. Phrased differently, conversations with a faculty member's co-ordinator around the faculty member's meeting performance standards are not the norm. And I think that there is something lost in this approach to faculty evaluation. Becoming better at your craft and enhancing your understanding of teaching and learning is rarely done in isolation; conversations breed learning opportunities that prompt you to explore new ways of teaching and learning and to rethink how teaching and learning is framed.

5.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented and discussed the themes that emerged during the analysis of the interview and focus group transcripts and related them to research on faculty evaluation. As I reflect on these themes, I am struck by the tensions that surround most of them. Although not a theme, the adjectives that participants used to describe the faculty evaluation process acting in concert with the comparisons that participants made about the process really do afford a telling glimpse into the tensions and contradictions of the process.

Clearly, there is uncertainty over the purpose of the faculty evaluation process. While this uncertainty centres on whether the process can provide for improvement in teaching performance, there is no uncertainty regarding it being used as a personnel-decision making tool. In addition, tension surrounds the Alerting and Guidance provision in the faculty evaluation process and the need for earlier intervention for faculty needing assistance. Moreover, the stigma that engulfs the terms Alerting and Guidance as well as the process that it entails creates tension for those involved in it. Likewise, tension exists over the evaluation of an instructor's performance being judged as "satisfactory" versus "less than satisfactory," which lacks acknowledgment of the commitment that instructors have to their students, their profession, and the university.

A further tension involves the length of time it takes before faculty can view the results of their evaluation file, which translates into the feedback not benefiting the students who provided it and signals that the purpose of the evaluation process is summative. Tensions also encircle the peer evaluation component of the faculty evaluation process because faculty, whether co-ordinators or instructors, find it difficult to give negative feedback to faculty within a formal evaluation process because of the impact it can have on working relationships and possibly future employment with the university. Lack of training for peer evaluators is also a source of tension. Faculty would be more comfortable providing feedback if training were provided and the purpose and expectations of a peer evaluation were made clear.

Not surprisingly, evaluation begets anxiety and the fear factor is a constant tension in the faculty evaluation process. This tension emerges because of the importance placed on the faculty evaluation process as a measure of continued membership in the university. The fact that the faculty evaluation process resides in the faculty collective agreement creates a tension in that faculty and administration view the process as difficult to change, although participants in this study offered ideas for improving the process by working outside the collective agreement and still meeting its requirements. During this study, participants were asked to consider what an ideal faculty evaluation system would be and often confined their ideas to the current faculty evaluation process and had to be prompted to think "big picture."

Finally, I analyzed the faculty evaluation process against guiding principles for a faculty evaluation program, which identified some of the strengths and shortcomings of the current process. In addition, I also identified a number of elements of the faculty evaluation process that are based on the principle of Management by Exception.

Chapter 6.   An Analysis and Interpretation of the Faculty Evaluation Process Using Bourdieu's "Thinking Tools"

Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) forms of capital and his concepts of habitus, field, doxa, and symbolic violence provide a framework that provides compelling insights into the faculty evaluation process at CU. This framework provides the theory and the language to understand how the process becomes practice and works as a "structuring structure" within the institution (Bourdieu, 1977/2004, p. 72). What follows is an analysis of the faculty evaluation process using what Bourdieu (1989) referred to as "thinking tools" (p. 50).

6.1. Mapping the "Thinking Tools" onto the Setting

To provide an understanding of how Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) "thinking tools" open up the faculty evaluation process to further analysis, this section maps the Bourdieusian model onto the setting of CU.

The field in this study is CU, the field in which the faculty evaluation process is operationalized. Within this field, the orthodox view of faculty evaluation determines what constitutes a legitimate satisfactory faculty evaluation, what forms of capital are valued, how the faculty evaluation process is implemented and its procedures followed. Pushing up against this orthodox view of faculty evaluation are individuals whose diverse views conflict with the orthodox view of the faculty evaluation process; these individuals provide a counterweight to examine and reconfigure forms of capital and to dismantle forms of symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 167) within the faculty evaluation process. These opposing viewpoints are central to the concept of heterodoxy (Bourdieu, 1977/2004, p. 169; Webb et al., 2002, p. xiii), which fuels agency and the capacity of individuals to break from the "structured structure" and the "structuring

structure" (Bourdieu, 1977/2004, p. 72) that a faculty evaluation process can impose and continue to reproduce.

Within the field of CU, Bourdieu's (1997) three forms of capital are present: cultural, economic, and social (p. 47). How these forms of capital are conceived in relation to the faculty evaluation process depend largely on the habitus (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 76) defined and demarcated by the individuals who operationalize the process and who have responsibility for the process within the institution, and by the taken-for-granted assumptions, the orthodoxy (Bourdieu,1977/2004, p. 169; Webb et al., 2002, p. xiii), that serves to structure the faculty evaluation process. According to Bourdieu (1997), capital determines the field's currency – it determines what is valued and what is not, what is conceivable and what is not. Circling around these forms of capital are opportunities for symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 167), which emerges from inequities that exist in how the faculty evaluation process is structured. These inequities can limit, for example, a new faculty member's access to resources or opportunities due to his/her lack of cultural and social capital and due to a habitus that has not developed a tacit understanding of how the faculty evaluation process operates and what forms of capital the institution values. These inequities (symbolic violence) are perpetuated by the orthodox view of what constitutes a legitimate satisfactory faculty evaluation at the university.

The potential to reconceptualize faculty evaluation rests with change agents who have the necessary cultural capital to know how the process operates, its limitations, and its potential. Change agents who have the respect and trust of the faculty and who have the social capital to open up a dialogue at the university that explores how the heterodox view of faculty evaluation might shape and inform the current orthodox view of what constitutes a legitimate satisfactory faculty evaluation at the institution.

The following sections build on themes that were presented in Chapter 4 and provide some Bourdieusian insights into how the faculty evaluation process operates.

6.2. Mentorship

Faculty are usually hired because of their educational qualifications for a teaching position; they have acquired cultural capital in terms of their undergraduate and advanced degrees, experience in their fields, and other specialized qualifications. But the minute they step over the threshold of CU, these forms of cultural capital will be given less value if teaching performance is not at a level that the university deems appropriate for the institution. If the first round of SETs presents performance issues, the co-ordinator offers mentorship in an attempt to support faculty to develop their teaching skills and improve the ratings on student evaluations, which should result in increased cultural capital. If a new faculty member refuses mentorship, evaluations take place each term during the probationary period. A faculty member who is not on probation but whose SETs indicate mentoring is warranted may refuse mentorship.

Participants in this inquiry wanted to see mentorship placed much earlier in the process; they preferred that each new faculty member be paired with an experienced teacher, which would allow them to visit each other's classes multiple times throughout the academic year, have informal learning conversations about what they observed, and offer support to each other. This visualization of mentorship is more like a reciprocal learning opportunity for both mentor and mentee and should offer expanded social capital and cultural capital for both. Sal, a participant in this study, provided an example of how new faculty are immediately matched with a mentor who teaches a similar subject. In this arrangement, the mentor assists the new faculty member in navigating the numerous processes at the institution and assists with curriculum design, etc. Sal is taking a proactive, welcoming approach to aid new faculty and in doing so is helping to increase the social and cultural capital of the new faulty member. With this approach, the faculty member would gain more information (cultural capital) about how the faculty evaluation process works and, as a result, may avoid some of the obstacles that new faculty face in understanding how the process operates. Likewise, Sandra recognizes that one of her faculty is struggling and immediately arranges intervention prior to the formal distribution of SETs. She has the faculty member work with a long-term, well-respected mentor to help guide the faculty member to a successful evaluation.

This approach to mentorship lessens the opportunity for symbolic violence, which can emerge from inequities such as a new faculty member's lack of access to information about the faculty evaluation process (cultural capital) and lack of access to networks at the institution (social capital). Providing opportunities for new faculty to have a mentor when they begin teaching at the institution gives them an improved chance of transitioning to teaching at the university and having a successful evaluation. These co-ordinators are attempting to reconfigure forms of capital and dismantle forms of symbolic violence by offering mentorship prior to formal evaluations and honouring the forms of capital that open the doors of the university to these new faculty members.

Clearly, providing a mentor upon arrival at the university is preferable to intervening when a problem arises because if improvement in performance is not seen in SETs and co-ordinator and/or peer reports, the faculty member could be placed on Alerting and Guidance (A&G), which is a disciplinary action. When the faculty member is placed on A&G, he or she works with a three- to five-member guidance committee, which hopefully will result in increased cultural and social capital for all members of the committee but especially for the faculty member receiving the guidance. However, the guidance that is offered may profit all members of the guidance committee in only limited ways for it is modelled on a "normative culture of supervision" that provides mentors with institutional power (Grimmett, 2007, p. 143). The lack of opportunities to build social capital in the mentorship process is lessened by the institutional approach to mentorship that views it as supervision rather than building a learning community with possibilities for developing social capital through networks.

Since new faculty are just beginning their teaching assignment at CU, they have limited knowledge of CU procedures, policies, and access to resources (objective cultural capital) and limited social capital across the institution. Consequently, the approach to mentorship in the faculty evaluation process is organized around a deficit model of social and cultural capital. And although a new faculty member may have cultural, social, and economic capital as a specialist in his/her field, the forms of capital that opened the door to teaching at CU and the deficit model that the mentorship provision is built on, do not allow new faculty to exchange these forms of capital in the new environment at CU. Consequently, new faculty may become "dominated by the

182

dominant" (Grenfell, 2010, p. 96) as they must decide to adjust their teaching to survive and maintain membership at CU or perhaps face termination, resulting in a loss of economic capital. Since it is primarily the lack of cultural capital (pedagogical habitus) within the field of CU that fuels the mentorship provision, it ensures that cultural capital becomes the dominant currency at CU because it is the knowledge of how to teach by actively engaging students in the learning process that is recognized as legitimate at CU and that reproduces a hierarchy that marks those who possess this cultural capital from those who do not. Teachers who are used to lecturing at large research universities may find themselves disadvantaged by the institutional habitus of CU, which regards lecturing, certainly in some divisions in the institution, as a less than ideal way to teach.

6.3. Formative Evaluations

Although participants in this study questioned the value of peer evaluations, they offered many suggestions for ways to obtain formative feedback from their peers outside the evaluation process. Examples include: videotaping classes and having a group of peers meet with the instructor to review the videotape together and learn from the shared feedback, having a peer observe a couple of classes and provide feedback, becoming a member of a faculty learning community, eliciting feedback from a trained group of peers who would visit an instructor's classes. All of these suggestions would provide varying degrees of increased cultural and social capital for the participants and by extension economic capital because of their continued membership in the organization.

The faculty evaluation process has a formative evaluation provision (Article 11.5.8, Appendix C), which indicates that a faculty member "should not be subject to a formal evaluation without direct feedback on his or her performance," that this formative feedback is for the faculty member's "use only and that procedures should be designed to protect the confidentiality of this information," and that "all employees can benefit from feedback on a regular basis." Although this provision has been in the faculty evaluation process for decades, I contend that this provision is largely unknown by most of the faculty at the university. In fact, I will readily admit that I was not aware of it, although I frequently went to faculty members' classes and provided them with feedback prior to

choosing to do a formal observation. This provision needs to be emphasized in training sessions for co-ordinators and in orientation sessions with new faculty to ensure that new faculty understand their rights. What is interesting to note is that this provision does not indicate who should be providing the feedback; is the faculty member to acquire this information through informal formative evaluations? Is it the responsibility of the co-ordinator to provide direct feedback on performance and on what evidence would that feedback be based?

One key finding of this inquiry was the desire for increased opportunities for formative evaluations. The current faculty evaluation process is based on summative evaluations, which take place each year until the instructor is off probation (usually two academic years) at which time the faculty member is placed on A&G, terminated, or hired as a non-regular faculty member. Faculty who have passed the probationary period are formally evaluated every five years unless the Dean calls for an out-of-sequence evaluation. However, faculty members are free to survey their students throughout the term, but are not required to do so, and that feedback resides with the instructor.

Faculty often distribute formative evaluations prior to the formal round of evaluations so that they can address any student concerns. This allows faculty to take some control over the outcome of the evaluation process. However, new faculty, especially those new to teaching, are often not familiar with conducting formative evaluations prior to the formal summative evaluation because of their lack of embodied cultural capital within the field of CU. Therefore, they are not sufficiently aware of how to play the evaluation game at CU and need advice on how to do so in order to be successful at the institution. In terms of Bourdieu's concept of playing the game, Grenfell and James (1998) clarify that Bourdieu is referring not only to a set of prescribed rules for how to play the game but also to the implicit perfunctory way that individuals go about engaging in the game. In reality, it will take an investment of time on the part of new faculty to become more familiar with the suggested ways to play the evaluation game at CU so that playing the game becomes natural, the rules become automatic, and their cultural capital becomes expanded. This investment strategy is geared toward enabling faculty to survive the evaluation process at CU. Receiving

feedback from mentors or a guidance committee also works as investment strategies "individual or collective, conscious or unconscious, aimed at establishing or reproducing social relationships that are directly useable in the short or long term" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 6). And it is these investment strategies that CU is banking on to produce and reproduce the results it is aiming for: improved ratings on SETs to maintain membership in CU or the evidence that will support a pathway to termination. Consequently, mentors' and Guidance Committee members' social and cultural capital will hopefully accelerate the mentee's social and cultural capital at the institution. If so, the university demonstrates through its A&G policy that it can reproduce what it claims the A&G provision is meant to do: provide a means to improved teaching performance by remedying "the shortcomings highlighted in the evaluation and for which guidance is required with respect to the criteria of 11.5.2 and will specify the improvement expected" (Article 11.5.6.3, Appendix C).

6.4. Alerting and Guidance

The A&G provision determines the success of a faculty member's performance by focusing on product (measurable improvement in student questionnaires) rather than the processes involved in helping that faculty member to reflect critically on her teaching practice and seek opportunities for praxis. This emphasis on rating scale results on student questionnaires reduces the teaching process to objective evidence of the teaching and learning processes. Therefore, the new form of capital in this process might well be a sense of the game in the hierarchy of capital values. Since full-time faculty have the right to select only two courses in which to have SETs distributed as part of the formal evaluation process, they can manipulate the process by choosing the classes that provide the best chance of keeping them off the A&G track. However, why would a faculty member take the risk of having SETs distributed in a class as part of the formal evaluation if she or he already knows that students are less than satisfied with the teaching? Why risk being placed on A&G?

The A&G policy diminishes the capital value of the instructors who are placed on A&G. Since the institution lacks confidence in these instructors, their capital value cannot be perpetuated within the organization. Consequently, the policy serves to mark

instructors and signals to them and to the university community that they do not measure up. Accumulating embodied cultural capital through the prickly process of A&G may also serve to mark an instructor. In short, CU no longer honours the cultural capital that allowed instructors on A&G to enter the institution. What is valued determines its capital. And what CU values and prides itself on is being a teaching-focused university that values excellence in teaching, which for the most part is determined by student and co-ordinator evaluations. Consequently, it is evaluation results that determine an instructor's value. The A&G provision perpetuates its longevity by both its symbolic and actual power, which serve to demonstrate to the university community and its stakeholders that it regulates the standard of teaching at the institution based on performance measures and quality control. A&G functions like symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1992) because it highlights the lack of cultural and social capital (inequities that exist) between those who are marked by being on A&G and those who are not. In addition, it can limit the career aspirations of faculty who find themselves on A&G.

6.5. Training Needs

The findings of this study indicated a need for training for not just co-ordinators but also peers. Suggestions included providing training on how to complete an classroom observation, training a team of peer evaluators whom faculty members could choose from to have a peer evaluation competed, and training enough co-ordinators to not only handle the turnover in these positions but also the challenging situations they find themselves in when they are handling a performance issue that has been highlighted in the evaluation file. The need for training on the intent of the evaluation process was also noted. Providing training collectively to peers and co-ordinators should work to increase their knowledge of the peer evaluation process, as well as expand their social and cultural capital, which may help to improve the value that is placed on peer and co-ordinator reports. Increased social and cultural capital can result from peer evaluation training but meeting the guidelines outlined in the research for peer evaluations is critical to their being recognized as legitimate forms of evaluation. It is through conversations between the peer evaluator and faculty member that increased social and cultural capital can also be realized. Merely sending off a peer evaluation, via

email, for feedback to the faculty member being evaluated erases the opportunity for social and cultural capital to be realized, which is, unfortunately, a common approach that is often followed at CU. Although the faculty evaluation process is clear that co-ordinators must make every effort to discuss comments made in their reports regarding unsatisfactory performance with the faculty member prior to submitting the report to the file, it is because of the exceptional nature of the comments that a discussion must take place. No information in the faculty evaluation process indicates that peer evaluators should meet with faculty to discuss the peer report, even if comments highlight unsatisfactory performance.

When faculty have successfully passed their round of evaluations with satisfactory performance or better, the practice that co-ordinators usually engage in entails sending via email a copy of the co-ordinator's report for the peer's review. No face-to-face meeting is usually held if the evaluation file is satisfactory and faculty tend not to submit a self-evaluation report to the file unless they are challenging the content of SETs or the co-ordinator's report. These two observations reflect how the structure of the evaluation process reproduces through the actions of co-ordinators, peers, and Deans, the structure from which it operates (Bourdieu, 1986). It has the tendency to limit the behaviour and actions of the individuals involved and to signal social practices – what is "doable" and what is not – what is "thinkable" and what is not. In other words, submitting a self-evaluation to one's file is unthinkable if the evaluation file is satisfactory. And co-ordinators holding face-to-face reviews with faculty who are being evaluated is not "doable" and in most cases not "thinkable" in many departments in the university (often because of limited time and resources). Furthermore, as noted in Chapter 5, many participants in this study offered suggestions for changes to the faculty evaluation process that would not alter the language in the collective agreement but would complement the current process in terms of improved training for evaluators, access to mentorship directly upon the faculty member's initial assignment at the university, and more emphasis on formative evaluations. However, the majority of participants acknowledged the difficulty in negotiating changes to the collective agreement and many offered suggestions that would not run counter to it. In other words, many participants were unable to think in a broad way about faculty evaluation because they did not view change to the collective agreement as possible. This

observation reflects a collective habitus that views what is "thinkable and doable" evaluation practice within the field of CU when it comes to negotiating change. The collective agreement has constrained the actions of some participants to be able to think about what an ideal faculty evaluation program would look like. In other words, many participants offered suggestions that would support the orthodox view of faculty evaluation and few offered significant heterodox views that would run counter to what constitutes a legitimate faculty evaluation at the institution.

6.6. Satisfactory versus Less than Satisfactory

As noted previously, faculty shared their concerns regarding the form they receive from the Dean informing them whether their performance has been deemed satisfactory or less than satisfactory, while administrators shared their methods for attempting to humanize the form. Participants also wrestled with the meaning of satisfactory. Throughout these interviews and focus groups, no one offered an explanation for why the process includes this binary choice for judging performance. Consequently, as a participant observer with social capital within the organization, I sought out a colleague who has a wealth of knowledge regarding the procedures and origins of the faculty evaluation process and who has been at the institution for more than 30 years. Through a conversation with him, I learned that the evaluation process is based on these two categories for performance – satisfactory versus less than satisfactory – because faculty evaluation is modelled on a collegial process. This explanation seems reasonable and logical to me. Cipriano (2011) defines collegial as a "collective responsibility shared by each member of a group of colleagues with minimal supervision from above" and notes that operationalizing collegiality "enhances productive dissent, a basic tenant of the academy" (p. 23). The word "collegial" gestures to each faculty member being viewed as equals who are responsible for assisting each other in our journeys to be the teachers and the contributors to the university that we want to become. With this in mind, limiting the performance rating of the faculty evaluation to the broad terms of satisfactory or less than satisfactory avoids comparisons being made among faculty who are sitting at or above the threshold of satisfactory but not so for faculty whose performance is judged less than satisfactory.

The observation that the faculty evaluation process is based on a collegial model would indicate that the purpose of the faculty evaluation process is to protect a faculty member's right to a fair evaluation and to protect a department's right to fairly evaluate a faculty member. Consequently, this purpose aligns itself with a summative form of evaluation on which personnel decisions are based rather than with formative evaluation on which faculty development opportunities are based.

Each faculty member develops a "pedagogic habitus" (Bourdieu, 1986, cited in Grenfell, 2010, p. 92) acquired through teaching and educational experience, "craft" knowledge (Grimmett & McKinnon, 1992), and approaches to practice that exist on both a conscious and unconscious level and which are context-dependent (Grenfell, 2010). Faculty members face the dilemma of choosing to do what they think is best for the students in their classrooms as they continue to negotiate ways to expand their approaches to teaching and learning. The nature of teaching is a very individualistic one. Yet, faculty have every right to defend their approach to teaching their subject matter, which may put their habitus at odds with the learning-centred approach the university promotes.

Using Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1990) concepts of capital, habitus, and field as a theoretical framework suggests that when an instructor's pedagogical habitus (Grenfell, 2010) closely aligns with that of the dominant view of teaching at the institution, as demonstrated by their ratings on student evaluations and co-ordinator and peer reports, their performance is deemed satisfactory, as structured by the evaluation process at CU. The structure of the process constrains the actions of the Dean as she/he is only able to choose between a satisfactory evaluation or a less than satisfactory evaluation. In effect, this policy constraint demonstrates "the dynamic cause and effect as a structured structure and a structuring structure" (Grenfell and James, 1998, p. 12). The Dean works within the defined structure of the process, which in turn actively structures her/his actions. Conversely, when the departmental evaluation committee and the Dean determine that an instructor's evaluations are less than satisfactory, the instructor's pedagogical habitus and lack of cultural capital run counter to the dominant view of what is satisfactory performance from an instructor within the field of CU. While the determined cause is the instructor's individual pedagogical habitus and lack of cultural

189

capital, the determined effect is often to place the instructor on A&G. This effect produces adherence to another policy structure as outlined in the university's Guidance Committee process, highlighting once again the notion that structure has a "dynamic cause and effect [both as a] structured structure and a structuring structure," key elements of the concept of habitus (Grenfell & James, 1998, p. 14).

Bourdieu (1989) explains that when "habitus encounters a social world of which it is a product, it finds itself as a fish in water" (p. 43). However, for many new faculty, the social world that they encounter at CU is one of which they are not a product and which positions them like a fish out of water as their pedagogical habitus is not recognized as legitimate or orthodox by the institution. Since access to information is key to developing social capital (Grenfell, 2009), open communication needs to flow between the university and faculty regarding the evaluation process, its purpose, and its procedures.

Although the faculty evaluation process provides a clear outline of the articles that comprise the process, how specific articles are implemented is often left to departments to figure out. For example, the formative evaluation principles outlined in the evaluation process indicate that a faculty member cannot be subject to a formal evaluation without direct feedback on his/her performance and that the feedback is for the faculty member's use only. In addition, the process indicates that procedures should be designed to protect the confidential nature of this information. Likewise, when a faculty member is placed on A&G, it is the responsibility of the guidance committee members to determine how often it meets with the mentee, how often or if it conducts classroom observations, etc. In addition, the timeliness of evaluation results emerged as a concern of participants in this study. Although the faculty evaluation process clearly states that "The evaluation file is open to the employee at any time during business hours, but the file must not be removed from the office in which it is kept" (Article 11.5.3.5, Appendix C), some faculty are waiting too long to access information from the SETs. Furthermore, student questionnaires, according to Article 11.5.3.2.1, shall be administered to two sections per evaluation and represent the functional areas in which the faculty member teachers. Two sections are the equivalent of two courses for a full-time faculty member whose full workload would include eight sections (eight courses). This article does not indicate whether student questionnaires can be distributed in only

one term or whether student questionnaires should be distributed over two terms. In the three departments where I have taught, student questionnaires for full-time faculty were distributed to two sections per term for a total of four sections per year, which represented 50 percent of a faculty member's workload. For a full-time faculty member who wishes to survey only two of their eight courses, this article indicates that they may choose to do just that. These examples reflect what Grenfell (2010) refers to as "frontline policy implementation" (p. 91), which can certainly affect a faculty member's access to information regarding his/her performance and run counter to the text contained in specific articles.

In terms of A&G, the university centralizes its control through this provision, a regulatory mechanism that ensures accountability for teaching performance. Consequently, the A&G policy shapes and defines the institution through its accountability measures and sets an exchange rate for them. In sum, avoiding A&G will result in continued membership in the institution and continued economic capital. Additionally, the accountability measures seek to increase the institution's economic capital through increased enrolment based on its reputation for teaching excellence (cultural capital) in the field of higher education. Thus the A&G Policy, an official university policy document, represents the capital form that fuels the evaluation process at the university.

The policy provides a language, "Alerting and Guidance," that legitimizes the university's authority over the process and its "worldview, which sanctions a certain model of practice" (Grenfell, 2009, p. 25). Consequently, it is imperative that co-ordinators, as indicated by the faculty evaluation process, make every effort to discuss the contents of their reports when performance concerns have been noted in the SETs and/or peer evaluations.

The social world is a "signposted universe" that can prohibit, limit, and exclude because the "social world is not a universe of possibilities equally accessible to every possible subject" (Grenfell, 2009, p. 20). Although habitus exists within rigid social structures, individuals do have the capacity to change their present circumstances by strategizing and accumulating the necessary cultural and social capital to pry open the

social world that prohibits them from entering. And this capacity to change rests with faculty and their desire to maintain membership. Mentorship, the Guidance Committee, the classroom observations, and the feedback sessions are opportunities for praxis, but ultimately it is only the faculty member who can make the investment of time to expand his/her pedagogical capital so that he/she can produce and reproduce what the university (the system) demands.

Since the faculty evaluation process is ultimately a summative one that ultimately indicates whether you are continuing membership in the organization, it provides a means to produce and reproduce hierarchies of power and social inequities. For example, placing newly hired faculty on A&G prior to their knowing how the evaluation process works at the institution is punitive and furthermore reproduces and perpetuates inequities. It is often when faculty members receive the formal notification from the Dean indicating the performance, as deemed by the departmental evaluation committee, is less than satisfactory that they realize the impact that this process could have on their continuing to teach at CU – a realization that their economic capital is at stake. Participants in the focus group of new instructors commented on their lack of knowledge of how the evaluation process works. In addition, for faculty who are new to the organization and are placed on A&G, it is often when they receive the letter from the Dean that they realize how seriously the evaluations are taken at CU and the impact that they can have on maintaining membership. This realization can seriously affect the faculty member's relationship with the institution because of the inequities in power that it realizes demonstrating that the A&G Policy will continue to produce and reproduce social inequities and power hierarchies that are in place to serve the system more than the individual instructor.

The A&G Policy is a form of capital that is enacted based on a deficit model of a faculty member's pedagogical habitus. Faculty who are new to the institution, teach only a few courses, or have limited involvement with the institution for any number of reasons may lack capital to understand the orthodoxy around how the rules of the evaluation game are played at CU. The policy produces and reproduces a "structured structure" and a "structuring structure," to use Bourdieu's terms (1977/2004, p. 72). The policy goes on to produce and reproduce its structures as a means of assuring quality control

and the reliability of the university's accountability measures; this policy works to balance alerting with guidance; it is a disciplinary measures that functions like alerting and supervision/surveillance. A faculty member who is on A&G will receive formal guidance starting in the next term; for non-probationary faculty, the guidance and subsequent evaluation take place during the next academic year (Article 11.5.6.3, Appendix C).

An individual needs to be part of the system to reproduce it. A faculty member's individual and pedagogical habitus that now encompasses the lived experience of working through the faculty evaluation process, and if required, the A&G Policy, will most likely structure her social relations at CU, which will expand and adapt her cultural capital as a means of avoiding A&G. The faculty member has now acquired the social and cultural capital to become part of the system and to reproduce it. This observation suggests that the A&G Policy primarily serves the interests of the university, the field. Although the university places high value on the results of student questionnaires regarding faculty performance, as it should, offering mentorship only after concerns in formal evaluations are raised is counterproductive. The university's approach reflects a management style that is termed management by exception (Langton & Robbins, 2011); in order words, it intervenes only when the standards that it sets for teaching performance are not met. Consequently, the doxa of the faculty evaluation process as executed in practice serves to heighten power differentials between those that know and understand the evaluation game and those who do not.

Establishing a learning community of mentors paired with newly hired faculty who together could join a collective group of mentors and mentees may provide an improved opportunity to expand the social and cultural capital of all its members as they learn from each other about the dominant teaching practices (orthodoxy) at CU and the role that evaluation plays and how it can impact an instructor's economic capital. Having accountability measures in place to assess the teaching quality of faculty is important. Placing new faculty on A&G is "too much, too soon" as they do not have the social networks, cultural capital, or pedagogical habitus within the field of CU to understand the evaluation game prior to being placed on A&G. Although many new faculty members may find themselves on A&G due to a lack of social and cultural capital within the field of CU and their lack of pedagogical habitus, A&G is not limited to new faculty. Faculty who

should have acquired the social and cultural capital to continue membership in the organization can still find themselves placed on A&G, which signals to them that their performance is not measuring up. This observation highlights the disciplinary nature of A&G, which I think is more pronounced for faculty who have been at the institution well beyond the probationary period. Being placed on A&G after the probationary period has passed could be a reflection of the fact that "the evaluative process no matter how good [it is] gets in the way of good teaching," a point that an administrator participant made during an interview for this study (see p. 106 of this dissertation); in other words, trying out new pedagogical approaches during the evaluation cycle may not be worth the risk. A senior faculty participant indicated that when she was scheduled for evaluation this year, she made sure that she relied on her standard approaches to teaching for fear of trying something new that might not work out well and may result in less than ideal results on the SETs. Consequently, non-probationary faculty should be advised to accumulate more sets of SETs over the course of the five-year evaluation cycle and enter them into their evaluation file to build a more substantial data base rather than limit the distribution of SETs to a minimum of two courses during the fifth year of their evaluation cycle.

These observations point to the importance of providing information sessions for faculty, whether new to the institution or not, on the prickly process of faculty evaluation at the university. However, once faculty gain a feel for the evaluation game, they become strategic in ensuring that they are not placed on A&G to avoid its stigma. Learning the evaluation game, however, does not ensure that faculty members have acquired the cultural capital that will make them successful teachers and result in improved learning opportunities for their students. It only ensures that the system in place at CU will continue to perpetuate itself as long as this process remains unchallenged.

The doxa, a taken-for-granted, unquestioning view of reality, surrounding the faculty evaluation process ensures that the institutional press of this policy's implementation is accepted as natural. Bourdieu's (1977/2004) concepts of orthodoxy and heterodoxy demonstrate how the process can serve to reproduce and confine the actions of the principal players in the faculty evaluation game or push them to challenge

it. And the participants in this inquiry offer policy changes that would signal to the university community that investing in faculty from their first teaching assignment at CU has the potential to garner more benefits for all university stakeholders than the current model provides.

The incongruity of the A&G policy name chafes most participants in this inquiry and represents in Bourdieusian (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) terms a form of "symbolic violence." Pairing Alerting with Guidance in this policy name privileges the word "alerting" and subjects the "guidance" function to a secondary position. The policy name seeks to impose a particular meaning that functions to highlight the accountability measures that the university has in place and to legitimize its quality control and guidance function to become the dominant interpretation of the policy. The words Alerting and Guidance "become imbued with authority and prescribed meaning; they impose legitimate definitions in a way that does not tolerate non-orthodox versions," a clear explanation that exemplifies the concept of symbolic violence (Grenfell, 1998, p. 79). The dominant view of this policy that the university promotes contrasts with the signs and signals that the policy conveys – that it is a suspicious, punitive process. It is the first step on the road to termination, which has the potential to drive good teachers who were placed on A&G away from the institution.

6.7. Conclusion

CU's faculty evaluation process reflects the minimal investment (economic capital) that the university is prepared to make in improving the teaching and learning opportunities for faculty who lack the pedagogical habitus and cultural capital to receive satisfactory evaluations on their student questionnaires. This policy demonstrates its economic efficiency by investing its economic capital in a last-ditch attempt to meet its legal employment contract requirements. What comes last, costs least in economic terms as the policy represents the university's attempt to offer guidance as a means of improving the teaching and learning opportunities for faculty and their students. This policy is intended to assure the university administration and its constituents that it provides a formal means to improve teaching performance prior to dismissal; however, it could be viewed more as a gesture than a serious attempt to provide a pathway to

195

improvement. By choosing not to invest in its faculty from the outset of their teaching assignments but rather when feedback from student questionnaires provides evidence of less than satisfactory teaching performance clearly demonstrates the lack of economic and institutional capital that the university is willing to make in one of its most important resources, its faculty. The coded secrecy surrounding the policy will ensure that faculty who are new to the institution will continue to be surprised to find themselves being placed on A&G. However, once faculty learn the consequences that result from less than satisfactory evaluations, they acquire a feel for the evaluation game. This newly acquired capital does not in any way ensure that there is improved teaching and learning happening in university classrooms, only that the orthodoxy around the evaluation process at CU is understood and the risk of being placed on A&G avoided. This policy primarily serves the institutional need for accountability and quality control over teaching performance rather than the needs of the faculty, particularly those who have been placed on A&G.

Chapter 7.   An Idealization of Faculty Enrichment

7.1. Introduction

Faculty evaluation programs may serve a formative and/or summative function; ultimately this means that they must provide information for improving or enhancing faculty performance and/or relevant information on which to make personnel decisions (Arreola, 2007). If faculty development or enrichment is a purpose as well as an outcome of faculty evaluation programs, then faculty evaluation programs should engage faculty in supportive ways to learn from each other in order to improve or enhance teaching performance and to grow professionally. However, in reality, faculty evaluation programs, such as the one identified in this study, are often primarily summative with the outcome of the evaluation process a confirmation of or a conclusion to continued membership in the institution. In an effort to bridge the gap between the limited benefits that accrue to faculty within the faculty evaluation process at my institution, I share two discoveries that I made during the writing of this dissertation and offer a way to conceive of faculty enrichment through Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs).

7.2. Discovery: Lack of Faculty Evaluation Theory

In 1995, T. Rifkin noted the absence of a faculty evaluation theory, an observation that is repeatedly cited by scholars in higher education (Rector, 2009). Noting the absence of a faculty evaluation theory and a gap between CU's faculty evaluation's summative evaluation process and its lack of opportunities for faculty enrichment that can accrue from it, I looked to Etienne Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning as an idealization of faculty enrichment that promotes opportunities for learning as experiencing, learning as doing, learning as belonging, and learning as becoming.

Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning positions learning as "social participation" in which active participants engage in the practices of their social communities and negotiate their identities as a result of their active participation in them (p. 5). The social theory of learning integrates the components of meaning, practice, community, and identity; these components act in concert to realize learning. Meaning is a process of negotiation; it is negotiated and organized through reification, a term that aims to make something that is abstract concrete. Through the experience of participating in the social enterprise, participants construct meaning and in doing so, fuel a path to agency.

Practice requires action and therefore signifies not only the act of doing but also how that action relates to shared historical and social contexts of the community, all of which work together to result in learning (Wenger, 1998). Learning collectively results in practices that are reflections of the social relationships of the participants and in practices that advance the enterprise. Practice is envisioned as "property of a community created over time by the sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise" (p. 45); it is practice that provides the context for what we do.

Communities of practice, an ongoing joint enterprise comprised of its participants and the practices in which they engage, are "the basic building blocks of a social learning system because they are the social 'containers' of the competencies" that make up this social enterprise (Wenger, 2000, p. 229). Competencies are developed in a community of practice through committed, actively engaged participants who hold each other accountable for their joint enterprise. Participants establish norms, develop trusted mutual relationships, and share a repertoire of resources such as language, tools, routines, and stories (Wenger, 2000, p. 229). It is through this active participation and mutual investment in the joint enterprise of learning that competencies are shared, developed, recognized, and negotiated. Participation in a community of practice also serves to shape one's identity, which is integral to the social theory of learning. For Wenger, actively participating in a community of practice "translates into an identity as a form of competence" (p. 153). As participants develop their competencies in a community of practice, those competencies in turn shape their identities – their participation becomes more visible, their confidence grows, and their repertoire expands.

Table 1:   Components of a Social Theory of Learning (Wenger, 1998, p. 5).

Meaning (Learning as experience)	A way of talking about our changing ability, individually and collectively, to experience life as meaningful.
Practice (Learning as doing)	A way of thinking about shared historical and social resources, frameworks and perspectives that can sustain mutual engagement in action.
Community (Learning as belonging)	A way of talking about our social configurations in which our enterprises are defined as worth pursuing and our participation in community is recognizable as a form of competence.
Identity (Learning as becoming)	A way of talking how learning changes who we are, and creates personal histories of becoming often in the context of community

Wenger's social theory of learning undergirds Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs). It is through active social engagement in learning communities that we can provide faculty with the opportunities to talk about their changing ability, opportunities to think about shared perspectives that sustain their professional learning, opportunities to talk about community-based activities recognizable as a form of competence, and a way of understanding how learning changes us in the context of community. Therefore, FLCs should add to who we are, what we do, and what it means to us, and the communities in which we practice (Adams, 2010).

Consequently, as a participant observer in this research study, I make apparent in the following paragraphs how FLCs benefit the organization, my colleagues, and myself. Through my dual roles of participant in the FLCs and of observer, I am afforded the opportunity to share the intricate details and the broad perspectives of my experiences in developing and participating in FLCs at the university.

Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning speaks to me. It reflects my experience as a member and facilitator of FLCs at my institution. After attending a week-long facilitator's training program at the Kellogg Ranch, California Polytechnic University, led by Milton Cox and Laurie Richlin in 2011, I returned to my university with the tools to launch an FLC. I sent out an email to faculty across the institution in May 2012 explaining what an FLC was and inviting them to apply to join the FLC for the coming academic year on the topic of "Teaching and Learning with Engagement." At the end of the application process, I had 11 keen recruits to begin my first FLC.

FLCs have given my colleagues and me the space and uninterrupted time to explore the literature on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, to think about the value of teaching philosophy statements as a form of reflection and as a form of self-promotion, to discover new ways of teaching and learning, and to be a support for colleagues during critical classroom incidents. And there is more: to engage in stimulating conversations that open us up to new ways of knowing and new ways of seeing, to test-run a new teaching technique before trying it out in our classes, to review what we could have done differently when our lessons fall flat. And there is more: to be motivated to design an inquiry into our teaching practice and share what we learned from it with our colleagues, to learn from the work of scholars, some of whom have joined us to discuss their research, and to find opportunities to inform the university community and the academy about what we have been creating together. And there is more: to learn more about each other as colleagues, as friends, as collaborators.

On the afternoon of every third Friday, we flock to our meeting room that offers a panoramic view of the North Shore mountains, the bustling waterways of a world-class city, and the pre-dinner rush of commuter bridge traffic. We break bread together, we enjoy a hot beverage, we check in to see how we are doing, and we get down to business. No matter what the topic of discussion might be, one FLC member will have been selected to share an activity that she uses in her classes. Have you tried the snowball technique? How about energy boosters? Meditation? The six-word story? Song of the day? The pencil activity? Need to get your students to do the course reading? Try a 10-minute, in-class readiness assessment with instant feedback scratch cards!

After trying out and discussing an activity, we move on to an exploration of teaching and learning ideas. A small sampling of topics the FLC plans to tackle this year include efficient lesson planning, alternatives to PowerPoint, the Alexander Technique, self-regulation, conflict handling techniques, as well as preparations for the Society of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Conference, which is taking place in Vancouver in 2015.

Professional learning is inherently social. When it takes place in an environment of trust where members are free to share their successes and their challenges, and are supported in their attempts to enhance their repertoire, increased confidence and negotiated competence ensue. FLCs are learning as experience, learning as doing, learning as becoming, and learning as belonging. Learning happens in the interplay of active, committed participation in a shared endeavour. FLCs are the building blocks of social learning; they are the "containers of the competencies that make up the social enterprise" (Wenger, 2000, p. 229). They inform our identities as we journey constantly between novice practitioner and expert advisor. FLC are an idealized form of faculty enrichment; they are an approach to professional learning that is startlingly absent from the faculty evaluation process. FLCs, under the right conditions, motivate members to get out of their offices when their desks are piled high with marking, when they think they can't face another student demand, to seek reprieve among a community of colleagues. Life in the classroom looks brighter and more manageable at the end of an FLC session than before we entered in.

The FLC shares resources such as instructions for an activity we tried out together, links to research in the field of higher education, upcoming conference information, and notes from each session, all of which are uploaded to an FLC Moodle site and accessible to all FLC participants. These are forms of cultural capital, according to Bourdieu (1990); these activities and discussions encompass our experiences and practice and for Wenger (1998) can be termed "reification" as "aspects of human experience and practice are congealed into fixed forms and given the status of object" (Wenger, 1998, p. 59). Learning is "the interplay between social competence and personal experience. It is a dynamic two-way relationship between people and the social learning systems in which they participate" (Wenger, 2000, p. 227). Although FLC members who are new to teaching may initially express concern about their ability to contribute significantly to FLC discussions, their personal experience and their expertise in their field always combine to ensure that they do indeed have something valuable to contribute. It is an environment that is built on trust that allows all FLC members to open up to their vulnerabilities and extend hospitality to each other. It is in this environment that we stretch our competences and practices; it is in this environment that identities are negotiated. It is in this environment that meaning is negotiated; it is in this

environment that our cultural, social, and economic capital is expanded. It is in this environment that our pedagogical habitus is valued and shaped.

The opportunity to introduce FLCs to my institution and to see the idea expand across the institution is a legacy of Wenger's social theory of learning. FLCs build social capital by designing networks that encourage collaboration, critical evaluation, and reassessment of approaches to pedagogical problems – with the overarching goal to improve the learning experience for students. FLCs have a natural tendency to challenge taken-for-granted assumptions about teaching and learning; they involve people working together on a regular basis to learn from each other, to reflect on practice, to individually and collectively engage in experimenting with approaches to teaching and learning. Consequently, I have benefitted from my experiences in the FLCs in these ways: my classes are richer, my support system secure, my repertoire expanded, and my leadership enhanced.

Moreover, FLCs have the potential, from a Bourdieusian perspective, to develop a member's pedagogical habitus, accelerate forms of social capital, lessen opportunities for symbolic violence, and become the means to develop opportunities for formative peer review that could challenge the orthodox view that the current model of peer evaluation perpetuates at the institution.

Since FLCs are the containers of the competencies that make up a social learning system (Wenger, 2000, p. 229), it is through the sharing of activities, teaching resources, and scholarly articles and through the sharing of competencies and practice that members can develop their pedagogical habitus. FLCs provide the opportunity for members to examine their approaches to teaching and learning and compare them to the dominant approach to teaching and learning that prevails at the institution while questioning how student learning is enhanced by these approaches. By reflecting on this question, FLC members discover new pedagogical approaches, demonstrate their commitment to changing their teaching behaviours for the benefit of student learning, or remain confident that their approaches are working well for their students. No one, however, from my experience, ever leaves an FLC at the end of a ten-month period without new approaches to teaching and learning. These new approaches ultimately

make their way into practice for the benefit of student learning. Consequently, FLCs affect one's pedagogical habitus and by extension one's cultural capital, which are important to having a successful faculty evaluation experience.

FLCs by their very nature expand social capital, which has, according to Bourdieu (2007), a multiplier effect. As an FLC develops as a community of learners, FLC members begin collaborating on cross-disciplinary student projects as a result of studying in community together. Mentorship opportunities naturally emerge and evolve in FLCs, which provide opportunities for learning conversations that develop social capital within the FLC setting and beyond. As these mentorship opportunities emerge so do opportunities to lessen forms of symbolic violence. Faculty who are new to the institution and who join FLCs have the opportunity to seek information on the evaluation process and how it works and how they might best learn from the faculty evaluation process. One key way that the FLCs that I have facilitated encourage this is by offering FLC members the opportunity to visit each other's classes and to engage in learning conversations based on these classroom visits. This approach is akin to formative feedback that is helpful to any instructor provided the learning conversations are supportive and seek to understand how student learning is enhanced and valued in the learning process.

Undoubtedly, Bourdieu's (1997) "thinking tools" provide a lens into understanding the increased value of FLCs as a means to developing pedagogical habitus and social capital and to lessening opportunities for symbolic violence through naturally emerging mentorship experiences while promoting a heterodox view of peer review. Moreover, expanding one's pedagogical habitus, cultural and social capital, fostering mentorship opportunities, and reconceptualising peer review can best be realized through Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning, a theory that highlights the value of learning that is fostered through active committed participation in a social learning system.

7.3. Discovery: FLC Research Lacks Theoretical Lens

Etienne Wenger espouses a social theory of learning, which informs the design of Communities of Practice and by extension Faculty Learning Communities. Yet,

scholars such as Cox (2004, 2011) who have been instrumental in establishing FLCs on university campuses, neglect to cite this theory of social learning as a basis for their work. Instead they refer to Wenger's concept of communities of practice with little reference to the theory of social learning that undergirds it. For example, the journal *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* devoted its Spring 2004 issue to *Building Faculty Learning Communities.* Milton Cox and Laurie Richlin are listed as editors. In the opening article of this edition, Cox (2004) provides an introduction to FLCs. This article provides a definition of FLCs, their outcomes, and evidence that they work. Of the thirteen articles included in this issue, there are only two references to Wenger. Cox notes on page 9 of his article that FLCs are "a particular kind of community of practice" and cites the work by Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002) entitled, *A Guide to Managing Knowledge: Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Returning to the same issue of the journal cited above, Petrone and Ortquist-Ahrens (2004) in their article entitled "Facilitating faculty leaning communities: A compact guide to creating change and inspiring community" observe that there is a "wealth of literature on group dynamics and leading groups, and in order to provide narrative coherence we tell our story independent of such references. Those interested in the literature can consult Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002)," (p. 64). Likewise, in the *Faculty Learning Community Program Director's Handbook and Facilitator's Handbook* (Cox, 2011), the following quote is included in the section, "What are Faculty Learning Communities?" (p. 7): "Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis" (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002, p. 4). More interesting is the fact that although E. Wenger's (1998) text is cited in the bibliography of Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder's (2002) text, *Cultivating Communities of Practice,* which E. Wenger co-authored, searching for the term "social theory of learning" in an electronic copy of this 2002 text, which is available from the SFU library collection, results in zero matches.

A search of the database of digital dissertations (in June 2015) revealed that using the words "social theory of learning" (enclosed in quotation marks) produced 493 results. Searching for the words "faculty learning communities" produced 280 results. Combining both searches yielded a mere nine results. Adding "Wenger" to the above

two searches produced the same nine results. Of these nine, four theses used Wenger's social theory of learning as a theoretical frame and the remainder dealt more with how communities of practice are executed. Of those four theses, only one noted the gap in the research literature. Interestingly, repeating the same search in both the Educational Source database and the ERIC database yielded zero results. All three searches were verified by one of the university's librarians to ensure that I was using the search tools correctly and to ensure my results were accurate.

Barra (2005) asserts that "little research in learning communities has utilized a theoretical lens to observe the complexities of what teachers do in learning communities" (p. 265) and comments on how Wenger's social theory of learning helped guide her "in terms of identifying what to pay particular attention to during the study and how to shape my questions and thinking (p. 265)." She goes on to state, "Identifying learning as a social phenomenon places focus on the engagement of people to create meaning and away from the individual as the central aspect of learning" (p. 265-266).

I think that Wenger's (1998) theory of social learning provides a valuable theoretical lens for understanding the benefits that can accrue to faculty as they participate in FLCs, as they negotiate meaning, their identities, their competencies and develop their sense of belonging.

7.4. Conclusion

When I discovered the limited benefits that accrued to faculty and by extension their students from the university's faculty evaluation process, I went searching for a way to close the gap between what the process results in – continued membership in the organization or a path to termination – to what faculty enrichment could be envisioned as. Bourdieu (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) provided the lens to understanding the limits of the faculty evaluation process while Wenger (1998) provided the theory to understanding why FLCs are an idealized approach to faculty enrichment. The lack of a theoretical lens for understanding the growth of Faculty Learning Communities on university campuses calls for more scholars to explore Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning as a theoretical framework that undergirds FLCs.

Chapter 8.   Implications and Recommendations

This purpose of this chapter is to discuss how my findings relate to the research questions, how these findings might be used in the academy, and what my recommendations are for further research.

8.1. The Research Questions

The first research question focused on faculty and administrator satisfaction with the faculty evaluation process at Capilano University. The research revealed a number of tensions surrounding the faculty evaluation process. At Capilano University, the peer and co-ordinator evaluations are both conducted by "peers," which can make for an uncomfortable situation if the faculty member's performance is deemed to not meet department or university standards. Consequently, a continued need for training for faculty to complete peer and co-ordinator reports was identified. A repeated suggestion for small teams of faculty who are highly respected teachers with strong interpersonal skills to be trained in peer observation and writing peer reports emerged from the interviews and focus groups. In addition, faculty indicated that they were waiting too long to view the results of their evaluation file thereby limiting their opportunities to improve teaching performance and student learning for the students providing the feedback. Both administrators and faculty participants questioned the binary choice of "satisfactory versus less than satisfactory" for assessing faculty performance. Participants in this study also generally viewed the Alerting and Guidance provision of the faculty evaluation process, which is a disciplinary action, as a punitive process.

The second research question focused on faculty and administrator perceptions of what are the most important components of a faculty evaluation process. Although the faculty and administrator participants questioned the value of peer evaluations as a component of the faculty evaluation process, they did value opportunities for peer

evaluation outside the formal evaluation process. Encouraging faculty to visit each other's classes, setting the conditions for mentorship to thrive, creating "flying squads" (groups of peers) who would agree to observe classes and provide suggestions for improvement were suggestions that faculty and administrators proposed that would increase the value of formative peer evaluation. Generally, both faculty and administrators saw opportunities to improve the formal peer evaluation by ensuring that the peer observer met with the instructor before a classroom observation to gain insight into the instructor's goals for the session and after the peer observation to review the feedback.

In contrast to their definitive views on the lack of value and usefulness of peer evaluations, participants did value co-ordinator reports and student evaluations of teaching (SETs). They saw students not just as educational consumers but also as individuals who participate in a reciprocal learning relationship with their instructors and who add value and credibility to the faculty evaluation process through the feedback that they provide on the SETs. In addition, the co-ordinator reports were generally viewed as serious attempts to provide feedback that would confirm the quality of teaching, offer suggestions to improve teaching behaviours, or build an iron-clad case for a faculty member to be placed on Alerting and Guidance, which is a disciplinary action. However, participants also noted that the faculty evaluation process does not adequately assess performance beyond teaching roles. Participants also wanted opportunities for faculty to add more to their evaluation file in the form of a self-reflection on their performance and on their future goals.

Although the perceptions of both faculty and administrator participants indicated similar concerns regarding the faculty evaluation process, a perception gap existed only in one significant way: Administrator participants indicated a preference for the faculty evaluation process to be removed from the Faculty Collective Agreement. Faculty participants shared many concerns around the faculty evaluation process and their need to comply with the process as it is set out in the Faculty Collective Agreement, but they did not express a clear desire to have the process removed from the agreement.

The third research question focused on faculty and administrator perceptions of whether the current faculty evaluation process advances faculty enrichment at the institution. The faculty evaluation process appears more likely to provide opportunities for teaching improvement for new instructors during their typical two-year probationary period than for faculty members who have passed the probationary period and who are on a five-year evaluation cycle. But should faculty evaluation processes be designed to provide opportunities for faculty to assess and reflect upon their performance with an eye to continuous improvement and professional growth? The term this study used to refer to opportunities for continuous improvement and professional growth was faculty enrichment, although other common terms are faculty development and professional development. While the specialists in faculty evaluation, such as Arreola (2007) and Seldin (2006), agree that a faculty evaluation process should go hand-in-hand with faculty enrichment opportunities, CU's faculty evaluation process was not designed to accommodate faculty enrichment as it is a summative evaluation process. However, CU's faculty accrue two months of professional development time if they are full-time employees. In addition, the university's Professional Development Committee offers approximately two weeks of structured sessions in May of each year on a number of timely topics such as assessment, Faculty Learning Communities, innovative teaching technologies, etc.

Faculty are required to submit a proposal to their Dean prior to their accrued professional development time outlining how they plan to use their professional development in service to their department, the university, and to their own professional development. When the accrued professional development time has passed, faculty are required to provide a report outlining what they accomplished. So, although the university does provide professional development time for faculty, the faculty evaluation process itself does not appear to provide the impetus for faculty enrichment. The faculty evaluation process and the professional development program appear to run parallel at the institution, with the faculty evaluation process providing no meaningful opportunity for faculty to seriously reflect upon their performance with a plan for continuous improvement and professional growth. In large measure, this observation may reflect the fact that the majority of faculty members who have passed the probationary period at the institution are on a five-year evaluation cycle. However, new instructors who were

interviewed for this study or who participated in a focus group did not see the current faculty evaluation process as providing opportunities for faculty enrichment either.

8.2. Evaluating the Research

Before I begin the overview of the research methodology, it is important for me to address the assumptions and limitations of this study. My primary assumption is that participants in this study would provide responses to the interview and focus group questions honestly. Since participants were eager to participate and share their experiences with the faculty evaluation process through focus groups and/or interviews, I am confident that they responded honestly to the questions that were posed. Participants voiced their appreciation for being able to discuss such an important topic with me throughout the individual interviews, focus groups, and follow-up emails. When reading the first-person profiles in Chapter 4 and the excerpts from the transcripts in Chapter 5, the participants come alive and their understanding of the faculty evaluation process and their roles in it point to their desire to improve the faculty evaluation process at CU and to the openness with which they shared their experiences.

Another obvious limitation is that this case study focused on one institution, CU, an institution that functioned as a community college for 40 years and became a special purpose teaching university in 2008. My responsibility as a qualitative researcher is to "provide the database that makes transferability judgments possible on the part of the potential appliers" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 316). Therefore, my responsibility is to provide thick descriptions through the voices of the participants in my study to enable readers to transfer the information into their individual academic settings. As a qualitative researcher, my desire is for the findings provided from the database of information presented in this study to be applicable to other institutions reviewing or establishing faculty evaluation processes and to add to the research base of qualitative research. Since this study presents the unintended effects of a faculty evaluation process, my desire is that it may be useful in informing the design of faculty evaluation programs at other institutions.

Beyond the limitations and assumptions of the study, it is prudent to make a few observations regarding the qualitative research methodology prior to my presenting the recommendations for this study and suggestions for further research.

Interviews, focus groups, and document analysis provided the data for this qualitative case study. The rich descriptions of the faculty evaluation process at my institution are shared through *My Story*, which was introduced in Chapter 1 and will conclude in the final paragraphs of this chapter, and through the voices of my colleagues. The five profiles featured in Chapter 4 allow an understanding of the complexities of faculty evaluation to unfold through the thick descriptions of participants' lived experiences, which come alive through these first-person narratives. In addition, the voices of my colleagues are revealed in the themes of tensions, contradictions, and opportunities that emerged from the transcripts of the focus groups and interviews, which afforded key insights into the strengths and weakness of the current faculty evaluation process.

Trustworthiness is key to informing the design and valuing the findings of a qualitative case study and trustworthiness necessitates that credibility be established. A variety of activities such as prolonged engagement, triangulation, peer debriefing, and member checking increase the probability of establishing credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Although the criterion of prolonged engagement was met by my 36-year association with the institution in a variety of faculty and administrative positions, triangulation and member checking also served as primary methods to establish credibility. Triangulation was achieved in a number of ways: First, I conducted two in-depth interviews with five participants, and I facilitated five focus groups; consequently, the perspectives of 24 participants from a variety of positions at the university were recorded. Facilitating two in-person interviews with the five interviewees allowed me to follow up on ideas or issues that presented themselves in the first interview. The repeated themes that emerged throughout the interviews and focus groups also triangulated the evidence.

The trustworthiness of the research is enhanced when the collected data support "the findings, interpretations and recommendations" that are presented in the study

(Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 318). As previously noted, triangulation and the audit trail are two techniques that I used in my study to ensure dependability. The repeated emergent themes that presented themselves throughout the analysis of the data make the data more dependable since they come from multiple sources. Dependability is also rooted in the written participant approval for transcripts and for the first-person profiles. Furthermore, peer review by my Ph.D. Committee continued throughout the research and through to completion of the finished thesis; and finally, field notes recorded my ideas for follow-up questions, key points made during the focus group or interviews, and my assessment and reflections of how the study was progressing. For example, I recorded in my field notes my concern around the maintaining the anonymity of some of the participants because of their positions at the university and the inclusion of their profiles in the dissertation. Consequently, I sent an email to each participant and explained that I wanted to include his/her profile, according to Seidman's (2006) definition, in the body of my dissertation. When I sent the individual profile to each participant, I agreed to meet with him or her to review the text. I met with two of the participants and received their verbal and written approval with no changes required. The remaining three participants sent their approval via email and only one participant requested a few minor changes to the profile. As many of the interview participants noted, I had used their exact words, and they stood behind what they had shared whether someone could figure out their identity or not.

I recorded in my notes my satisfaction with how well my first interview for my study went and that we both seemed to enjoy the interaction very much. It was in this very first interview that I spontaneously asked what adjectives the participant would use to describe the faculty evaluation process. Because I thought the answer was so revealing, I decided upon completion of that interview that I would include that question in all interviews and focus groups. I also recorded my concerns around the questions I had prepared for the second set of interviews and worried whether they would create enough opportunities for the participants to make meaning from their experiences with faculty evaluation at the university. Here is an excerpt from my notes: "I am really hoping I got this right. I worry that the questions may not elicit enough meaning making and reflection." After the interview, I made this entry in my notes: "I'm satisfied that the questions are getting at the heart of faculty evaluation at CU. The questions around

211

what you would compare the faculty evaluation process to and what adjectives would you use to describe it are eliciting some interesting responses. Somehow these simple questions tell quite a story." As I sit at my computer in what I expect and hope will be the final days of writing this dissertation, I am struck by the fact that there was never a question I wished that I had asked of participants in this study. I remain confident that the questions I posed were the ones that were the most important to understanding faculty evaluation at my university.

8.3. Recommendations

In this section, I will make recommendations as to how the research can benefit CU, the academy, and those interested in developing or reviewing faculty evaluation processes.

- The findings of this study clearly determined that the purpose of the faculty evaluation process at this institution is unclear to both faculty and administrators. Consequently, the university needs to establish the purpose of the faculty evaluation process. Determining the purpose of the faculty evaluation process should be conducted with input from a wide variety of stakeholders but with significant input from faculty and should be based on more than just the assessment of teaching behaviours.

- Faculty are eager to develop their pedagogy outside the formal faculty evaluation process. They are interested in getting feedback on their approaches to teaching and learning and to curriculum development from their peers that will enable them to enhance learning opportunities for their students. Consequently, opportunities for providing and assisting with formative peer feedback need to be encouraged across the university outside of the formal peer evaluation process. Many formative evaluation programs exist, as outlined in Chapter 2 of this dissertation; however, it will likely take a faculty and administrator initiative to open up meaningful opportunities for formative peer feedback.

- Seeking ways to have the faculty evaluation process connect and align more closely with opportunities for faculty enrichment not only in the improvement of teaching performance but also in the ongoing pursuit of continuous improvement and professional growth would make for a more comprehensive faculty evaluation process. The findings of this study indicate the current model of faculty evaluation does little to promote the improvement of teaching performance and that it has not been designed

to advance faculty enrichment at the institution. The university should consider connecting faculty enrichment to the faculty evaluation process.

- The study's findings indicate that the current model of faculty evaluation at the university is an accountability measure to determine an instructor's membership in the institution, which is a model that perpetuates fear. Consequently, taking a broader approach to faculty evaluation may help to reduce the fear factor. An approach that would encourage faculty to submit a variety of documents to their evaluation file such as a self-submission identifying what they expect to be working on during the next academic year and/or evaluation period, what their goals are, samples of their curricula, samples of student work, feedback from students outside the formal evaluation process coupled with SETs and co-ordinator reports may reduce the fear factor.

- The university should develop faculty evaluator training on how to conduct a peer observation, to write up findings, to develop criteria for a pre- and post-peer observation meeting – all of which should help to increase the credibility and the objectivity of the peer evaluations at the institution. In addition, training should be provided to explain the purpose of the faculty evaluation process, its objectives, its process, and its outcomes.

- The faculty evaluation process does not distinguish between exemplary faculty performance and minimum satisfactory performance. This observation indicates that the faculty evaluation system is a quality control measure aimed primarily to meet accountability measures. Since the evaluation process resides in the Faculty Collective Agreement, the university should find ways to acknowledge the work of its faculty outside the formal faculty evaluation process.

- The university should consider reframing the Alerting and Guidance provision in the collective agreement, which is based on a deficit model of faculty development.

- Faculty should request access to view the results of their Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) shortly after the students have completed them to ensure timely access to the information contained in the SETs.

- Faculty should be encouraged to take advantage of the self-submission in the faculty evaluation process, which can be viewed as an opportunity to record their reflections on their teaching practice and of their professional growth.

- The university should work with stakeholders to develop a faculty evaluation process that embraces opportunities for faculty enrichment

and development thereby reducing the current punitive approach to evaluation.

- This qualitative study serves as a preliminary investigation into the faculty evaluation process at CU. A broader investigation within the institution should be conducted to further the findings of this study.

- This study should be applicable to other institutions reviewing or establishing faculty evaluation processes and to add to the research base of qualitative research in faculty evaluation, which is underrepresented in the research literature. This study presents the unintended effects of a faculty evaluation process and could be useful in informing the design of faculty evaluation programs at other institutions.

- This study demonstrates the value of employing Bourdieu's (1997, 1993, 1992, 1990) "thinking tools" in an analysis of a faculty evaluation process and suggests that other researchers consider them when investigating faculty evaluation systems. Bourdieu's tools have the ability to uncover taken-for-granted assumptions about faculty evaluation that a framework of guiding principles of faculty evaluation will likely not uncover.

8.4. Final Reflections

What a journey this has been! I started out wanting to know more about how my colleagues experienced the faculty evaluation process at my institution, and I learned so much more along the way. My intent in undertaking this study was to open up a dialogue with my colleagues around the prickly topic of faculty evaluation at my institution and to determine if there was a perception gap between administrators and faculty regarding this process. I discovered from the key themes that emerged in this study that no perception gap existed except in this one aspect: Administrators did indicate a preference for the faculty evaluation process to reside outside the Faculty Collective Agreement.

I came to understand more fully the university's approach to the faculty evaluation process and why it was designed as it was. More importantly, I came to understand that in many ways I was trying to get the process to do something that it was never equipped to do. I came to understand that although the process resides in the collective agreement, the varied ways that it is interpreted ensure that inconsistencies in its execution will prevail. I came to understand that the primarily summative role that the

evaluation process serves creates a process that does not engage faculty; it functions like a process that surrounds them but rarely touches them. Apart from the observation of teaching that forms part of the peer and coordinator reports, the faculty member is somewhat removed from the process, unless, of course, the evaluation is deemed less than satisfactory. The co-ordinator observes, prepares a report, and hopefully reviews it with the faculty member before it goes into the evaluation file; a similar process is followed for the peer report. Although the faculty member may add a self-submission to his or her evaluation file, the faculty member is on the sidelines. Recognizing faculty evaluation as an opportunity to critically reflect on your practice, to encourage innovative approaches to teaching and learning, to learn from your colleagues about how you are teaching and from your students about how they are learning, to welcome it as a professional learning opportunity, and to encourage collaboration among faculty would envision faculty evaluation differently that the current process does.

An evaluation process that moves beyond its role as an accountability measure to opportunities for growth can begin in a number of ways. By encouraging faculty to consider the self-submission to their file as an opportunity to reflect on their teaching practice, to record their successes, innovations, and areas of their teaching that they want to work on, and to set goals for the next evaluation period would envision faculty evaluation more as an opportunity for growth. Additionally, faculty could include in their reflections opportunities that they have taken to collaborate with faculty on curricula or in other aspects of their roles as faculty members, to participate in mentorship opportunities and to reflect on how these mentorship arrangements could be improved or have been successful. Including examples of course syllabi and student projects and assignments from a variety of grade levels would add to the comprehensive nature of the self-submission and would not run counter to the self-submission article as outlined in the faculty evaluation process, which states that "materials, including self-submissions, relevant to the evaluation [may be] added to the file by the employee. These materials may be added any time prior to the expiration of the challenge period" (Appendix C, Article 11.5.3.2.4).

Encouraging faculty to see the value of including more class sets of SETs during the period of their evaluation would enable them to accumulate a more substantial

database of student feedback and would provide faculty with additional information on which to track trends in their teaching that they may wish to address through the self-submission. There is nothing in the faculty evaluation process that precludes a faculty member from including more sets of SETs than the minimum that the faculty evaluation process requires as noted in Article 11.5.3.2.4 (Appendix C) pertaining to a self-submission. Using the self-submission and adding more sets of SETs would provide faculty and by extension the evaluation committee and the Dean with more information on which to base a decision, would help to reduce the fear factor in the process, and would envision faculty evaluation as opportunities for growth rather than the current process, which functions as an accountability measure.

Eliciting formative feedback from students and colleagues would also move the process to one than is more growth promoting than it presently is. Examples of formative feedback from students and how their suggestions informed teaching practice and/or curricular changes would be valuable to include in the self-submission as well. Learning from colleagues is also invaluable as a way to move the current faculty evaluation process to one that promotes growth. One key way to accomplish this is to train peers to complete peer evaluations that are helpful, highlight suggestions for improvements, and recognize the teaching strengths that are demonstrated through classroom observations. As Chism (2007) notes, however, peer observation differs from peer review as peer review includes a more comprehensive approach to peer evaluation. Samples of syllabi, student reports, projects, course websites, etc., are included in the peer review and provide a context for understanding the teaching and learning that is happening in university classrooms.

With the suggestions just outlined in mind, I think it is appropriate for me now to address the question of how I might assist in this process. Through my dissertation, I realized that there are opportunities to assist new faculty as they transition to teaching at CU, which may help them and by extension their students to have a more successful learning experience. Consequently, in August 2015, I presented a workshop to faculty who have administrative responsibility for preparing coordinator reports in the School of Business, one of the largest schools at the institution. In this workshop, I focused on key areas of faculty evaluation as outlined in the formal faculty evaluation process, key

216

guidelines for faculty mentorship, and key guidelines for conducting a peer evaluation. I began the workshop by presenting attendees with a list of true and false questions regarding the faculty evaluation process. This activity immediately engaged faculty as they tried to determine the correct answer in consultation with their colleagues, and their responses to these questions proved very enlightening. Faculty who were at the institution for over 20 years were unaware that their evaluation file was open during the evaluation period (five years for permanent faculty), that they could submit SETs throughout the evaluation period, and that they could request access to see the results of the SETs prior to the formal evaluation file being completed and ready for their signature.

After reviewing a list of mentorship guidelines with faculty, I posed the question: What do you, as leaders of program areas, want to focus on regarding mentorship opportunities. The response was clear: focus on mentorship arrangements for new faculty. It was at this time that the department decided that each new hire would be assigned a mentor who had subject speciality and strong interpersonal skills. Consequently, each program leader sent me the name of the newly hired faculty member and the mentor who would be working with him or her for the upcoming academic year. With the help of a colleague, we set out to talk to each mentor/mentee pair and to go over guidelines that would assist in the success of the mentorship opportunity. All heads of programs in the School of Business have indicated their commitment to ensuring that this approach to mentorship continues in the department.

During the workshop, I also showed a video that was posted on YouTube of a well-known professor teaching a timely business topic and asked my colleagues to provide feedback on his teaching. They clearly outlined the strengths and weakness of this professor's approach. These observations lead to a conversation regarding what should program leaders who are responsible for preparing co-ordinator reports and peers who are responsible for completing colleague evaluations look for when they visit an instructor's classroom. What became clear is that individuals who are responsible for completing peer and co-ordinator reports should have a list of teaching behaviours that they can focus on during the peer observation. In addition, we discussed the value of having a pre-observation and a post-observation meeting. This semester is the first term

217

that these suggestions for conducting peer evaluations, for arranging mentorship partnerships for new hires, and for better understanding how faculty evaluation can take a more comprehensive approach have been implemented.

My desire is to present a workshop during PD Days in May 2016 that examines the faculty evaluation process and focuses on ways that the process can be enhanced through the process that is in place at the institution. Additionally, I would like to garner support for establishing a Peer Collaboration Network (PCN) that follows the model implemented at the University of Windsor (The Peer Collaboration Network, uwindsor.ca/pcn). This approach to providing confidential, voluntary, formative feedback to faculty by peers trained in classroom observation make this a model that seems workable and that meets the repeated suggestion from faculty in this study for increased opportunities for formative feedback outside the formal faculty evaluation process. The PCN process involves the typical three-meeting model: pre-meeting, observation, and post-meeting and has the peer observer focusing on teaching behaviours that the observee has requested feedback on. The observer passes all notes taken from the teaching observation over to the observee to ensure confidentiality and to underscore the collaborative nature of this approach to peer observation. This approach to formative feedback is viewed as an exchange of teaching and learning ideas and is designed to be not evaluative but rather to be viewed as a growth promoting approach to teaching and learning.

In the final paragraphs of this dissertation, it seems fitting for me to return to *My Story*, which set the context for this dissertation in Chapter 1. *My Story* described my navigating the complexities of the university's faculty evaluation process with Jackson, a newly hired faculty member, a faculty member who had been selected by a search committee that was committed to hiring a top-notch university teacher. *My Story* uses a pseudonym and significantly alters details to protect Jackson's identity. Jackson excelled in his teaching demonstration and in his interview with the search committee, he had provided outstanding written references, which were supported by reference checks, and he had taught in 5 countries in his 12-year teaching career. The Search Committee was thrilled that he had accepted the university's offer of employment. But transitioning to a teaching university with a heavy teaching load – eight sections

(courses) per academic year – coupled with navigating a complex, unfamiliar faculty evaluation process can produce unexpected results for new hires like Jackson.

Although *My Story* features Jackson, many of the descriptions and observations that I include in my narrative re-emerge through the profiles of participants and the voices of my colleagues. Readers, I expect, felt empathy for Jackson and perhaps for Rachael, whose profile appeared in Chapter 4, as their stories unfolded and unearthed a complex and prickly faculty evaluation process. And while the faculty evaluation process has its shortcomings, as examined in the previous chapters of this dissertation, it is a necessity fuelled by the continuous need for institutions of higher learning to seek accreditation to attract international and domestic students and faculty, to provide a voice for students regarding their learning experience, to protect the rights of faculty members to a fair evaluation, the rights of departments to information regarding the instruction that is taking place in their university classrooms across the institution, and the rights of an institution to implement quality control measures in an attempt to assess teaching quality.

At my institution, when a faculty member is notified by the Dean's office that he or she will be evaluated in the upcoming academic year, the term that is used to describe this process is that the faculty member is "up" for evaluation, which could imply enthusiasm for the process when in reality most faculty are eager to get it over with. Faculty want to get on with teaching rather than worrying about the outcome of the faculty evaluation process, and it is in this observation that opportunities emerge for CU. Change can begin in small yet valuable ways. This dissertation serves as my humble attempt to begin a dialogue on faculty evaluation at my institution. By sharing my heterodox view of faculty evaluation, which is reflected in the recommendations and in my reflections presented in this study, my hope is that it might serve to inform the current orthodox view of what constitutes a legitimate and satisfactory faculty evaluation at the institution. Finally, I hope that the experiences of the participants in this study and in this particular setting and my analysis of them provide an illustrative case study and a necessary caution to institutions of higher learning with respect to how faculty evaluations are structured and conducted and to other institutions generally given the

prevalence of employee evaluation procedures and protocols in almost all organizational

contexts.

References

Adams, L. (2010). *University teachers' understanding of how instructional technology affects their experience with practice*. West Virginia University. ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 3420353.

Akopoff, T. M. (2010). *A case study examination of best practices of professional learning communities.* Walden University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 3427820.

Algozzine, B., Gretes, J., Flowers, C., Howley, L., Beattie, J., Spooner, F., Mohanty, G., & Bray, M. (2004). Student evaluation of college teaching: A practice in search of principles. *College Teaching*, *52(4),* 134-141.

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006). Mentorship behaviors and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: Closing the gap between research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91(3),* 567-578.

Amundsen, C., Gryspeerdt, D., & Moxness, K. (1993). Practice-centred inquiry: Developing more effective teaching. *The Review of Higher Education*, *16(3),* 329-353.

Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems*. San Francisco: Anker Publishing, Inc.

Atkinson, M., & Hunt, A. N. (2011). The peer review of teaching in post-tenure review. In T. Van Valey (Ed.), *Peer review of teaching: Lessons from and for departments of sociology* (pp. 115-127). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

Barra, J. M. (2005). *A situated social practice analysis of teacher change in two learning-community teams*. The University of Utah, ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing. 3194271.

Bell, M. (2001). Supported reflective practice: a programme of peer observation and feedback for academic teaching development. *International Journal of Development*, *6(1),* 29-39.

Benton, S. L., & Cashin, W. E. (2012). Student ratings of teaching: A summary of research and literature. *Idea Paper #50* (pp. 1-22). Retrieved from http://www.theideacentre.org on June 19, 2012.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1975). Components of an effective faculty development program. *The Journal of Higher Education, 46(2),* 177-211.

Blackmore, J. (2010). Policy, practice and purpose in the field of education: A critical review. *Critical Studies in Education, 51(1),* 101-111.

Bolam, R. (2008). Professional learning communities and teachers' professional development. In D. Johnson & R. Maclean (Eds.), *Teaching: Professionalization, development, and leadership* (pp. 159-178). Netherlands: Springer.

Boreen, J., Johnson, M. K., Niday, D., & Potts, J. (2009). *Mentoring beginning teachers: Guiding, reflecting, coaching*. Portland, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (with L. Wacquant) (1989). Towards a reflexive sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory*, *7(1),* 26-63.

Bourdieu, P. (1977/2004). *Outline of a theory of practice.* Translated by R. Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question.* London: Sage Publications.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *The forms of capital*. In A. H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, and A. Stuart Wells (Eds.), *Education: Culture, Economy, and Society* (pp. 46-58). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture.* London: Sage Publications*.*

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Systematic mentoring for new faculty teachers and graduate teaching assistants. *Innovative Higher Education, 22(3),* 157-179.

Buller, J. L. (2012). *Best practices in faculty evaluation: A practical guide for academic leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Capilano College (1972). *Memorandum of understanding: 1972-1973.*

Capilano University (2011). *Faculty handbook*.

Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Centra, J. A. (2003). Will teachers receiver higher student evaluations by giving higher grades and less course work? *Research in Higher Education, 45(5),* 495-518.

Chism, N. V. N. (2007). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook*. San Francisco: Anker Publishing.

Cipriano, Robert E. (2011). *Facilitating a Collegial Department in Higher Education*. Jossey-Bass. Retrieved 8 December 2014, from <http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=317706

Clarke, D. and Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teaching Education*. 18 (947-967).

Colbeck, C. L. (2002). *Evaluating faculty performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cook, D. A., Bahn, R. S., & Menaker, R. (2010). Speed mentoring: An innovative method to facilitate mentoring relationships. *Medical Teacher, 32(8),* 692-694.

Cox, M. D. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 97,* 5-23.

Cox, M. D. (2011). *Faculty learning community: Program director's handbook and facilitator's handbook*. Ohio: Miami University.

Cranwell-Ward, J., Bossons, P., & Gover, S. (2004). *Mentoring: A Henley review of best practice*. New York: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing from among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing.

Crews, T. B., & Curtis, D. F. (2011). Online course evaluations: Faculty perspective and strategies for improved response rates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36(7),* 865-878.

DeWalt, K. M. & DeWalt, B. R. (2011). *Participant observation: A guide for fieldworkers*. Plymouth, UK: Altamira Press.

DeWalt, K. M., DeWalt, B. R., & Wayland, C. B. (1998). Participant observation. In H. R. Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology* (pp. 259-299). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Denson, N., Loveday, T., & Dalton, H. (2010). Student evaluation of courses: What predicts satisfaction. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *29(4),* 339-356.

Devanas, M. A. (2006). Teaching portfolios. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance: A practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service* (pp. 111-130). San Francisco: Anker Publishing Company.

Donnell, K. & Harper, K. (2005). Inquiry in teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, (Summer), 153-165.

Dufour, R. (2004). What is a professional learning community? *Educational Leadership, 61(8), 6-11.*

Duke, D. L. (1990). Developing teacher evaluation systems that promote professional growth. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *(4),* 131-144)

Fink, L. D. (2008). Evaluating teaching: A new approach to an old problem. *To Improve the Academy, 26,* 3-20.

George, J. & Cowan, J. (1999). *A handbook of techniques for formative evaluation*. London: Kogan Page.

Grenfell, M. (2009). Applying Bourdieu's field theory: The case of social capital and education. *Education, Knowledge and the Economy*, *3(1),* 17-34.

Grenfell, M. (2008). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*. Durham: Acumen.

Grenfell, M. (2010). Being critical: The practical logic of Bourdieu's metanoia. *Critical Studies in Education*, *51(1),* 85-99.

Grenfell, M. (1998). Language and the classroom. In M. Grenfell and D. James (Eds.), *Bourdieu and education: Acts of practical theory.* London: Falmer Press.

Grenfell, M. & James, D. (1998). Theory, Practice and Pedagogic Research. In M. Grenfell and D. James (Eds.), *Bourdieu and education: Acts of practical theory.* London: Falmer Press.

Grimmett, P. G. (2007). Mentoring teachers in Anglophone Canada: Building learning communities. In M.V. Zuljan & J. Vogrinc (Eds.), *Professional inductions of teachers in Europe and elsewhere* (pp. 137-153). Ljubljana, Slovenia: University of Ljubljana.

Grimmett, P. G. & MacKinnon, A. (1992). Craft knowledge and the education of teachers. *American Educational Research Association*, *18,* 385-456.

Groundwater-Smith, S. & Mockler, N. (2009). What learning community? A knotty problem. In S. Groundwater-Smith & N. Mockler (Eds.), *Teacher professional learning in an age of compliance: Mind the gap* (pp. 101-111). Springer: Science+Business Media. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4020-9417-0_9.

Gump, S. E. (2007). Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness and the Leniency Hypothesis: A Literature Review. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *30(3),* 55-68.

Hardy, I. (2010). Critiquing teacher professional development: Teacher learning within the field of teachers' work. *Critical Studies in Education*, *51(1),* 71-84

Higgerson, M. L. (2006). Building a climate for faculty evaluation that improves teaching. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance: A practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service* (pp. 35-49). San Francisco: Anker Publishing Company.

Hightower, W. H. (2010). *Perceptions of Virginia community college system faculty and administrators on the purposes for and composition of a comprehensive evaluation system for teaching faculty members*. Old Dominion University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 3429590.

Hord, S. (1997). Professional learning communities: What are they and why are they important? *Issues about Change, 6(1),* 1-7.

Iqbal, I. (2013). Enhancing the summative peer review of teaching. *The Department Chair*. Spring 2013, 8-10.

Johnson, N. A., Ratsoy, E. W. Holdaway, E. A. & Friesen, D. (1993). The induction of teachers: A major internship program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *44(4),* 296-304.

Johnson, T.D., & Ryan, K.E. (2000). A comprehensive approach to the evaluation of college teaching. In K.E. Ryan (Ed.), *New directions for teaching and learning: Evaluating teaching in higher education: A vision for the future* (*Vol. 83*, pp. 109–123). San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Klasen, N. & Clutterbuck, D. (2002). *Implementing mentoring schemes: A practical guide to successful programs.* Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Langer, A. M. (2010). Mentoring nontraditional undergraduate students: A case study in higher education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 18(1),* 23-38.

Langton, N., Robbins, S., & Judge, T. A. (2010). *Organizational behaviour: Concepts, controversies, applications*. Toronto: Pearson Higher Education.

Layne, J., Froyd, J., Morgan, J., & Kenimer, A. (2002, November). Faculty learning communities. *Frontiers in Education, 2002. FIE '02. Proceedings 32ⁿᵈ Annual Conference.* Boston, MA, (pp. F1A13-F1A18).

Leese, M. (2010). Bridging the gap: Supporting student transitions into higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *34(2),* 239-251.

Licata, C. M. (1986). Post-tenure faculty evaluation: Threat or opportunity? *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1*. (HE D19 321; ED 270 009).

Licata, C. M. & Morreale, J. (1999). Post-tenure review: National trends, questions, and concerns. *Innovation Higher Education*, *24(1),* 5-15.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lubawy, W. C. (2003). Evaluating teaching using the best practices model. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *67(3),* 1-3.

Lumpkin, A. (2011). A model for mentoring university faculty. *The Educational Forum, 75(4),* 357-368.

Mandzuk, D., Hasinoff, S., & Seifert, K. (2003). Inside a student cohort: Teacher education from a social capital perspective. *Canadian Journal of Education*. *28(1&2),* (168-184).

Marsh, H. (1987). Students' evaluation of university teaching. Research findings, methodological issues and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *11(3),* 253-388.

McAlpine, L., & Harris, R. (2010). Evaluating teaching effectiveness and teaching improvement: A language for institutional policies and academic development practices. *International Journal of Academic Development, 7(1),* 7-17.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millis, B. J. (2006). Peer observations as a catalyst for faculty. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance: A practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service* (pp. 82-95). San Francisco: Anker Publishing Company.

Ministry of Advanced Education. Public post-secondary institutions. *University Act*. (http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/publications/legislation.htm).

Mitchell, C. & Sackney, L. (2009). *Sustainable improvement: Building learning communities that endure*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Murray, H. G. (2006). Does evaluation lead to improvement in teaching? *International Journal of Academic Development, 2(1),* 8-23.

Nakamura, J., Shernoff, D. J., & Hooker, C. H. (2009). *Good mentoring: Fostering excellent practice in higher education*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Office of the Premier, Government of British Columbia. (2008). *Province to establish Capilano University* [Media Release]. Retrieved from Office of the Premier, https://www.capilanou.ca/2008-media-releases/April-25,-2008--Province-to-establish-Capilano-University/

Pallett, W. (2006). Uses and abuses of student ratings. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance: A practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service* (pp. 50-65). San Francisco: Anker Publishing Company.

Persson, E. K. B. (2002). *A faculty supervisor training program to assess faculty performance: A community college case study*. The University of Texas at Austin, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing, 3099513.

Peskin, J., Katz, S., & Lazare, G. (2009). Curriculum, coherence, and collaboration: Building a professional learning community among instructors in initial teacher education. *Teaching Educational Psychology, 5(2),* 23-38.

Plant, P. Geoffrey. (2007). *Campus 2020: Thinking ahead: The report: Access and excellence: The Campus 2020 plan for British Columbia's post-secondary education system*. Victoria, BC: Ministry of Advanced Education.

Pratt, D. D. (1997). Reconceptualising the evaluation of teaching in higher education. *Higher Education*, *34(1),* 23-44.

Rector, J. (2009). *Faculty perceptions of faculty evaluation programs at selected private colleges/universities in the Southeast United States*. The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga: ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 3439781.

Redmond, M. V., & Clark, D. J. (1982). Student group instructional diagnosis: A practical approach to improving teaching. *AAHE Bulletin*, *34,* 8-10.

Rifkin, T. (1995). *The status and scope of faculty evaluation*. ERIC Digest. ED384315.

Sam, D. A. (2002). *The journey into community: The professional learning community in one community college.* Michigan State University: ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 3064303.

Saroyan, A., Amundsen, C., McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Winer, L., & Gandell, T. (2004). Assumptions underlying workshop activities. In A. Saroyan & C. Amundsen (Eds.), *Rethinking teaching in higher education: From a course design workshop to a faculty development framework* (pp. 15-29). Sterling, Va.: Stylus Publishing.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York: Teachers College.

Seldin, P. (1984). *Changing practices in faculty evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seldin, P. (1993). When students rate professors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/article/When-Students-Rate-Professors/731201/ on June 24, 2014.

Seldin, P. (2006a). Essential operating principles and key guidelines. In P. Seldin, (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance* (pp. 20-34). San Francisco: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Seldin, P. (2006b). Building a successful evaluation program. In P. Seldin, (Ed.). *Evaluating faculty performance* (pp. 1-19). San Francisco: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Seldin, P., Miller, J. E., & Seldin, C. A. (2010). *The teaching portfolio: a practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schaffner, M., & MacKinnon, F. J. D. (2002). *A standards-driven approach to faculty evaluation: The conflict of change.* (Report No. HE035148). Bowling Green State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED467600). Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED467600.pdf November 18, 2014.

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: BasicBooks.

Snooks, M. K., Neeley, S. E., & Williamson, K. M. (2004). From SGID and GIFT to BBQ: Streamlining midterm student evaluations to improve teaching and learning. *To Improve the Academy*, *22,* 110-121.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sojka, J., Gupta, A. K., & Deeter-Schmeiz (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of student evaluations of teaching: A study of similarities and differences. *College Teaching*, *50(2),* 44-49.

Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236 – 247). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Prideaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education: BEME Guide No. 8. *Medical Teacher*, *28(6),* 497-526.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A. Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change. 7(4),* 221-258.

Surgenor, P. W. G (2013). Obstacles and opportunities: Addressing the growing pains of summative evaluation of teaching. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *38(3),* 363-376.

Szeto, W. F. & Wright, P. C. (2003). Searching for the Ideal: A cross-disciplinary study of university faculty performance evaluation. *Equal Opportunities International, 22(8),* 54-72.

Trevitt, C., Stocks, C., & Quinlan, K. M. (2012). Advancing assessment practice in continuing professional learning: Toward a richer understanding of teaching portfolios for learning and assessment. *International Journal of Academic Development, 17(2),* 163-175.

University of Windsor (n.d.). *The peer collaboration network*. Retrieved from uwindsor.ca/pcn.

Webb, J., Schirato, T., & Danaher, G. (2002). *Understanding Bourdieu.* London: Sage Publications.

Webster-Wright, A. (2009). Reframing professional development through understanding authentic professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, *79(2),* 702-739.

Weinberg, B. A., Hashimoto, M., & Fleisher, B. M. (2009). Evaluating teaching in higher education. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *40(3),* 227–261.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization*, *7(2),* 225-246.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Wolfer, T. A. & McNown Johnson, M. (2003). Re-evaluating student evaluation of teaching: The teacher evaluation form. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *39(1),* 111-121.

Woolhouse, C., Dunne, L., & Goddard, G. (2009). Lifelong learning: Teaching assistants' experiences of economic, social, and cultural change following completion of a foundation degree. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*. *28(6),* 763-776).

Worcester, P. I. (1993). *Faculty and administrator perceptions of faculty evaluation in a technical college.* Indiana University. ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 9319419.

Yao, Y. & Grady, M. L. (2005). How do faculty make formative use of student evaluation feedback: A multiple case study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *18(2),* 107-126.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Yopp, M. C. (2006). Mentoring makes sense: Try it. *Journal of Adult Education*, *35(1),* 23-35.

Zachary, L. J. (2005). *Creating a mentoring culture: The organization's guide.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Zakrajsek, T. (2006). Using evaluation data to improve teaching effectiveness. In P. Seldin, (Ed.), *Evaluating faculty performance* (pp. 166-180). San Francisco: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Zellers, D. F., Howard, V. M., & Barcic, M. A. (2008). Faculty mentoring programs: Reenvisioning rather than reinventing the wheel. *Review of Educational Research, 78(3),* 552-588.

Zutter, C. (2007). Mentoring adjunct instructors: Fostering bonds that strengthen teaching and learning. In R. E. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty* (pp. 68-74). Bolton, Massachusetts: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Appendix A.

Interview Questions

Session 1

1. Tell me about your journey to becoming a teacher or administrator.
2. How do you go about getting feedback on your teaching?
3. Tell me about your experience with the faculty evaluation process at the university.
4. What is the purpose of the faculty evaluation process at the university?
5. Does the evaluation process provide opportunities for improvement in teaching? Please explain.
6. Does the evaluation process provide opportunities for faculty enrichment (continuous improvement in teaching and professional growth for individual faculty members)? Please explain.
7. Do the components of the faculty evaluation process accurately reflect the teaching performance of a faculty member? Please explain.
8. How would you like faculty to be evaluated? or How would you like to be evaluated?
9. Do you feel competent to complete a co-ordinator and/or peer evaluation on a colleague's teaching? Has the university provided you with any training to complete a colleague evaluation? or Do you feel that co-ordinators and faculty are competent to complete a co-ordinator or colleague evaluation? Has the university provided any training to faculty to complete these types of evaluations?
10. Should the process around faculty evaluation change? If so, how? If not, why not?
11. Does the evaluation process support the strategic directions of the university as a special purpose teaching university or teaching-focused university? Please explain.
12. What are the most important components of a faculty evaluation?

Session 2

13. Did anything strike you as significant in our last interview? Is there anything you would like to add before we begin the second interview?
14. What does faculty evaluation mean to you?
15. What does the experience of a faculty member going through the evaluation process mean to you?
16. What have you come to understand about the faculty evaluation process based on your experience at Capilano?

17. What would you compare the experience of going through the faculty evaluation process to?
18. What adjectives would you use to describe the faculty evaluation process at Capilano?
19. What would an ideal faculty evaluation process look like?
20. What recommendations would you make to the university regarding the current faculty evaluation process?
21. Anything else you would like to add regarding your experience with faculty evaluation that we haven't covered?

Appendix B.

Focus Group Questions

1. How do you go about getting feedback on your teaching?
2. What is your experience with the faculty evaluation process at the university?
3. What is the purpose of the faculty evaluation process at the university?
4. Does the evaluation process provide opportunities for improvement in teaching? Please explain.
5. Does the evaluation process provide opportunities for faculty enrichment (continuous improvement in teaching and professional growth for individual faculty members)? Please explain.
6. Do the components of the faculty evaluation process accurately reflect the teaching performance of a faculty member? Please explain.
7. How would you like faculty to be evaluated? or How would you like to be evaluated?
8. Do you feel competent to complete a co-ordinator or peer evaluation on a colleague's teaching? Has the university provided you with any training to complete a colleague evaluation?
9. Should the process around faculty evaluation change? If so, how? If not, why not?
10. Does the evaluation process support the strategic directions of the university as a special purpose teaching university or teaching-focused university? Please explain.
11. What are the most important components of a faculty evaluation?
12. What adjectives would you use to describe the faculty evaluation process at Capilano?
13. What have you come to understand about the faculty evaluation process based on your experience at Capilano?
14. What would you compare the experience of going through the faculty evaluation process to?
15. What would an ideal faculty evaluation process look like?
16. What recommendations would you make to the university regarding the current faculty evaluation process?

Appendix C.

Faculty Evaluation Process

Article 11 APPOINTMENTS, EVALUATION, TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION, REGULARIZATION, REDUCTION

11.1 **COORDINATORS**

11.1.1 **Appointments** (see 2.8)

The final decision for appointment of Coordinators rests with the Dean; however with a view to arriving at a consensus amongst those in the bargaining unit and those in the administration directly affected by any particular appointment, the following consultative processes will be used in making such appointments:

11.1.1.1 By March 15, the Dean will invite applications from those employees wishing to be considered for a Coordinator's position.

11.1.1.2 Each Dean will then initiate the process of selection of Coordinators and will ensure democratic involvement of employees in this selection process. This will be done by the Dean requesting the functional area to conduct an election by secret ballot requiring a majority vote to confirm its recommendation. This vote must take place irrespective of the number of applicants for the position of Coordinator, among the applicants pursuant to 11.1.1.1. If, by May 15 there is no accord between the Dean and the functional area, or if the functional area has failed to submit a name to the Dean, the Dean, subject to the decision making model described in 2.8, will make the appointment.

11.1.1.3 Coordinators will be appointed for an initial term of two (2) years. Renewals to that appointment will be for terms of one (1) year. Coordinators will be released from faculty duties for a minimum of one (1) three-credit section per term, or one-quarter (1/4) of a normal duty load. In appropriate cases, the Dean may arrange for more release time.

11.1.1.4   Annual Coordinator orientation shall be done jointly by the Union and the College. All new Coordinator appointments shall be subject to their attending the Coordinator orientation. (See Letter of Intent).

11.1.1.5   The Dean may ask a Coordinator to resign in the case of a non-confidence vote taken by secret ballot within a functional area. In areas where there are two or fewer faculty, including the Coordinator, the Dean may remove the Coordinator for cause, without a vote of non-confidence. Such removal is subject to review through the grievance procedure (see 2.8).

11.1.1.6   An employee may decline appointment as Coordinator; a Coordinator may resign at any time, the resignation to take effect at the first opportunity consistent with the needs of the functional area. In such an event, the Dean shall initiate the process indicated in 11.1.1.2.

11.2   ADMINISTRATORS

11.2.1   Search Committee – Regular Appointments

11.2.1.1   Selection of the Executive Administrators is the duty and responsibility of the College Board. It is recognized, however, that such persons should be selected only after wide consultation within the College community. Therefore, before making a permanent appointment of an Executive Administrator, the College Board will establish a Search Committee within the College.

11.2.1.1.1   The Committee will be comprised of an equal number of members of the Union and members of the Administration who do not belong to the bargaining unit, which latter members may include a member or members of the College Board. The Union shall select its members for such committees. In addition to the members so selected, a chairperson shall be named by the College Board who will ordinarily be the President. The chairperson will be non-voting. It will be the responsibility of the Search Committee to recommend names to the College Board for appointment to the office in respect of which it is struck.

11.2.1.1.2   The above is not intended to exclude the possibility of staff and/or student representatives also being invited by the College Board to join in such a Search Committee. In the event that the College Board does invite representation from these additional constituencies, the number of representatives from each additional constituency shall not exceed the number of Faculty Union representatives on the Committee.

11.2.1.1.3   Although appointments will normally be made from the names submitted by the Search Committee, the Board may appoint any candidate whose application has been placed before the Search Committee. Further, the names of all qualified internal candidates, whether or not they hold acting appointments, shall be included in the recommendations referred to in 11.2.1.1.1 and 11.2.2.1.

11.2.1.1.3.1   For purposes of 11.2.1.1 to 11.2.1.1.3 above, the term "Executive Administrator" shall be understood to mean the President and any other administrator who reports directly to the President.

11.2.1.2   Selection of administrators is a duty of the College Board. Such appointments shall only be made after a Search Committee has recommended an appointee to the Board.

11.2.1.2.1   The Committee shall be comprised of an equal number of members of the Union and the Administration. The Union shall select its members for such committees. In addition to the members so selected, a chairperson shall be named by the President. The chairperson shall be non-voting.

11.2.1.2.2   Staff and/or student representatives may be invited to join such a Committee. In the event that such additional representatives do join the Committee, the number of representatives from each additional constituency shall not exceed the number of Faculty Union representatives on the Committee.

11.2.1.2.3   Although appointments will normally be made from the names submitted by the Search Committee, the Board may appoint any candidate whose application has been placed before the Search Committee. Further, the names of all qualified internal candidates, whether or not they hold acting appointments, shall be included in the recommendations referred to above.

11.2.2   **Search Committee – Acting Appointments**

11.2.2.1   In order to make Acting appointments to positions named in 11.2.1.1, the Board shall establish a Committee consisting of one member of the Board or an administrator, and the President of the Union or his/her delegate. In addition to these members, a non-voting chairperson, who will normally be the President, shall be appointed by the Board. As well, the Board may invite a representative of the Staff Union and/or a representative of the Student Society to join the Committee.

11.2.2.1.1   Within one (1) week of the establishment of this Committee, the Committee shall recommend a name or names to the Board, which recommendation shall be advisory only. If the Committee does not make a recommendation within one (1) week, the Board will make the appointment.

11.2.2.2   When it appears that an acting appointment will last for a period longer than four months, a Search Committee as specified in 11.2.1 will be formed at the time the initial acting appointment is made, or immediately upon the College's determination of the probable length of the appointment. At the conclusion of the process outlined in 11.2.1, the person selected by that process shall receive the acting appointment. The initial acting appointment resulting from 11.2.2 may be extended by mutual agreement between the parties if the work of the Search Committee is not concluded at the end of the four-month period.

11.2.3   <u>Faculty Secondment</u>

11.2.3.1   Faculty who are appointed to an administrator position may choose to enter the "administrator stream" or to receive a secondment from their faculty position to fill the administrator position. Such secondment shall be for up to three years. Secondment renewals beyond that period require the agreement of the Union and the College. During the secondment, the faculty member must maintain contact with his/her discipline by working at least one section of primary duties per year in his/her functional area. Faculty who are seconded will be fully compensated on the appropriate administrator scale. Faculty who are seconded are subject to evaluation as an administrator and as an active faculty member. Such faculty members are excluded from union membership for the period of the secondment but have access to the grievance process for issues concerning his/her faculty evaluation and are required to pay union dues on the faculty work.

11.2.3.2   Seconded faculty may switch to the "administrator stream" at any time providing this does not conflict with the operational needs of the faculty's functional area.

11.3   <u>FACULTY APPOINTMENTS</u>

11.3.1   Every effort will be made to have all new regular employees appointed by May 31st of the year preceding the beginning of the academic year; and non-regular employees by May 31st when appropriate to the needs of the College.

11.3.2   All candidates for employment are to be processed and dealt with in a similar manner.

11.3.3   The parties recognize and agree that only employment appointments of individuals can be made under this Agreement. Appointments cannot be offered to corporations, partnerships or proprietorships.

11.3.4   <u>Criteria</u>

11.3.4.1   During the screening and interview processes, the applicant will be evaluated according to criteria classification, so far as they are applicable to the job classification in question, as follows:

- professional qualifications;
- professional development and experience;
- teaching experience;
- college contribution;
- community awareness; and
- personal attributes

11.3.5   <u>Procedures</u>

C.A. April 1, 2007-ver.2

11.3.5.1   All applications should be dated and acknowledged, and filed appropriately for use by the Dean and made accessible only to the Coordinator and the Search Committee of the functional area. Positions will be posted publicly as soon as they are identified.

11.3.5.2   The Dean will request the appropriate Coordinator to establish a Search Committee and to assume or delegate the chairing of the Committee. The Committee members shall be the Dean and at least three members drawn from the bargaining unit (see 2.8).

11.3.5.3   The Search Committee shall interview candidates and compile a shortlist of candidates. This list shall be forwarded to the President for his/her consideration. The list may be ranked when appropriate.

11.3.5.4   Notwithstanding the above, the names of all internal candidates with the required competence and/or qualifications shall be included in the shortlist of candidates referred to in 11.3.5.3.

11.3.5.5   Where positions involve duties in more than one functional area, the Coordinator, Search Committee and the Dean referred to in 11.3.5.1 to 11.3.5.6 shall be drawn from each functional area.

11.3.5.6   Where the Search Committee shortlist is ranked and the President decides not to appoint the first ranked candidate, the President shall refer the matter back to the Search Committee to redo the ranking or re-open the competition, whichever the Search Committee determines is most appropriate.

11.3.5.7   Applications shall have a closing date stated in the publication or advertisement. Only applications received before the closing date or by the date the Committee begins interviewing, whichever is later, shall be referred to the Search Committee.

11.3.6   **Change in Appointment**

11.3.6.1   When an employee has worked a minimum of one (1) section, or section equivalent, for five (5) consecutive years or more, in a functional area other than that in which s/he holds an appointment, his/her appointment(s) will be changed to reflect the assignment history.

11.3.6.2   If the employee does not wish to accept the changed appointment, his/her assignment may revert to his/her original appointment.

11.3.6.3   For the purpose of all applications of 11.8, an employee who accepts a changed appointment as a result of the application of 11.3.6 will be considered to also hold an appointment in the functional area(s) in which s/he held an appointment before the application of 11.3.6.

11.3.6.3.1   If, as a result of the application of 11.3.6.3, an employee requires retraining to meet the current subject competence and/or qualifications that match the *bona fide* curriculum requirements as determined by the College and the functional area, s/he shall be given an unpaid educational leave for a period of up to two (2) years in order

to retrain. This article does not limit the ability of the College to pay for the retraining, or of the employee to choose that the retraining form part or all of his/her professional development activities. The employee may choose to complete the retraining while working as long as the required competence and qualifications are achieved in a timely manner.

11.4   **FACULTY APPOINTMENTS**

11.4.1   **Probationary Appointment**

11.4.1.1   Normally, the first appointment for a regular RLT and non-regular employee shall be for a two (2) year probationary period.

11.4.1.2   The probationary period shall be waived for a regular employee and for a regular employee who is re-hired within one (1) year and if the following conditions are met:

- previously s/he has satisfactorily completed a probationary period, and
- his/her regular appointment is in the same functional area as the previous probationary position.

11.4.1.3   Having met the conditions in 11.4.1.2, the regular employee shall be on a continuous appointment according to 11.4.2.

11.4.1.4   At least three (3) months prior to the expiry date of the probationary appointment, the employee shall be offered a continuous appointment, or, in the case of less than satisfactory performance judged by criteria set out in 11.5.2, s/he shall be offered a probationary extension of up to one year or shall be advised that no further appointment offer will be made.

11.4.1.5   When the evaluation during the probationary year results in a probationary extension, alerting and guidance, followed by a further evaluation as set out in 11.5, will be conducted during the extension period.

11.4.2   **Continuous Appointment**

11.4.2.1   A satisfactory completion of the probationary appointment period shall result in a continuous appointment and shall establish the employee's five (5) year cycle for evaluation pursuant to 11.5.1.4.

11.4.2.2   In the event that the evaluation conducted pursuant to 11.5.1.4 results in the determination of less than satisfactory performance and judged by the criteria set out in 11.5.2, this appointment will be terminated. Such termination can only occur after adequate alerting and guidance (see 11.6.7.1).

11.4.2.3   Terminations shall be subject to the procedures specified in 11.6.7.

11.4.2.4   Notice of such termination pursuant to 11.4.2.2 shall be given a minimum of five (5) months prior to the date the termination is to take effect. The time limits of such

notice are mandatory. Failure to observe the timelines shall result in the notice having no force and effect.

11.4.3   <u>Regular Limited Term Appointments</u> **(RLT)**

11.4.3.1   The length of an appointment made under this provision (see 2.1.4) is limited to a maximum of one year. If the appointment is to be extended, the RLT employee will be notified of the extension at least three (3) months prior to the termination date of the current appointment. No notification shall be given if an extension cannot be offered due to the employee who is absent from the regular position returning or resigning, or, in the case of an RLT employee appointed under 2.1.4.1.1, the assignment is complete. In the case of less than satisfactory performance judged by the criteria set out in 11.5.2, the RLT employee will be advised that such an offer of extension is not to be made.

11.4.3.2   If the RLT position referred to above is filled by an RPT employee in accordance with 2.1.4.3, and when the RLT position is terminated as a consequence of the resignation referred to above, then the holder of the RLT position shall be offered the vacated regular position.

11.4.3.3   Upon expiry of an RLT appointment the employee shall be offered a non-regular appointment if the duties which the employee has satisfactorily performed, or similar duties within the competence of the employee, recur within the next three terms. An employee who refuses such an offer forfeits his/her rights to a further appointment. An RLT employee who declines an appointment in a third consecutive term does not lose his/her reappointment rights as a result of that declining (see 6.8.15).

11.4.3.4   The employee will not be offered a non-regular appointment if:

11.4.3.4.1   an evaluation, judged on the criteria set out in 11.5.2, indicates less than satisfactory performance, or

11.4.3.4.2   the reduction process (11.8) is applied, or

11.4.3.4.3   there are insufficient non-regular sections available in the functional area; insufficient non-regular sections may arise as a consequence of assigning a duty load to an RPT employee in excess of his/her committed minimum.

11.4.4   <u>Regular Appointments</u>

11.4.4.1   Normally the first appointment for a regular employee shall be for a two year probationary period unless 11.4.1.2 applies.

11.4.4.2   Having met the conditions set out in 11.4.2, the regular employee shall be on a continuous appointment according to 11.4.2.

11.4.4.3   Where the employee being offered his/her first regular appointment does not have complete credentials for the position, the appointment may specify that further

appointments will be conditional upon completion of the credentials, even though s/he may have received a satisfactory evaluation.

11.4.4.3.1 Further conditional appointments, each normally being for one-year period, up to a maximum of four additional years following the expiry of the first conditional appointment, will normally be offered, assuming the employee can provide evidence that s/he has achieved reasonable progress towards the completion of the credentials.

11.4.4.3.2 If mitigating circumstances beyond the control of the employee make the completion of the credentials unattainable, subsequent offers of reappointment will not be withheld simply because the credentials remain incomplete. The determination of what constitutes reasonable progress towards completion of the credentials or what constitutes mitigating circumstances shall be made by the Vice-President, Education by April 1st of each year. Mitigating circumstances shall not include the straightforward failure of the employee to meet the standards of the accrediting institution or agency.

11.4.5   <u>**Non-Regular Appointments**</u>

11.4.5.1 A non-regular appointment shall be specified to be such at the time of offer. Normally the first appointment for a non-regular employee shall be for a specific period of time not to exceed one (1) year. All non-regular employees shall have a probationary period as set out on 11.4.1.

11.4.5.2 **Further Non-Regular Appointments**

11.4.5.2.1 Once a non-regular employee has satisfactorily completed probation s/he becomes a continuous employee.

11.4.5.2.2 Non-regular employees will be assigned work in their area(s) of appointment on the basis of seniority as defined by the department/functional area. Seniority for the purposes of this article will be defined as number of sections taught in the department/functional area; seniority as defined in 11.8.6; or, another method of calculating seniority that has been provided in writing to the Dean pursuant to 2.8.2.4 by September 30, 2007. A non-regular employee will be offered additional work in his/her area(s) of appointment if work the employee has satisfactorily performed, or similar duties within the competence of the employee, recur within the next three terms. An employee who refuses such an offer forfeits his/her rights to a further appointment unless the offer would require the employee to work in three consecutive terms or the offer of further work occurs within 30 calendar days prior to the start of the assignment (see 6.8.14).

11.4.5.2.3 A non-regular employee who has had workload assigned only pursuant to 2.3.2 and 6.15 for three consecutive terms shall have his/her reappointment rights extinguished at the end of the third term.

11.4.5.2.4 A non-regular employee will have his/her continuous appointment status terminated if:

- an evaluation judged on the criteria set out in 11.5.2 indicates less than satisfactory performance, or
- the reduction process under 11.8 is applied, or
- there are insufficient non-regular sections available in the functional area; insufficient non-regular sections may arise as a consequence of assigning a duty load to an RPT employee in excess of his/her committed minimum.

11.4.5.3 **Duty Load of Less Than .5 Section**

11.4.5.3.1 For non-regular employees with a duty load of less than 0.5 section per term or equivalent, the normal process of evaluation may be waived by agreement between the functional area and the Dean. The employee and/or the Dean may request an evaluation and an evaluation shall then take place; if an evaluation in conformity with 11.4 and 11.5.2 takes place, the other provisions of 11.4.3 shall apply.

11.4.5.3.2 Where the initial hire for a non-regular employee is for a duty load of less than 0.5 section per term or equivalent, the normal process of appointment, reappointment and evaluation may be waived by agreement between the functional area and the Dean. The non-regular employee shall not be reappointed until such time as s/he has completed the normal appointment and evaluation processes.

11.4.6 **Joint Appointments**

11.4.6.1 It is recognized that joint appointments across functional areas do occur. When joint appointments across functional areas occur, the Coordinator in the area where the employee has the greatest appointment level will be the Coordinator responsible for the evaluation of that employee and shall seek input from the Coordinator, colleagues and students in all the functional areas where the employee holds an appointment. If the appointment level is equal, the Coordinators shall agree between themselves who shall have this responsibility.

11.4.6.2 The responsible Coordinator shall seek representation for the Evaluation Committee from all functional areas where the employee holds an appointment by making a request through the appropriate Coordinator of the other functional areas (see 11.5.5).

11.5 **EVALUATION PROCEDURE**

11.5.1 **Schedule for Summative Evaluations**

11.5.1.1 Non-regular and regular employees will be evaluated at least once per academic year following procedures outlined in 11.5.

11.5.1.2 For a non-regular employee not placed on scale under eight (8) and who has satisfactorily completed probation, unless there are valid reasons otherwise, the Dean shall waive these procedures two years out of three.

11.5.1.3 For a non-regular employee placed on scale under eight (8) and who has satisfactorily completed his/her probationary period, unless there are valid reasons otherwise, the

C.A. April 1, 2007-ver.2

Dean shall waive these procedures for the first four years of a five-year cycle established in the academic year following his/her most recent regular evaluation.

11.5.1.4 For a regular employee with a continuous appointment, the evaluation will occur every five years unless the Dean determines there are valid reasons otherwise. The five year evaluation cycle will be established at the commencement of the continuous appointment.

11.5.1.5 **Evaluation Period Extension**

11.5.1.5.1 Employees, participating in an exchange under Appendix D, will have their evaluation period extended for a period equivalent to the term of the exchange.

11.5.1.5.2 An employee who has worked less than one-quarter (.25) of his or her appointed duties in his/her appointment area in any one year during the evaluation cycle shall have the evaluation period in his/her appointment area extended so as to ensure that s/he has returned to the appointed duties for at least one year prior to being evaluated.

11.5.1.5.3 When, during the final year before an evaluation, a regular employee is on a one year leave or full term leave, the date for the employee's evaluation shall be advanced equal to the length of leave. A regular employee on probation shall have his/her probationary period extended by the length of his/her leave provided the leave is a minimum of one term.

11.5.1.6 Notwithstanding 11.5.1.2, 11.5.1.3 and 11.5.1.4, employees working past age 65 shall be evaluated every two (2) years.

11.5.1.7 All evaluations under 11.5.1 shall be conducted by an Evaluation Committee under 11.5.5.

11.5.1.8 Where, under 11.5.1.2, 11.5.1.3 and 11.5.1.4, the Dean causes an evaluation of an employee to occur during the intervening years, that evaluation will have no effect on the timing of the employee's pre-existing evaluation cycle (i.e. three (3) years, four (4) years and five (5) years).

11.5.2 **Evaluation Criteria**

11.5.2.1 Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be applied in a similar manner to all employees. The following are the criteria for evaluating an employee. Though designed for instructors, they will be applied *mutatis mutandis* to other employees.

11.5.2.2 **The Employee in Relation to Students**

11.5.2.2.1 Develops an approach to learning designed to reach a wide variety of students. Students should be encouraged to develop an independent and questioning attitude and not be unduly dependent on the faculty for learning.

11.5.2.2.2 Each student should be treated with respect and genuine interest.

C.A. April 1, 2007-ver.2

11.5.2.3	**The Employee in Relation to Assignments**
11.5.2.3.1	Adequately develops written course objectives relevant to student needs.
11.5.2.3.2	Adheres to approved course outlines.
11.5.2.3.3	Communicates material and answers questions clearly and effectively.
11.5.2.3.4	Organizes and develops material clearly and effectively.
11.5.2.3.5	An employee's commitment to his/her discipline should demonstrate a balanced and full presentation of material and an identification of his/her philosophy as pertinent to the course material.
11.5.2.4	**The Employee in Relation to his/her Subject or Area of Specialty**
11.5.2.4.1	The employee should understand and be knowledgeable in the latest developments in his/her field. Where practicable, the employee should also be involved in such developments.
11.5.2.4.2	The employee should design and teach material to take into account current offerings of secondary institutions and be compatible with the requirements of post-secondary institutions and/or the community.
11.5.2.5	**The Employee in Relation to Other Members of the College Community**
11.5.2.5.1	Employees should be willing to exchange ideas and to assist other faculty, staff and community partners in a professional manner.
11.5.2.6	**The Employee in Relation to the College**
11.5.2.6.1	Aside from contractual obligations, an employee is expected to participate in functional area meetings, student consultations, and in such other activities from which the students, the employees and the College as a whole may reasonably be expected to profit.
11.5.2.6.2	Employees should make a continuing contribution to the objectives of the College.
11.5.2.6.3	Employees should adequately perform approved professional development.
11.5.3	**The Evaluation File**
11.5.3.1	A Coordinator shall be responsible for ensuring that the materials listed below are present in the evaluation file and that they have been reviewed by the employee before the Committee considers a specific employee's case. However, should the Coordinator fail to have the materials collected or fail to have the employee review the materials, the Committee's consideration of the case will not be invalid only by reason of such failure. When the file is complete, the employee will be notified in writing accordingly. For joint appointments, see 11.4.6.

C.A. April 1, 2007-ver.2

11.5.3.2   The evaluation file shall contain only the following items, and all materials shall pertain only to and be based upon the criteria set forth in 11.5.2.2 – 11.5.2.6.

11.5.3.2.1   Questionnaires filled out by the students will not normally be distributed until at least forty percent (40%) of the scheduled contact time for the course has been completed. Questionnaires shall be distributed to a minimum of two sections per evaluation, unless the employee is working fewer than two sections during the evaluation period, in which case his/her total term workload will be evaluated. The sections chosen for student questionnaires shall be representative of the functional areas in which the employee has been assigned work.

11.5.3.2.2   A report, from one or more employees, chosen by the employee being evaluated, unless the non-probationary employee being evaluated and the Coordinator (or his/her designate) elect in writing to waive this item. A probationary employee's file must contain this report. This report will deal with at least the criteria in 11.5.2.2, 11.5.2.3 and 11.5.2.4.

11.5.3.2.3   A report from the appropriate Coordinator or his/her Designate, based on the criteria in 11.5.2.2 to 11.5.2.6. The report may contain the conclusion of the Coordinator, or Coordinator Designate as to whether the employee's performance is satisfactory or less than satisfactory.

11.5.3.2.3.1   Where the Coordinator's or Coordinator Designates Report indicates unsatisfactory performance with respect to any of the criteria, the Report shall include any supporting evidence to substantiate the critical evaluation or recommendation. In addition, the Coordinator or Coordinator Designate shall make reasonable efforts to discuss comments relating to an unsatisfactory performance with the employee prior to finalizing the Report and submitting it to the evaluation file.

11.5.3.2.4   Materials, including self-submissions, relevant to the evaluation added to the file by the employee. These materials may be added any time prior to the expiration of the challenge period of 11.5.4.1. When materials are added following completion of the Coordinator or Designate Report (11.5.3.2.3), this fact should be noted on the material.

11.5.3.2.5   Materials relevant to the evaluation added to the file by the appropriate Dean or by the President. It is agreed that only such material as is based on the Dean's or the President's personal contact, investigation or observation will be added. The Dean's submission to the current evaluation file of employees on continuing appointment shall be limited to the period commencing with the recommendation of the immediately previous evaluation committee and to information included in the immediately previous evaluation file.

11.5.3.3   In the case of instructors, the reports mentioned in 11.5.3.2.2 and 11.5.3.2.3 shall be based at least in part on observation visits to their classrooms; for all other employees, these reports shall be based at least in part on observation visits to their work area. When an employee's duties require him or her to liaise with outside

C.A. April 1, 2007-ver.2

245

Page 103

agencies and/or funding partners, the Coordinator can seek input from those outside agencies and/or funding partners.

11.5.3.4   No classroom visit for evaluation shall take place without reasonable prior notification to the employee being evaluated.

11.5.3.5   The evaluation file is open to the employee at any time during College business hours, but the file must not be removed from the office in which it is kept.

11.5.4   Challenge to the Evaluation File

11.5.4.1   An employee may insert a written challenge into his/her evaluation file, challenging any statements made in the submissions which constitute the materials under 11.5.3.2.1 to 11.5.3.2.5. The challenge must be submitted within seven working days of the employee being advised that the evaluation file is complete. The challenge shall relate to the appropriateness of statements made in the material on the grounds that they are not relevant or that they contain information and/or judgments that are not supported by the evidence of materials in the file. The challenge procedure must be completed prior to the review of the evaluation file by the Evaluation Committee.

11.5.4.2   The challenge will be evaluated by a Challenge Committee established by the Dean and drawn from at least three functional areas and the Committee must include in its recommendations to the Dean a recommendation that the challenge be either sustained or denied in total or in part (see 2.8).

11.5.4.3   The Dean shall make a final determination in writing as to whether all or part of the challenge will be sustained or denied. If the challenge is denied in total or in part, the portion denied will be entered in the evaluation file along with the employee's written challenge.

11.5.4.4   Where the appropriate Dean determines that a challenge in total or in part is sustained, the sustained materials shall be removed from the file by the Dean. The employee shall be informed of this and provided with the materials impugned and all the written materials comprising the challenge and its disposition relating to the sustained portion of the challenge.

11.5.4.5   Where the Dean determines that a challenge in total or in part is sustained, any letter of reference or response to a request for a recommendation will not reflect the contents of that sustained challenged material, nor will the said contents be reflected in the Dean's recommendation to the President.

11.5.5   Evaluation Committee

11.5.5.1   The appropriate Coordinator shall establish one or more Evaluation Committees, drawn from the faculty in appropriate functional areas. Where an Evaluation Committee is to review a file for an employee with a joint appointment, the Coordinator shall seek representation from each of the functional areas where that employee holds an appointment. No one shall serve on this Committee who has submitted any material to the employee's evaluation file for that evaluation period,

C.A. April 1, 2007-ver.2

unless there is agreement by the employee and the Dean. This Committee shall recommend to the Dean the appropriate alternative from 11.5.5.1.1 or 11.5.5.1.2. Where the Committee is made up of representatives from more than one functional area where the employee holds an appointment, the Committee may make one joint recommendation or separate recommendations for each appointment.

11.5.5.1.1   In the case of a probationary employee:

- continuous appointment – when the probationary period has ended with a satisfactory evaluation, (the employee has met the standard required to be hired as a regular employee),
- continuation of probation – when the probationary period has not yet ended and the employee received a satisfactory evaluation,
- continuation of probation with alerting and guidance – when the probationary period has not yet ended and the evaluation is less than satisfactory and alerting and guidance is appropriate,
- extension of probationary period with alerting and guidance – when the initial probationary period has ended and the evaluation is less than satisfactory and alerting and guidance is appropriate, or
- termination – where the evaluation is less than satisfactory and alerting and guidance or continuation of probation with alerting and guidance is not appropriate.

11.5.5.1.2   In the case of an employee not on probation:

- the evaluation is satisfactory, resulting in no change of the employee's appointment status,
- the evaluation is less than satisfactory and alerting and guidance is appropriate, resulting in no change of the employee's appointment status, or
- termination – where the evaluation is less than satisfactory and further alerting and guidance is not appropriate.

11.5.5.2   The Committee shall make its recommendation on the basis of the five criteria listed in 11.5.2.2 through 11.5.2.6 and, subject to the provisions of 11.5.5.3, only on the basis of materials in the evaluation file collected since the date of the last completed satisfactory evaluation.

11.5.5.3   In cases where alerting and guidance has been initiated, the evaluation file shall include all evaluation material initiating the alerting and guidance and all subsequent evaluation materials until the alerting and guidance is completed and the employee is notified that the alerting and guidance has been completed.

11.5.5.4   Where there is a substantial problem under any of the components of the evaluation, the Evaluation Committee may request clarification of, or additional information on, that component. Before the component is considered, the employee will be notified and can challenge the new material under 11.5.4.1 and/or add materials under 11.5.3.2.4.

11.5.5.5   The Committee's recommendation and reasons shall be given in writing. The employee shall be given a copy of the recommendations.

11.5.6   The Dean's Evaluation

11.5.6.1   The Dean will make an overall evaluation and recommend to the President the appropriate alternative from 11.5.5.1.1 or 11.5.5.1.2.

11.5.6.2   Where there is a substantial problem under any of the components of the evaluation, the Dean may request of the Evaluation Committee clarification of, or additional information on, that component.

11.5.6.3   **Alerting and Guidance**

11.5.6.3.1   The employee shall be advised of the Alerting and Guidance in writing. The letter will indicate the shortcomings that have been identified in the evaluation and for which guidance is required with respect to the criteria of 11.5.2 and will specify the improvements expected.

11.5.6.3.2   A guidance committee shall be established by the Coordinator consisting of a minimum of three (3) to a maximum of five (5) faculty members, approved by the employee.

11.5.6.3.3   The guidance and subsequent evaluation for employees on probation shall commence in the next term with an instructional assignment and, in the event the alerting and guidance is not complete at the end of the probationary period, the probationary period will be automatically extended to the end of the alerting and guidance. The guidance and subsequent evaluation for employees not on probation shall occur in the next academic year.

11.5.6.3.4   The guidance committee will write a report to the Dean indicating the magnitude and the specifics of the guidance provided. The guidance committee shall provide a copy of the report to the employee who is the subject of the report. This report shall be submitted before reappointment.

11.5.6.4   **New Evaluation Cycle**

In the case of a continuous employee, a recommendation of continuation of that appointment marks the beginning of a new evaluation cycle, commencing with the beginning of the next academic year.

11.5.6.5   **Union Notification**

When an employee is placed on alerting and guidance, the Union will be notified of that fact. Failure to notify the Union does not invalidate any of the procedures under 11.5 nor remove any of the College's rights under this Collective Agreement.

11.5.7   Special Cases

11.5.7.1   In cases where the Coordinator or Chair mentioned in 11.5.5.1 is being evaluated, the Dean will identify a Coordinator designate who shall act as the Coordinator for the purposes of the evaluation. The Coordinator designate will then establish the Evaluation Committee.

11.5.7.2   When an employee has been on leave, the recommendation will be based on the material for the period during which the employee has been on duty.

11.5.7.3   When there is no new material in the employee evaluation file since the last evaluation, the Committee recommendation will be in the case of an employee on a continuous appointment, confirmation of that continuous appointment and, in the case of a probationary employee, continuous appointment or a further non-regular appointment.

11.5.7.4   An employee may request an evaluation of his/her performance by the Dean at any time. These shall be placed in the evaluation file. The Dean is not hereby restricted from making such evaluation as s/he considers appropriate.

11.5.8   **Formative Evaluation Principles**

The formative evaluation principles are as follows:

- Wherever possible, probationary employees should not be subject to an 11.5 evaluation without the opportunity for prior direct feedback on his/her performance related to the evaluation criteria of 11.5.2.2, 11.5.2.3 and 11.5.2.4;
- Non-probationary employees should not be subject to an 11.5 evaluation without the opportunity for prior direct feedback on his/her performance related to the evaluation criteria of 11.5.2.2, 11.5.2.3 and 11.5.2.4;
- The resulting information from a formative evaluation is for the employee's use only. Procedures should be designed that recognize the confidentiality of this information;
- All employees can benefit from feedback on a regular basis.

11.5.9   **Mentoring**

11.5.9.1   Mentoring will be offered to all employees whose student questionnaires in the first term of the evaluation year warrant mentoring in the opinion of the Coordinator.

11.5.9.2   When a probationary employee is identified for mentoring, the Union will be notified of that fact.

11.5.9.3   The mentor shall be mutually agreed upon by the Coordinator and employee.

11.5.9.4   The mentoring shall begin within two weeks of the Coordinator deciding mentoring should occur.

11.5.9.5   Participation in mentoring by employees not on probation shall be at the option of the employee. The degree of participation is not a factor in an 11.5 evaluation file.

11.5.9.6   For probationary employees who do not agree to a mentor, evaluations shall take place each term during the probationary period.

11.5.9.7   For probationary employees, the evaluation file shall contain a report detailing the mentoring given. A copy of the report shall be given to the employee. The report notes that the mentoring took place or that the employee refused to participate in mentoring. The report does not evaluate the employee's performance or participation in mentoring.

11.6   TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION

11.6.1   Union Representation

At any disciplinary meeting between an employee and the College, the employee has a right to be represented by a steward or officer of the Union.

11.6.2   Resignation

A regular employee who resigns shall give at least six (6) months' notice in writing to the President. The resignation date shall coincide with the end of the term. These provisions may be waived or the dates altered by mutual consent in writing.

11.6.3   Retirement

If an employee wishes to retire at age sixty-five (65) or earlier, the retirement shall coincide with the end of the term and s/he must give at least six (6) months' notice in writing to the President. These provisions may be waived or the date altered by mutual consent in writing.

11.6.4   Suspension

In conformity with Part 4, Section 37(1) of the *College and Institute Act*, the President may suspend an employee. The President shall provide a written notice of suspension to the employee at or before the time of said suspension, and will, within two (2) working days, provide his reasons in writing for levying the suspension, on the understanding that a copy of the letter will then be placed in the employee's evaluation file. The employee may grieve the suspension and, in conformity with provisions of the Act, may appeal to the College Board.

11.6.5   Dismissal for Just Cause

The College Board may dismiss an employee for just cause. The College will provide the employee with written notice of the dismissal at or before the time of dismissal, and written reasons will be provided at the time of dismissal, where practicable; or in any case, within seven (7) calendar days.

11.6.6   Termination of Appointment during Probationary Period

C.A. April 1, 2007-ver.2

11.6.6.1   Within twenty-one (21) days after notice by or on behalf of the College that his/her appointment is to be terminated, the Union may, on behalf of the probationary employee, appeal the termination by presenting a written complaint to the President.

11.6.6.2   If within ten (10) calendar days the President does not resolve the complaint, there shall be an appeal hearing by a three (3) member Appeals Board. One member shall be named by the Union, one shall be named by the President. The President's nominee shall not be the Coordinator of the appealing employee or Dean of his/her functional area. The chairperson shall be drawn on a rotation basis from the list of "Arbitrators and Appeal Board Chairpersons" specified in 5.3.1.1.

11.6.6.3   The Appeal Board shall formally hear the question put by the employee or his/her representative as to whether or not s/he should have been terminated. The employee shall be permitted to introduce evidence relevant to the issues to support his/her case and the Dean who made the recommendation referred to in 11.5.6 in respect of the appealing employee may also introduce relevant and substantial evidence to support his/her position.

11.6.6.4   The evaluation criteria referred to in 11.5.2 shall be the only criteria used by the Appeal Board in making its decision.

11.6.6.5   The Appeal Board shall consider the evidence and shall render its decision, within three (3) weeks after a chairperson has been selected, which shall be binding on all parties. The Appeal Board shall act with all powers of arbitration under the *Labour Relations Code*.

11.6.6.6   Article 5 does not apply to 11.6.6 except as to procedural matters. Nothing in 11.6.6 shall preclude the Union or employee exercising any right of appeal under the *College and Institute Act*.

11.6.7   **Procedure for Suspension or Termination of Non-Probationary Employee**

11.6.7.1   Suspension or termination of an employee for unsatisfactory performance can be justified only when adequate alerting and guidance to the necessary improvements have failed to result in a satisfactory level of performance as judged against the criteria set out in 11.5.2. Except as otherwise provided herein, such suspension or dismissal shall only occur after the President has obtained a report from the Special Evaluation Committee.

11.6.7.2   The Special Evaluation Committee (SEC) will be made up of one (1) member from the Union, one (1) from Administration, and one (1) sub-administrator mutually acceptable to both parties to the Collective Agreement. The members of the Committee may be released from their duties up to full time at their discretion for the duration of the Committee's work. The person being evaluated and one (1) representative of the Union may also be released of their duties at the discretion of the person being evaluated. The Union shall bear any costs for the release time of the Union representative on the SEC and for the Union representative of the person being evaluated.

11.6.7.3 The Committee shall investigate the following questions: first, do there exist reasonable grounds to claim that the performance was unsatisfactory enough to warrant suspension or termination? Second, had there previously been adequate alerting and guidance?

11.6.7.4 The Committee shall submit to the President its report within two (2) weeks of the activation of the SEC process.

11.6.7.5 All SEC reports shall be kept on file and it is recommended that any SEC refer to these reports for guidance.

11.6.7.6 The SEC process shall be activated by and dated from the date on which the employee and the Union are notified in writing by the President that the employee is to be suspended or that a recommendation is to be made for his/her termination. The written notice shall name the College's appointee to the SEC and invite the Union to name its appointee.

11.6.7.7 In the event of failure of the parties to agree upon the appointment of a member within one (1) week of the activation of the SEC, or the failure of the Committee to deliver its report on time, the President may suspend or recommend termination without benefit of the Committee's report.

11.6.7.8 Refusal by either party to devote a reasonable amount of time to the deliberations of the committee shall be deemed a point of substance in any actions taken by either party which ensue from this process.

11.6.7.9 Nothing in 11.6.7 shall preclude the applicability of Article 5.

Appendix D.
Informed Consent Form

Participant Consent Form

A Perception Gap? Faculty and Administrator Perceptions of Capilano University's Faculty Evaluation Process and Its Ability to Advance Faculty Enrichment

Principal Investigator: Mary Giovannetti, Ph. D. Candidate
                                   Faculty of Education
                                   Simon Fraser University

Goals of This Study

      As part of my Ph.D. dissertation in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University, I will be conducting interviews and focus groups with administrators and teaching faculty at Capilano University. My study investigates faculty and administrator perceptions of the faculty evaluation process at Capilano University (CU). This study will determine if a perceptual gap exists between these constituents regarding the faculty evaluation process and whether it advances faculty enrichment at the institution. Faculty enrichment refers to the development, documentation, and implementation of a faculty member's individual plan for continuous improvement and professional growth.

General Focus of Research Questions:

There will be ten questions that examine:

1. How satisfied are teaching faculty and administration with the faculty evaluation process at Capilano University?
2. What do faculty and administration perceive to be the most important components of a faculty evaluation program?
3. How satisfied are teaching faculty and administration that the current faculty evaluation process advances faculty enrichment at the institution?

What Participants Will Be Asked To Do:

1. You will complete an Informed Consent Form.
2. You will be individually interviewed twice or participate in a focus group.
3. You will be given the opportunity to review the transcripts from your interviews or from the focus group in which you participated.

1

253

Time Required of Participants

- Interviews:

  Two interviews will be conducted; each interview will take approximately 1.5 hours.

  The first interview will focus on how you became involved with teaching or administration at CU to provide a context for your experience with the faculty evaluation system and its ability to advance faculty enrichment at the institution.

  The second interview will ask you questions that relate to your experience with the faculty evaluation system and its ability to advance faculty enrichment at the institution. Two interviews are needed to provide a context for your experience and to offer you the opportunity to reflect on the meaning of your experience as a result of your history at the institution and your experience with the faculty evaluation process at CU.

- Focus Groups:

  Focus groups will consist of 5 – 8 participants who will meet once to discuss their perceptions and understandings of the faculty evaluation process at Capilano University and whether it advances faculty enrichment at the institution.

  Each focus group will take approximately 1.5 hours – 2.5 hours.

Risks

Since I will be required as part of my job duties as Coordinator to complete Faculty Evaluations on teaching faculty in the School of Applied Business at Capilano University during the 2013-2014 academic year, no teaching faculty in this department who is required to be evaluated during the 2013-2014 academic year will be able to participate in this study.

Due to the nature of this research study, this study is minimal risk. There are no foreseeable risks (e.g., psychological stress, physical stress, risk with respect to employment or evaluation, etc.) to participating in this study.

Benefits

Although a vast amount of research, mostly quantitative, exists regarding the individual components of faculty evaluation systems such as Student Evaluations of Teaching,

2

more commonly referred to as SETs (Centra, 2003; Marsh, 1987; Gump, 2007), few quantitative studies explore how faculty would like to be evaluated (Szeto & Wright, 2003; Rector 2009) and little if any qualitative research has been directed toward faculty and administrative perceptions of faculty evaluation programs and their ability to advance faculty enrichment. This study will contribute to the existing body of research by investigating faculty and administrators' perceptions and understandings of the faculty evaluation process.

Participation in this study offers you the opportunity to discuss and to share your perceptions of the faculty evaluation process at Capilano University.

Confidentiality

All information collected in this study will be held in strictest confidence. Pseudonyms will be assigned to you to protect your identity. Unless permission is given, no identifying information will be released.

Interview and focus group notes and transcript tapes will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my home office, and all notes and tapes will be destroyed two years after the completion of this study. At the completion of this study, the data will be stored on a memory stick, which will be kept in a locked cabinet in my home office for two years and then the data will be destroyed.

Please Note: If you are a focus group participant, you will be asked to keep the information and ideas exchanged in the focus groups confidential. By consenting to participate in the focus group, you confirm that any information you encounter will be kept confidential and not revealed to parties outside the focus group. Although the objective is to maintain confidentiality, it cannot be guaranteed.

Participation

Your participation is this study is voluntary. If you decide not to participate, you may withdraw from this study at any time without prejudice. If you withdraw from participation in this study, your data must be withdrawn.

Concerns Should Be Directed to

Dr. Dina Shafey, Associate Director

Office of Research Ethics

Simon Fraser University

Burnaby, BC

V5A 1S6

3

Approval for This Study

Approval for this study has been obtained from Simon Fraser University Research Ethics Board and Capilano University Ethics Committee.

Application number: 2013a0199

To Obtain Results

If you wish to obtain a report of this study upon its completion, please contact me, Mary Giovannetti.

Consent

You have read the above information. You, _____, hereby consent to participate in the study described above, and you freely consent to participate.

☐   You grant permission to be quoted directly.

☐   You grant permission to be audio taped.

☐   You agree to be contacted about the possibility of a follow-up focus group and/or interview. Please initial _____

4

You agree to the terms:

Participant's Name: _____ (Please Print)

Participant's Signature _____ Date: _____

Participant's Contact Information: Email: _____ Phone: _____

Researcher's Signature _____ Date: _____

Appendix E.

School of Business Questionnaire

School of Business
Faculty / Course Evaluation

Course Name: _____ Course Number: _____ Date: _____

Instructor: _____ Course Section: _____

This survey will assist the School of Business to assess course content and instructor's ability. As a learning cooperative venture between you and your instructor, your constructive comments will provide valuable feedback to your instructor and the Business Administration Department. Your response will remain confidential and anonymous and survey results will only be tabulated after the final course grades have been submitted.

Please answer this survey honestly and fairly by indicating your evaluation by 'blacking out' one of the selections:

(1) Always (2) Mostly (3) Sometimes (4) Seldom (5) Never (6) Not Applicable

Student Participation	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Not Applicable
1. I generally complete assigned readings before class	O	O	O	O	O	O
2. Other than sickness related absences, I attend the classes	O	O	O	O	O	O
3. I put a lot of effort into this course	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. I generally participate in class discussions and ask questions in class	O	O	O	O	O	O
5. I have accessed the instructor during his/her office hours or via telephone or e-mail	O	O	O	O	O	O

Course Content	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Not Applicable
1. The textbook or other reading material used by the instructor is useful in helping me meet the course learning objectives	O	O	O	O	O	O
2. The assignments are generally useful in helping me meet the course learning objectives	O	O	O	O	O	O
3. The lecture content is generally useful in helping me meet the course learning objectives	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. The assessment (e.g. exams, assignments, tests, etc.) covers the learning objectives and material covered in class	O	O	O	O	O	O
5. Overall, the content for this course is generally effective in meeting the course learning objectives	O	O	O	O	O	O
6. I would recommend this course to other students	O	O	O	O	O	O

Please note any other comments related to your participation or the content used in this course: (optional)

_____

_____

_____

Please answer this survey honestly and fairly by indicating your evaluation by 'blacking out' one of the selections:

(1) Always (2) Mostly (3) Sometimes (4) Seldom (5) Never (6) Not Applicable

Instructor Ability	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Not Applicable
1. The instructor is organized and prepared	O	O	O	O	O	O
2. The instructor communicates realistic learning objectives	O	O	O	O	O	O
3. The instructor develops and articulates material clearly and effectively	O	O	O	O	O	O
4. The instructor demonstrates his/her knowledge of recent industry developments related to the course	O	O	O	O	O	O
5. The instructor adapts the content and the content delivery approach to reach most students in the class	O	O	O	O	O	O
6. The instructor raises challenging questions or problems for discussion	O	O	O	O	O	O
7. The instructor generally answers my questions satisfactorily	O	O	O	O	O	O
8. The instructor treats me with respect and shows interest in my progress in the course	O	O	O	O	O	O
9. The instructor is generally readily available for consultation with students	O	O	O	O	O	O
10. The instructor generally assesses my work fairly (e.g. assignments, tests, exams, etc.)	O	O	O	O	O	O
11. The overall teaching ability of the instructor is excellent	O	O	O	O	O	O
12. The instructor effectively integrates technology into the classroom (e.g. audio, visual, Internet, etc.)	O	O	O	O	O	O
13. I would recommend this instructor to other students.	O	O	O	O	O	O

What do you think the instructor does well in this course?

_____

What do you think the instructor could do differently to improve his/her delivery of this course?

_____

What motivated you to register for this course?

_____

Comments

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for participating in this survey!