This information contained in Section A, B, and C of this document is to be considered by Tenure and Promotion Committees in the context of the relevant terms and conditions of the Collective Agreement between the University of Guelph and the University of Guelph Faculty Association (UGFA). Tenure and Promotion Committees are also directed to specifically reference the Tenure, Promotion and Performance Assessment Article (Article 21) of the Collective Agreement, the faculty member’s agreed upon Distribution of Effort, and the Schedule of Dates Document provided annually by the Provost’s Office.

Tenure and Promotion Committees are responsible for confidential deliberations related to the following possible considerations:

1) Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor;
2) Progress toward granting of Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor;
3) Promotion to the rank of Professor;
4) Performance Assessment.

This Document contains three sections:

A) ACADEMIC MISSION: Statement of the agreed upon department academic mission which forms the basis for criteria and evidence.

B) CRITERIA: Statement of the criteria (in addition to that in the Collective Agreement) which forms the basis of the Tenure and Promotion Committee deliberations and its recommendations for each of the possible considerations as indicated above; and

C) EVIDENCE: Evidence of scholarly contributions, activities and accomplishments in each area of effort, that is relevant and appropriate for consideration by the Tenure and Promotion Committee related to the four possible considerations (i.e. 1 through 4 above) and established criteria.
A) ACADEMIC MISSION OF DEPARTMENT:

The mission of the department of Biomedical Sciences is to provide excellent teaching and research in the health sciences at the Ontario Veterinary College. The department provides courses in the basic health sciences for students in the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine program as well as contributing to the B.Sc. programs in Bio-Medical Science (offered in conjunction with the Department of Human Health and Nutritional Sciences) and Toxicology (offered in conjunction with the Department of Chemistry). Research programs in Biomedical Sciences focus on translating fundamental research into practical applications that enhance animal and human health.

B) CRITERIA for each of the possible considerations as indicated above:

Criteria, in each area of effort, for Granting of Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or assessment of progress toward the granting of Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor:

i) Teaching:

The Faculty Member should have had responsibility as a major course instructor or course coordinator. A teaching dossier is required ("The Teaching dossier: A Guide to its Preparation and Use", revised edition, CAUT, 1986 is a useful document for those seeking tenure and/or promotion). Evidence of consistently good teaching must be provided, including teaching evaluation data.

For those whose agreed upon principal activity is teaching, good student ratings will not per se be considered sufficient grounds for recommending that tenure and promotion be granted. Evidence of pedagogical leadership must also be provided. This would normally include the development and introduction of one or more new course offerings in the department and/or College, as well as positive peer evaluations of teaching methodology.

ii) Research/Scholarship:

Evidence of independent scholarship, as indicated by consistent publication in high impact, refereed journals appropriate for the faculty member's field and the ability to attract research funds from outside granting agencies to support both research operating costs and graduate students, is required for tenure and promotion. The Faculty Member should have established a high quality ongoing research program and must have demonstrated significant independent scholarly activity, including publications in refereed journals arising from work undertaken since joining the Department.

The definition of what constitutes a "consistent" rate of publication depends on both the research field in question and the nature of the publications involved. The average publication rate per faculty member in the department of Biomedical Sciences has historically been approximately 2 peer reviewed published papers per annum. This represents a reasonable expectation for granting tenure. Publications should also, on average, be in journals that are ranked within the top 50% of peer-reviewed publications in the investigator's field. If one or more publications are in particularly high impact journals (within the top 10% of journals in the faculty member's field) a more modest publication rate (<2 papers per annum) would merit consideration for tenure, because high impact publications
typically require far more time and effort to develop. Ratings of journals in individual fields are available in tables published by Thompson-ISI, citation frequency for publications can be obtained from Google Scholar (http://scholar.google.c while h-factor can be calculated using free software distributed, for example, through the web sites devoted to evaluation of scholarship (e.g. http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm#download).

Faculty Members with 40% or more research component should have evidence of substantive completed and ongoing independent research (e.g., being a principal investigator on one or more major projects), in addition to any interdisciplinary or collaborative activities.

For faculty whose principal activity is teaching, the requirement for ongoing major research funding from outside granting agencies will be given less weight. However, other evidence of leadership in education must be provided. This could include contributions to textbooks, curricular discussions/revisions, contributions to the literature on education, development of significant teaching aids and/or new approaches to teaching, and/or publication in highly rated peer-reviewed journals devoted to education.

The Faculty Member must provide evidence of active participation in the graduate program. This could be through supervising one or more thesis-based students to the completion of their graduate degree, or from active participation in several thesis-based graduate supervisory committees.

iii) Service:

The ability of the department to function effectively within the college and university requires cooperation and teamwork. A faculty member seeking tenure and promotion should have contributed to at least one major college or university committee, or other similar activity.

2) Criteria, in each area of effort, for Promotion to the rank of Professor:

i) Teaching:

There must be evidence of consistently good teaching ability. Preparation of a teaching dossier is required. Responsibility as a coordinator of one or more courses is expected.

For those whose principal activity is teaching, simply contributing a large amount of time to teaching and obtaining high course evaluation ratings will not be considered sufficient for promotion to the rank of Professor: evidence of pedagogical leadership will be required. This evidence should include the elements specified above, for promotion to Tenure and Associate Professor, but in addition must include evidence of peer recognition for University teaching and curricular development.

ii) Research/Scholarship:

Substantial evidence of independent research and scholarly activity must be provided. This must include success in obtaining continuing external research funds as well as a consistent rate of publication in highly rated, refereed journals appropriate for the faculty member's field (see footnote 1, above). The faculty member must have supervised at least three thesis-based students through to the completion of a graduate degree, including at least one to doctoral (PhD or DVSc).
level. An ongoing and substantial contribution to the graduate program of the department, college and/or university must be clearly documented.

For individuals who have chosen to emphasize pedagogical scholarship, evidence of leadership in curricular development and research must be provided. This may include teaching awards, invitations to participate in national or international bodies governing standards for professional education, contributions at the national level towards new curricular initiatives and/or publications in peer-reviewed journals devoted to pedagogical research.

iii) Service:

A substantial and continuing contribution to service activities in the department, college and university is expected for promotion to professorial rank. A full Professor would be expected to have taken on major service responsibilities at the College, University and/or National level (e.g. through participation in major policy-making committee, acting as Chair of a committee or sub-committee, and/or contributing to Provincial or National academic review bodies).

3) Performance Criteria for each area of effort, for the Assessment of Performance for the period of review:

i) Teaching:

Unsatisfactory:

Poor student course evaluations (averaging < 3.0/5) combined with at least two of the following problems should be considered grounds for an "unsatisfactory" teaching evaluation: serious student complaints about a course; documented misconduct in a teaching situation; significant departures during delivery of course material from the published course outline(s); failure to submit course grades on time or repeated serious inaccuracies in assignment evaluations; absenteeism/cancellation of lectures and other offerings without justification or prior approval; documented inadequate supervision of undergraduate project or course-based graduate students.

Needs Improvement/Developmental:

Weak teaching ratings (averaging < 3.5/5) combined with any one of the other teaching performance issues identified above under "Unsatisfactory" should be considered grounds for a rating of "Needs Improvement"

Good:

Satisfactory teaching, commensurate with the Faculty Member’s agreed DOE, combined with good student course evaluations (>3.5/5), with no examples of the problems identified above under the "Unsatisfactory" descriptor, should be considered "Good" teaching performance.

Very Good:

Teaching at or above a level commensurate with the agreed DOE, combined with strong student course evaluations (>4/5), no documented instances of problems with teaching, as well as active
involvement in course and/or curriculum development, should be considered "Very Good" teaching performance.

Outstanding:

Performance commensurate with the "Very Good" descriptor, combined with external peer recognition of teaching performance should be considered an "Outstanding" level of teaching, enhancing the University's recognition as an educational institution. Peer recognition for teaching could include, for example, teaching awards at either the College, University, Provincial or National level. It could also include recognition by University, Provincial or National teaching organizations for curricular development, or contributions to pedagogical scholarship in the faculty member's field.

ii) **Research/Scholarship**

Unsatisfactory:

No grant support, with no serious attempts at obtaining support through grant applications, combined with a lack of peer-reviewed scientific publications and no evidence of active involvement in thesis-based graduate training, represents an unsatisfactory level of research performance.

**Needs Improvement /Developmental:**

Existence of two of the deficiencies identified under the "unsatisfactory" heading, even if combined with satisfactory performance in the remaining category, represents research performance that needs improvement. For example, lack of credible attempts to obtain external grant support when no such support is combined with a limited number of publications should be considered grounds for a "Needs Improvement" rating, even if there is membership on thesis-based graduate supervisory committees.

Good:

Consistent rates of publication in high quality peer-reviewed journals appropriate for the field, combined with sufficient non-departmental operating grant funding to support at least one thesis-based graduate student (or, in the case of an unsuccessful renewal grant application within the last year, ongoing, credible and consistent efforts to regain such support) would be considered sufficient to merit a "Good" research rating. (What constitutes a "consistent" rate of publication is defined under footnote 1, above).

**Very Good:**

Better than average rates of publication in high quality journals appropriate for the field, combined with sustained external operating funding sufficient to support two or more thesis-based graduate students would be considered "Very Good" research performance.

If there are fewer than two thesis-based graduate students in the laboratory at the time of review but overall the laboratory has over the preceding two years provided support for more than one graduate student at a time, OR if the Faculty Member is still within his/her first three years of appointment, then a "Very Good" rating can still be considered.
2Note that, because the primary focus of B.Sc. and course-based Masters of Biomedical Science (MBS) students is on course work, such students cannot be considered as equivalent to thesis-based graduate students, in evaluating research performance. Credit for undergraduate project and course-based MBS students must be included under the "teaching" category.

Outstanding:

Performance commensurate with a "Very Good" rating, combined with national or international peer recognition for research should be considered an "Outstanding" level of performance. Peer recognition could include holding or receiving a research salary award from a major national agency during the period of review; receipt of a major Provincial, National or International research prize; or a better than average publication rate in peer-reviewed journals ranked in the top 25% of journals in the faculty member’s field (See note 1, above, in relation to determination of journal rankings). Additional performance metrics that would merit consideration for an "Outstanding" research rating include obtaining major research funding from more than one external funding agency in any evaluation period, as well as coordinating a successful multi-investigator, multi-site (i.e. involving at least 3 laboratories) research team grant application.

iii) Service

 Unsatisfactory:

Failure to attend required committee meetings, or to participate in other service responsibilities assigned by the chair, represents an unsatisfactory level of performance.

 Needs Improvement /Developmental:

Sporadic (50% or less) attendance at committee meetings and other service activities, evidenced by the minutes and attendance records for the committees in question, is not sufficient and would merit a "Needs Improvement" rating.

Good:

Regular attendance at committee meetings and participation in service activities, as required, without evidence of contributions exceeding those from other faculty, would be considered "Good" service performance.

Very Good:

Regular participation in assigned service activities, with evidence that the faculty member has made particularly strong contributions to the work of the committee (supported, for example, by documentation from the Chair of the committee) would merit a rating of "Very Good".

Outstanding:

Taking a leadership role in service activities (e.g. Chairing a committee, or spearheading a major new initiative on the committee) as evidenced by letters of support from either the Chair or other members of the Committee, would be considered an outstanding level of service. Additional factors that should be considered in determining Service rating include the work load involved (number of papers reviewed as a journal Editor, for example, or the amount for work involved in membership on an internal College or University committee).
GUIDELINES FOR OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATER - BASED ON ASSESSMENT OF EACH AREA OF EFFORT

Please note, in addressing the overall performance rating of a faculty member the following will provide a general guideline. The Committee will use its discretion in arriving at an overall performance rater reflecting the faculty member's agreed upon Distribution of Effort during the evaluation period, and circumstances which are not explicitly covered by the general guideline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Improvement Required/Development</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance is unsatisfactory. Performance is unsatisfactory in at least two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration and is poor in the other area of responsibility</td>
<td>Performance requires improvement and/or development. Performance requires improvement in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration and is poor in the other area of responsibility</td>
<td>Performance is Good. Performance is at least Good in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration and rated at least Improvement Required in the other area of responsibility</td>
<td>Performance is Very Good. Performance is Very Good in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration and at least Good in the other area of responsibility</td>
<td>Performance is Outstanding. Performance is Outstanding in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration, and with international recognition, and at least Very Good in the other area of responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS, ACTIVITIES, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The following are examples of scholarly contributions, activities, and accomplishments in each area of effort, which are relevant and appropriate for consideration by the Tenure and Promotion Committee as part of its deliberations processes (as outlined in Section A above):

i) Teaching:

Student teaching evaluations
Introduction of new course offerings
Peer recognition of teaching excellence at the National or local level
Contributions to textbooks, curricular discussions/revisions
Development of significant teaching aids and/or new approaches to teaching
Positive peer evaluations of teaching methodology
Evaluations of performance in supervision of undergraduate research project students and course-based graduate students.

ii) Research/Scholarship:

Publications in peer-reviewed journals
Relevant measures of the impact of scholarly publications (e.g. citation frequency, h-scores).
Review articles, book chapters and editorials in the faculty members field of expertise
Financial support obtained through successful grant applications, especially extramural grant applications
Positive peer-review feedback from unsuccessful grant proposals (indicating the potential for funding in the future)
Patents, other examples of recognition for intellectual property
Entries into public research databases (e.g. GenBank)
Evaluations of performance in supervising thesis-based graduate students, in relation to the University's published guidelines, including success in meeting program standards for time to completion of graduate degrees.

iii) Service:

Service on departmental, college or university committees
Documentation regarding the work load required (e.g. frequency of committee meetings, hours involved, etc).
Written feedback from the Chairs of departmental/college/university committees, or from other faculty, indicating particularly valuable contributions to the work of these committees
Participation in University, Provincial, National or International grant review committees
Membership in the editorial boards of peer-reviewed journals in the faculty member's field of expertise
Contributions as a peer reviewer for journals in the faculty member's field of expertise
Contributions to local and National professional organizations (including National examination boards).