



Department of **Biomedical
Sciences, Ontario Veterinary
College**

*Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion,
and Performance Review*

Draft Proposal for Discussion (05/24/2017)

Date of Approval by Provost:

Preliminaries

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 members 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) Biennial 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, University of Guelph. 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) and in

graduate programs to the doctoral level. 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:

1. **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:**

1. TEACHING:

The Faculty Member should have substantive responsibility as a course instructor or a course coordinator. Submission of a teaching dossier is required ("The Teaching Dossier: A Guide to its Preparation and Use", revised edition, CAUT, 1986 is a useful reference document for those seeking tenure and/or promotion). Evidence of consistently good teaching (including effective undergraduate and graduate student supervision) and development of strong pedagogical skills must be provided, including teaching evaluation data. Faculty are also encouraged to seek and include peer-review assessment of their teaching (formal and/or informal) as part of the supporting documents for teaching success.

The Faculty Member must provide evidence of active and successful participation in the graduate program. This is normally accomplished through the supervision of one or more thesis-based graduate students to the completion of their graduate degree, and active participation on more than one thesis-based supervisory committees.

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.

2. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Evidence of independent scholarship, as indicated by consistent (as defined in **Appendix 1**, below) publication in high impact, refereed journals and the ability to attract research funds from external sources, is normally required for consideration of tenure and promotion. Evidence of collaborative projects and in-kind contributions to support both research operating costs and personnel will be favourably reviewed. 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. Faculty Members with 40% or more research component should have evidence of substantive completed and ongoing independent research.

For faculty whose principal activity is teaching (based on DOE unless otherwise specified), the requirement for ongoing major research funding from outside granting agencies will be given less weight. However, other evidence of pedagogical scholarship must be provided, and must be consistent with the member's DOE towards research and scholarship. This could include contributions to textbooks, contributions to the literature on education, contributions to conferences and workshops on teaching and learning, development of significant peer-assessed teaching aids and/or new approaches to teaching, and/or publication in highly rated, peer-reviewed journals devoted to education.

3. 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. Faculty should also contribute to service-related activities that support both the Department, College, University, society and profession.

2. Promotion to Professor

The criteria for the granting of Promotion to Professor are applicable to tenured Associate Professors.

Article 21.7 reads:

“Promotion to Professor recognizes long-term, established and outstanding Scholarship. It is granted in recognition of academic competence, maturity and normally an established international reputation for achievement and expertise in the Member’s field.”

The Department T&P Committee reaches its recommendation on the granting of Promotion to Professor by considering the following criteria:

i) **TEACHING:**

There must be evidence of consistently good teaching ability. Submission of a teaching dossier is required. Responsibility as a coordinator of one or more courses is expected. A record of successful supervision of undergraduate and graduate student research. 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) level.

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 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, but in addition must include evidence of outstanding accomplishments for University teaching and curricular development.

ii) **RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP:**

Substantial evidence of independent research and scholarly activity, consistent with Article 21.7 above, must be provided. This must include success in obtaining continuing external research funds as well as a consistent rate of publication in high-impact, refereed journals appropriate for the faculty member's field (see **Appendix 1**, below).

For faculty whose principal activity is teaching, evidence of recognized pedagogical scholarship must be provided, and must be consistent with the member’s DOE towards research and scholarship. Examples of this may include evidence of peer-assessed regional, national or international reputation for teaching or pedagogical scholarship.

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). Service activities should also include servicing the profession and society.

3. BIENNIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The biennial performance review takes place in even-numbered years for Tenure-track and tenured faculty members. The two T&P Committees assess the contributions of each faculty member over the past two years in each of the three areas of effort: research/scholarship, teaching, and service. The outcome of the performance review is

- 1) feedback to the faculty member,
- 2) the assignment of a descriptor rating the performance in each area of effort, and
- 3) the assignment of an overall descriptor rating the overall performance of the faculty member in the past two years.

i) TEACHING (at the graduate and/or undergraduate level):

While all teaching contributions are considered in this assessment (**courses taught, number of graduate students supervised or co-supervised, undergraduate project students, advisory committees, qualifying and thesis defence exams**), emphasis is placed on performance in assigned teaching duties and the quality and impact of the faculty member as a teacher. In order for this assessment to be representative, it must be from a minimum of 20% of the final class enrollment. Faculty are encouraged to provide a statement reflecting on their evaluation score (ie. New pedagogically sound teaching innovation that did not yield positive results, etc). Faculty are also encouraged to include peer assessment of their teaching.

Unsatisfactory:

Poor performance as indicated in student evaluations and/or teaching evaluations, should be considered grounds for an "Unsatisfactory" teaching evaluation. Also, consecutive performance evaluations in which the faculty member has received "*Needs Improvement*", with no evidence of serious attempts to resolve the identified issues, may also result in a rating of unsatisfactory. Failure to submit a "Teaching Dossier" may also result in this rating.

Needs Improvement/Developmental:

Poor performance as indicated in student evaluations and/or teaching ratings, should be considered grounds for a rating of "Needs Improvement". Where the faculty member does not make substantive attempts to seek assistance from fellow faculty (peer review) or Teaching Support Services, despite ongoing student evaluation concerns, "Needs Improvement" will also be received.

Good:

Satisfactory teaching, commensurate with the Faculty Member 's agreed DOE, combined with student course evaluations, should be considered a "Good" teaching performance. Other factors such as teaching innovation/creativity may also be taken into consideration.

Very Good:

Teaching at or above a level commensurate with the agreed DOE, combined with strong student instructor evaluations, as well as active involvement in course and/or curriculum development (including incorporating contemporary methods of teaching when appropriate), should be considered a "Very Good" teaching performance.

Outstanding:

Outstanding performance is demonstrated by a number of factors including (but not limited to); excellent student evaluations (averaging 4.5/5 or better), innovative curriculum development, receipt of teaching award(s), and/or supervision of exemplary graduate theses. Peer recognition for teaching could include, for example, any one (or

more) of the following:

- Formal or informal evaluation of in-class instruction by another faculty member.
- Peer recognition for teaching including effective graduate supervision in terms of a reasonable number of students supervised, timely completion of thesis-based graduate students, supervision of exemplary graduate student theses.
- A teaching award at either the College, University, Provincial or National level. Recognition by Department or University for curricular development, or contribution to pedagogical scholarship in the faculty member's field.
- Other evidence for recognition from students of excellence in teaching could include local class awards, honorary class President designation, letter from student exec commenting on teaching excellence, letter from Teaching Support Services, etc.

ii) RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

In assessing the criteria below, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to justify BOTH the quality and/or quantity of their peer-reviewed publications based on their DOE. Metrics such as citation criteria, impact factor, Google Scholar, h-index, etc, should be provided to demonstrate quality. For grants/contracts, the name and dollar value (CDN currency) should be indicated. This category also includes evidence of pedagogical leadership as part of scholarly activity (contribution to textbooks, curricular revision, publications in educational literature, etc.). **See section “C” for more examples.**

Unsatisfactory:

No active grant or industry support, with no documented evidence provided of attempts at obtaining successful funding through grant or industry funding applications (ie. responding to reviewer’s concerns, significant modifications to re-submitted grants), and a lack of peer-reviewed scientific publications. Documented proof of guilt of research ethics violations based on factual demographic data, may be grounds for an unsatisfactory rating, and may take precedence over other indicators of performance for research.

Needs Improvement /Developmental:

No grant support, but makes credible attempts to obtain non-departmental operating support, as well as attending a conference in the field of research, should be considered

grounds for a "Needs Improvement" rating, even if there is membership on thesis-based graduate supervisory committees.

Good:

Average rate of publication (based on **Appendix 1** below) in high quality peer-reviewed journals appropriate for the field, OR with sufficient operating funding to support at least one HQP (thesis and non-thesis based graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, research associates, visiting scientists, etc.). In the case of an unsuccessful renewal

grant application within the last year, ongoing, credible and consistent efforts to regain such support, or presentations at scientific meetings/conferences, would be considered sufficient to merit a "Good" research rating.

Very Good:

Better than average rates of publication in high quality journals (based on **Appendix 1** below), chapters in books, books, presentations at conferences or professional meetings, appropriate for the field. This should be combined with sustained external operating funding sufficient to support HQP to be considered "Very Good" research performance.

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 source during the period of review; receipt of a major Provincial (such as OMRI, OMAFRA or NGO-sourced), National or International research prize; or exemplary quality and/or quantity of publication of research findings in the faculty member's field (See **Appendix 1** below, in relation to determination of journal rankings). Additional performance metrics that would merit consideration for an "Outstanding" research rating include obtaining Tri-Council research funding, or major research funding from more than one external funding source in any evaluation period, knowledge transfer (or other forms of intellectual property), directly organizing research conferences at the University of Guelph, or externally, or leading (PI) a successful multi-investigator, or multi-site, collaborative research team grant application.

ii) SERVICE

In assessing the criteria below as they related to the DOE for service, the areas that should be considered (but not limited to) normally include the following; Expert consultation, outreach activities; Administrative responsibilities in the department, OVC or University; Committee membership at the level of the Department, College, University or other organizations (ie. Government, non-profit organizations); External graduate student co-supervision; Service to the profession and to society.

Unsatisfactory:

Failure to attend required meetings or obligations to a committee or service activity, or to participate in other service responsibilities (for examples, see Section C, iii), represents an unsatisfactory level of performance.

Needs Improvement/Developmental:

Evidence of some administrative service, but below the members DOE, and the effort characterized by a lack of adequate performance of duties. A consistent refusal of opportunities to become involved in administrative/service tasks beyond a minimal commitment for the % DOE would also be indicative of a need for improvement rating.

Good:

Quantity and quality of activity level in service-related work is commensurate with % DOE. For example, regular attendance at meetings and participation in service activities, as required, would be considered "Good" service performance.

Very Good:

Very good performance is determined by both activity level and quality of performance in related areas such as Departmental, College, and University administration; professional service and administration; and professionally-related community service. Regular participation in assigned service activities, with evidence that the faculty member has made particularly strong contributions to the work of the committee or organization (supported, for example, by documentation from the committee or organization) would merit a rating of "Very Good".

Outstanding:

Outstanding performance is determined by both activity level and exemplary performance in Departmental, College and University administration; professional service and administration, and professionally-related community service (e.g. federal grant agency panels, journal reviews, national committees related to the profession).

Taking a leadership role in service activities (e.g. Chairing a committee, or spearheading a major new initiative on the committee), would be considered an outstanding level of service. Additional factors that should be considered in determining service rating include service to society or to a non-academic organization (government, industry or charitable organization), as it relates to your role as a UofG faculty member. Also, the work load involved will be assessed (number of papers reviewed as a journal Editor, for example, or the amount of work involved in membership on an internal Departmental,

College or University committee; leadership role in community-based activity; internal grant reviewer, etc).

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.

Unsatisfactory	Improvement Required/Developmental	Good	Very Good	Outstanding
Performance is unsatisfactory. Performance is unsatisfactory in at least two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration	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	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	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	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.

C) EVIDENCE of contributions, activities, and accomplishments:

The following are **examples** of 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
- Graduate student supervision, including time-to-completion
- Peer recognition of teaching quality
- Development of significant teaching aids and/or new approaches to teaching for one's course
- Positive peer evaluations of teaching methodology
- Evaluations of performance in supervision of undergraduate research project students

ii) **Research/Scholarship:**

- *Publications* – Refereed papers (journal paper; invited conference paper; book/textbook; book chapter; monograph; position paper; reference data; research report); patents or other forms of IP such as discovery and knowledge translation; unrefereed papers; submitted papers; software development.
- *Funding* – Grants awarded; grants applied for; contracts awarded; contracts applied for, classified as external or internal.
- *Conferences* - Organizing conferences, workshops, symposia; presenting of the member's scholarly output to external audiences (plenary/keynote; invited; contributed presentation or poster, classified as refereed or unrefereed).
- *Other Professional Research Activity:* – Visiting Professorship; entries into public research databases such as GenBank).
Other Recognition: Scholarship Awards; Editor/Editorial Boards; Citation record or impact; Paper Award; News articles or stories about the faculty member's scholarship.

iii) **Service:**

- Service on departmental, college and/or university committees
- Participation in the department's internal grant review process
- External Assessment (textbook review; T&P applications outside UofG; program review)
- External graduate student co-supervision
- 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, may be solicited to indicate particularly valuable contributions to the work of a committee
- Participation in University, Provincial, National or International grant review committees
- Membership in the editorial boards or peer reviewer for journals in the faculty member's field of expertise
- Contributions to local and National professional organizations (including National examination boards).
- Service to one's community/society in the context of one's faculty position.

Appendix 1: 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 as well as the DOE. For example, the average publication rate per faculty member with a DOE of 40% in the department of Biomedical Sciences has been approximately 2 peer reviewed published papers per annum (using data generated from their lab in this department). 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 (ie. < 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. Publications in known predatory journals (<https://scholarlyoa.com/individual-journals/>) will not be assessed. Citation frequency for publications can be obtained from Google Scholar (<http://scholar.google.ca>) 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>). It is the faculty members' responsibility to provide this supporting documentation when justifying "impact". Tenure-track faculty are encouraged to review their publication history in consultation with the Chair for advice on meeting this criterion.