

**Department of Population Medicine**

**Guidelines on Relevant Information and Criteria for Tenure, Promotion and Performance Review of Faculty.**

**Preamble.**

This document is consistent with the 2012 Collective Agreement between the University of Guelph and the University of Guelph Faculty Association. It is recognized that each faculty member has implicitly accepted a commitment to develop professionally as a University faculty member. It is further recognized that assessment of performance must be done in the context of an individual's responsibilities. As such, the Chair will meet annually with each faculty member to discuss and decide on an appropriate distribution of their effort among teaching, research and scholarly activity, service to the University and service to society. For this purpose, the relevant College template for Faculty Distribution of Effort, signed by the faculty member and the Chair, will be made available to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Normally, distribution of effort will be agreed to by the faculty member and the Chair, using the Departmental Criteria, at least one year before the evaluation and will be recorded on the College template (Distribution of Effort). The allocation of effort, whenever possible, should be designed to best utilize the strengths and talents of the individual and allow for alternative career paths. For example, where it is deemed appropriate, faculty members may be able to make either teaching or research their primary scholarly activity. One career path is not considered inferior to another. Evaluations are within the context of a faculty member's agreed upon distribution of effort. The distribution of effort accorded to Teaching, Research and Service by a Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be subject to any arrangements described in the Letter of Appointment and any arrangements made under any of the provisions of the Collective Agreement.

Faculty making application for the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or application for the granting of promotion to the rank of Professor are required to complete and submit an Assessment File, using the College Template, that documents his/her relevant lifetime scholarly contributions, activities, and accomplishments. The file will include, among other things, the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the Teaching Dossier, and information about teaching, research, and service and publication reprints. Faculty not applying for tenure or promotion but undergoing performance review and assessment are required to complete and submit an Assessment File using the College Template that lists activities over the past two years. Early career, pre-tenure faculty will also submit documents reflecting their relevant lifetime scholarly contributions each year.

Frequency of review and other matters related to performance review follow the Collective Agreement. Each year, the performance of all probationary faculty members and multi-year contractually limited faculty members will be reviewed. In the final probationary review, consideration for the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will occur. A faculty member may apply for the early granting of tenure and conferring of Promotion to Associate Professor in the third, fourth or fifth year of appointment. Consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor will occur only on request of the faculty member.

Performance review of all tenured faculty members will be considered biennially for the purpose of performance assessment and feedback. Such consideration will occur in even-numbered years. Subsequent to an overall assessment that is less than “good” of a tenured faculty member, that member will be subject to an annual review of performance. Deadlines for submission of assessment files and requests for consideration of Tenure and Promotion are those indicated in the Collective Agreement, for example, currently August 15<sup>th</sup> is the deadline for final submission of documentation. Deadlines for those applying for promotion to either Associate Professor or Professor are currently May 15<sup>th</sup>.

Written opinions of the member’s research and other scholarly activities by experts in the member’s field are required to support a recommendation for the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and for promotion to Professor. The selection of reviewers will follow the Collective Agreement.

## **A. Information Required for Evaluation of Faculty Performance.**

Within the following areas of responsibility, performance will be rated according to the items listed below. Teaching dossiers are required from all faculty. Non-tenured faculty should also submit dossiers for research and service, and tenured faculty should submit dossiers for their major areas of effort. The preparation of dossiers is considered to be valuable for purposes of self-assessment and career development.

### **1) Teaching**

#### **i) Undergraduate and Graduate Courses**

##### **a) Quantity**

- i. Course number (to include core and elective rotations), number of students taking the course for credit, and hours of student contact.
- ii. Course/Rotation coordinator responsibilities.
- iii. Names of undergraduate students advised (or co-advised), and their program (e.g. Biomedical Sciences, Summer Leadership).
- iv. Names of graduate students advised (or co-advised), and their degree/programs (normally half the time of advising is allotted to teaching and half to research; 1 FTE = advising 8 graduate students).
- v. Membership in other graduate student committees in a non-advisory role; student name and degree to be listed.
- vi. Involvement in graduate student examination committees; student name and degree to be provided.
- vii. Involvement in clinical training program of DVSc students; include an outline of the member’s participation in clinical training.

The advisory roles and committee memberships will be considered in the context of the terminal degree the faculty member is able to advise, and the nature of their research programs.

## b) Quality

- i) **Student evaluations of teaching competence/ability will be conducted for each course/rotation in which the faculty member presents four or more hours of lecture material, eight or more hours of laboratories, or has 16 or more hours of clinical teaching.** The appropriate Departmental Didactic or Clinical Teaching Form will be used for this purpose and will be distributed to the students for completion and return in a manner to achieve representative results. All signed student comments must be submitted to the Chair and the Committee to be considered as part of the information for faculty performance evaluation. Unsigned student comments are provided to the faculty member, but will not be provided to the Chair or the Committee.
- ii) **Teaching dossier.** A teaching dossier is required of all faculty with a teaching responsibility identified in their FR-1. The dossier will be revised/updated at least biennially. There is no detailed prescribed format. This dossier will include a teaching statement in which the faculty member provides a contextual commentary on teaching experiences and objectives. The teaching statement permits faculty to provide a context for student evaluations. The dossier may also include materials such as course outlines, assignments, instructional aids, final examinations, reports on classroom observation by peers, and measures of student achievements (such as entry-exit tests).

The dossier may also include such items as: examples of hand-outs, examples of audio-visual aids, innovative teaching features, contributions to pedagogy or a self assessment report including a list of pedagogic training courses/sessions attended, and awards recognizing excellence in teaching.

For clinical courses the dossier should include those aspects of the didactic course dossier that are pertinent to their clinical teaching role. The member may also note those aspects of clinical teaching they have attempted to improve, examples of training courses attended, etc.

- iii) **Evidence of pedagogical leadership.** This will be a mandatory part of T&P considerations for faculty emphasizing teaching as a career path. The evidence may, for example, include contributions to textbooks, curricular discussions/revisions, contributions to the literature on education, development of significant teaching aids (slide, audio visual, computer, etc.), and/or new approaches to teaching, and critical evaluation of teaching methodology.

A summary of, or copies of, peer reviews conducted for other faculty may be included if the faculty member wishes.

- iv) **Peer review.** All faculty are encouraged to utilize periodic peer review of teaching. For this purpose, one or more faculty members, mutually agreeable to the member and the chair, shall be selected to undertake the review. This

review is intended to be a positive coaching experience and is principally conducted between the member and the reviewer(s). Normally this review will go beyond assessing lecturing ability and will include a written assessment of a number of the features outlined in the teaching/clinical teaching dossier, and also include such items as the level of communication between the member and students, the availability of the member for questions or assistance, and responses of the faculty member to concerns of the Curriculum Committee and/or Undergraduate Departmental Committees. When completed, a copy of the review and the member's response to it, should be made available to the Chair of the Department, and appended to the appropriate departmental reporting form for review by the T&P Committee.

## 2) Research /Scholarship

In assessing a faculty member's research, the intent is to focus on the total contribution, both **quality** and **quantity**, of the member's research program(s). The three major areas considered include research results (eg. publications), ongoing research efforts (new contracts and grants and ongoing projects), and research community stature (scientific presentation which focus on research methodology or results and the number of research reviews performed).

- a) **Publications.** A listing of publication(s) published during the period of review should be submitted to the committee. Papers that have been accepted but not yet published may be listed. The main points to be considered are the **type of publication** (e.g. full length paper, research contribution via book(s), or book chapter(s), conference proceedings, abstracts, short communication, letters), and **nature of the journal** (i.e. refereed or not, and/or editor versus author).
- b) **Grants and Contracts.** Provide a **list of currently registered projects**; specify the granting agency, the amount and type of award (e.g. grant versus contract; operating or equipment). If the grant/contract is shared, the role of the faculty member should be stated. A **list of funding applications**, including a copy of the actual application if the faculty member wishes, may be provided.
- c) **Presentations.** List the scientific presentations (for which there were no proceedings published).
- d) **Reviews.** The numbers of research papers reviewed by journal, a list of books/chapters reviewed, and the number of reviews by granting agency should be submitted.
- e) **Final Research Reports to Granting Agencies.** These should be cited and may be submitted if the faculty member wishes.
- f) **Patents.** Including dates and nature of disclosures should also be listed.

- g) **Software.** A listing and brief description of software authored by the faculty member should be provided.
- h) Faculty may submit a **self-assessment** of their research activities. This could include such items as reprints of their published research work, or preprints of accepted papers. As well, a faculty member may want to point out the specific qualities of a paper or research area, by submitting additional material such as a citation analysis of a paper or journal, reviewer comments or other documentation. The assessment should list the research update sessions attended, including a brief statement of their nature and perceived value of these sessions. Awards recognizing excellence in research should also be noted.

### 3) **OVC Teaching Hospital (OVCHSC) Service**

It is recognized that clinical service is an integral part of clinical teaching (both undergraduate and graduate). Teaching Hospital (OVCHSC) Service is defined as those activities that support the caseload that is used for clinical teaching. Examples include: primary and herd level care provided when no undergraduate or graduate teaching is occurring, both in and out of hours; client and referring veterinarian communication; billing; completion of medical records; interaction with OVCHSC technicians, agricultural assistants, staff and administrators in support of veterinary care and OVCHSC function; communication and interaction with diagnostic services such as the Animal Health Laboratory, equipment maintenance and training; and courses connected to OVCHSC service required by the university (e.g. Health and Safety) or the veterinary profession (e.g. College of Veterinarians of Ontario).

- 1. **Quantity.** This will include the number of scheduled days/weeks, and out-of-hours OVCHSC duty.
- 2. **Quality.** Each faculty member with OVCHSC responsibilities should submit a brief self-assessment report describing their service role. This should make clear the essential (relative to teaching or research missions) ongoing aspects of service, and highlight the scholarly or innovative aspects that advance the discipline/activity. This assessment may also include reports to clients/producers, unsolicited letters from clients or referring veterinarians, letters to referring veterinarians, and/or a peer review of service activities.

The Service Chief and/or Area Coordinator will compile information on the following three aspects of service, and will share this information with the faculty member and the Committee:

- a. Completion of medical records and other service related communications in a thorough and timely manner.
- b. Conducting patient, herd/flock care in a competent, caring and compassionate manner.
- c. Communication with colleagues and clients in a regular, professional and positive manner.

## **Service to the University (other than clinical service mentioned above)**

Contribution to collegial governance and the administration of the department, college, or university is seen as part of the duties of every faculty member. The faculty member must have demonstrated active participation in one or more established committees at the department, college or university level. The type of administrative duty assigned to a faculty member by the Department Chair, by colleagues, by other University personnel or by election, will be recognized.

Title of committees served on (excluding graduate student committees).

- i) Nature and workload of the committees (including the nature of the work, how often the committee met each year, role on the committee, and hours per year for each committee)
- ii) Level of responsibility of the committee and the role of the member (e.g. Chair versus member).
- iii) Other administrative responsibilities, including secondments, as agreed to by the Department Chair.

## **Service to Society**

Service to society is seen as part of the duties of every faculty member.

- a) Continuing Education, Technology Transfer, Extension.
  - i) Courses Given: The faculty member should list the program, course titles presented, who they were presented to, the number in attendance, the length of the course and if solely or jointly presented, and other information the faculty member deems appropriate.
  - ii) Consultations/Discussions: List the extent and nature of consultations/discussions with veterinarians, the media (including television/radio or newspaper articles), and members of the public.
  - iii) Extension Communications: Each faculty member should list the nature and title of written extension communications (e.g. articles published in lay journals).
  - iv) Other Activities: The faculty member should list involvement with other activities such as conference organizing.

### **b) International Involvement**

Each faculty member should briefly describe his/her involvement in international activities that are not noted under teaching, research or elsewhere under service activities.

- i. Participation in international programs of the University.
- ii. Other international involvement and/or recognition.

c) Professional Society Memberships and Activities

- i. Membership in, and contribution to, scientific and professional groups, including office(s) held.
- ii. Editorships, assistant editorships, or editorial board memberships for professionally related groups should be noted.
- iii. Peer review of manuscripts and research proposals.
- iv. Participation in professional groups including office(s) held. (as opposed to membership). This could include participation in research committees or review boards outside of the University.
- v. Professional awards received. A brief description should be included.

d) Non-Professional Society Memberships and Activities

The faculty member may list non-professional activities that they believe to be noteworthy.

Service must include service to the university (clinical, committees and leadership roles) and may also include service to society (please see above). A faculty member with a service FTE of 10% is expected to illustrate an effort equal to ½ a day per week.

## **B. Performance Review**

### **Preamble**

For purposes of measuring performance, a faculty member's distribution of effort and selected career path, as indicated on the College template, will be recognized. All faculty will have responsibility and make contributions in each of the categories of teaching, research, service to the University and service to society. In addition, many faculty have OVCTH service responsibilities. For purposes of tenure, promotion and evaluating performance, a faculty member's distribution of effort in all areas will be considered. For some faculty members, OVCTH service may be an essential teaching support activity, and to a much lesser extent a research support. In these instances, OVCTH service may constitute the second largest component of the distribution of effort but will not be as large as the teaching component. The information received from the faculty member as described above under "Information Required for Evaluation of Faculty Performance." will form the basis of the assessment.

## **Tenure and Promotion Considerations.**

Each candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor is expected to establish a record of performance in each of Teaching, Research and Service. While a candidate must have achieved a satisfactory record of performance in Service, the meritorious performance of these duties shall not compensate for an insufficiently strong performance in Teaching or Research. However, an unsatisfactory record of performance in Service contributions may be an important factor in the denial of Tenure and/or Promotion. Consideration for the conferring of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor will be given to the individual Faculty Member's lifetime contribution in the areas as defined in the Collective Agreement. Contractually limited faculty members are eligible for consideration for promotion in rank. Contractually Limited Faculty Members are not eligible for consideration of Tenure and therefore granting of promotion for Contractually Limited Faculty Members does not confer tenure.

### **1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.**

The conferring of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is a very important step in the relationship between the University and a faculty member, and it should be decided upon only after careful consideration and attention to due process. The granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to a faculty member recognizes academic competence and maturity, and, significant scholarly achievement demonstrated by contributions to the academic functions of the University and to the member's discipline within and outside of the University. The conferring of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor obliges the University to support the career of the faculty member and it obliges the faculty member to continue to perform in a manner deserving of that support.

The following are the criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The relative weighting that is placed on each function, as indicated in the College template (Distribution of Effort), will be considered. Since faculty have a blended career path, their performance will be evaluated in all areas of activity bearing in mind their distribution of effort over the majority of their career.

#### **Criteria for Tenure and Promotion – Research**

The faculty member should have established high quality ongoing research activities, and must have demonstrated significant independent scholarly activity including publications in refereed journals, beyond publications arising directly from their thesis. Independent research activity is defined as providing the leadership role in identifying testable research hypotheses, acquiring the necessary funding, staff (e.g. graduate students, undergraduate students, technicians), collaborators and other resources to conduct the research, and transfer research outcomes to end users (e.g. peer-reviewed publications plus presentations, stakeholder reports). In most cases this will entail submitting research

proposals to funding agencies, acquiring research dollars sufficient to support the stipend and operating funds for a graduate student, and advising a graduate student through the completion of their degree and the publication of their research results in peer-reviewed journals. A faculty member with a research FTE of 20% will have evidence of *completed* and *ongoing independent* research. The completed work will include having successfully advised at least one MSc or PhD graduate student through the completion of their degree and publication (or acceptance) of at least two papers from this graduate students' work or from other research funded directly through independently acquired research funds.

Evidence of ongoing independent research includes supervising 2 additional MSc or one additional PhD/DVSc student, funded by independently acquired research dollars, at the time of applying for tenure. In addition, the assessment of research in the lifetime CV at the time of application for tenure must be 'good' or better.

A faculty member with more than 20% FTE for research will have evidence of proportionally more research as a principal investigator on one or more major projects and will have supported proportionally more graduate students through the completion of their degrees.

Evidence for this will include the scope and quality of the research program(s), and the number and quality of publications, especially in refereed journals, and presentations.

Quality may be determined by whether the refereed journal is appropriately selected for the research conducted so that it reaches the end user. The faculty member with at least 40% FTE for research should also show evidence of an on-going research program that includes advising additional MSc students through the completion of their programs plus co-advising or advising at least one PhD/DVSc student who, if not completed by the time of application for tenure, is progressing satisfactorily toward the completion of their degree.

Interdisciplinary and collaborative research activities are also seen as positive.

Footnote: While an early career faculty member may co-supervise their first graduate student, prior to applying for tenure, they are expected to be the principal investigator of the grant that supports the student and the research work. Further, it is understood that the supervision of graduate students differs by degree program and typically the research funds mentorship time required increase in the following order; MPH, MSc coursework, MSc thesis, DVSc and PhD. Therefore, as example, it is expected that faculty who assume responsibility for PhD students will have less time and money remaining to assume primary responsibility of other students than those who supervise MSc course work students.

### **Criteria for Tenure and Promotion – Teaching**

The faculty member with a teaching FTE of 20% must have established a high level of teaching success as measured by on-going pedagogic leadership and a consistently good or improving record of teaching ability as measured by teaching evaluations and/or peer assessments. Assessment of teaching in lifetime CV at the time of application for tenure must be 'Good' or better. Pedagogic leadership includes any of the following: contributions to curricular issues such as course/program structure, evaluation and coordination, contributions through teaching aids such as textbooks or chapters in textbooks, or through other information sources relevant to the discipline, and contributions to published peer-reviewed literature on teaching/learning principles. The faculty member should have had responsibility for coordinating at least one course. In addition, they should contribute as the

major instructor to one course (> 50% of the course) or to a lesser extent to more than one course (a course is defined as 36 hours of lecture in one semester). A faculty member with more than 20% FTE for teaching will have evidence of proportionally more teaching responsibility indicated by responsibility for more teaching hours and specifically more pedagogic leadership. A faculty member with 40% FTE for teaching will be expected to have responsibility for two or more courses or rotations. Interdisciplinary and collaborative teaching activities are also seen as positive. (While teaching evaluations vary from undergraduate to graduate courses and also from lecture to clinical teaching settings, mean teaching evaluations representing good teaching will typically range from 3.1 to 4.1).

Note: Normally, the time commitment for graduate student mentorship contributes equally to research and teaching responsibility.

### **Criteria for Tenure and Promotion – Service**

- a) The faculty member with a service FTE of 10% should have made substantial contributions to the University and may have also made substantial contributions to Societal Service within their professional realm.
- b) Faculty with assigned OVCTH Service duties will need to demonstrate that they have conducted these activities in a scholarly and professional manner appropriate to their assigned duties. Evidence for this can be provided in a variety of ways (as mentioned above in the section on service) but must be documented in a service dossier.
- c) The faculty member with a service FTE of 10% must have actively participated in University Service for the Department, College and/or University through their contributions to at least two major committees and/or other administrative activities. Evidence of appropriate scholarly Societal Service including such activities as technology transfer, industrial research, consultancies and external collaborations is normally expected, and in some instances may replace or modify the requirement for one of the major university committees described for University service.

The Department Committee will assess each faculty member's performance, review the letters from the external reviewers, and make a recommendation to the Chair of the College Committee with respect to the granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The Department Committee will complete an Assessment/Progress Report for each faculty member who has been considered. The Assessment/Progress Report will be signed by all members of the Committee who were present for the relevant deliberations. The completed and signed Assessment/Progress Report and relevant recommendation will be sent to the Chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Department Committee may, in the course of its deliberations, conclude that application for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor is appropriate and that external letters of assessment should be sought, even in cases where a probationary faculty member has not

applied for Tenure and Promotion. In such cases, the Chair, on behalf of the Department Committee, shall write to the faculty member to inform him or her of the Committee's opinion.

## **2. Promotion to Professor.**

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 faculty member's field. In order to achieve full professorship, a faculty member must possess a high degree of scholarship and expertise, and a substantial record of contribution to a number of areas in the Department, College and University. There must be substantial evidence of scholarship which can be validated by respected external referees who themselves are full professors and experts in the faculty member's discipline/area. Because of the expectations faculty must meet, in order to become a full professor, not all faculty are expected to reach this rank.

- a) The faculty member with a research career emphasis must have a consistent record of contributing effectively to the graduate program and normally will have advised several graduate students, to the highest degree for their discipline area. The faculty member also must have established an ongoing high quality independent and interdisciplinary research program(s) of international repute.
- b) The faculty member with a teaching/service career emphasis must have demonstrated consistently above-average teaching ability, preferably at both the undergraduate and graduate level, and must have had ongoing responsibility as a coordinator or major instructor for at least two different courses. The member also must have made consistent and substantial contributions to pedagogy; for example, through publications in the peer-reviewed literature on teaching/learning principles, by contributions to curricular issues (course/program structure, evaluation or management), and by contributions to teaching aids such as textbooks, or other information sources relevant to the discipline.
- c) Faculty with assigned OVCTH service duties will need to demonstrate that they have conducted these activities in a scholarly and professional manner appropriate to their assigned duties. Evidence for this can be provided in a variety of ways but should include a service dossier.
- d) The faculty member must have made consistent long term contributions in the areas of University service, at each of the Department, College and University levels, and where appropriate in societal service, beyond the levels expected of an Associate Professor.

Since most faculty have a blended career path, their performance will be evaluated in all areas of activity (i.e. in teaching, research, OVCTH service, if appropriate, as well as University and societal service), as outlined in their distribution of effort over the majority of their career.

The Department Committee will assess the Faculty Member's performance and make a recommendation to the Chair of the College Committee with respect to the promotion to Professor.

#### **4. Performance Review**

##### **The Departmental Process of Performance Review.**

In assessing performance, the Department Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee will have available, and consider, information provided by the faculty member in their Assessment File as described above under "Preamble". Failure to submit the completed Assessment File to the Chair by the deadline indicated in the Collective Agreement (currently August 15<sup>th</sup>), without prior approval from the Dean and Provost, will result in an "unsatisfactory" performance assessment. Performance Review will be based primarily (approximately 80% of weight), on performance in the most recent two-year period since appointment at Guelph, but will also consider the longer-term career performance and achievement (approximately 20% of weight), as evidenced by previous T&P Committee evaluations.

Two Committee members will be assigned to review the material submitted by the faculty member including teaching, research and service dossiers. In the meeting, they will open the discussion by commenting on the quantity and quality of the member's achievements. Thereafter, each member of the Committee will be asked in turn, to comment on the performance, strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member under evaluation. The faculty member's performance will be compared to the criteria (described below), bearing in mind their distribution of effort and agreed responsibilities described in the Distribution of Effort template.

##### **Outcome and Implications of Review.**

The review will result in a rating of performance in each area of effort plus an overall rating of performance. Importantly, the overall rating of performance will reflect and give corresponding weight to those areas with the greatest emphasis within the distribution of effort (e.g. a rating of good for a FTE of .10 will not inform the overall rating as much as a rating of good for a FTE of .60). In accordance with the Collective Agreement, the University expects that faculty members will engage in all three of the following areas of activity: teaching, research, and service/administration.

The following explains how ratings in the individual areas of responsibility are typically combined to produce an overall rating that reflects the weighting of teaching, research, and service in the distribution of effort.

## Performance Rating Descriptors

Overall rating	
Outstanding	Performance is Outstanding in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration, and at least Very Good in the other area of responsibility. The quality and quantity of achievements exceeds expectations and reflects international recognition of scholarship.
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
Good	Performance is at least Good in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration and not Unsatisfactory in the other area of responsibility
Requires Improvement and/or Development	Performance Requires Improvement in at least two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration or in one area of teaching, research or service/administration if that represents at least .50 FTE
Unsatisfactory	Performance is Unsatisfactory in at least two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration or in one area of teaching, research or service/administration if that represents at least .50 FTE  Performance is automatically Unsatisfactory if biannual documents are submitted after the deadline listed in the Collective Agreement (currently August 15) without prior approval from the Dean and Provost

Each voting member of the P&T Committee will contribute to the rating of the faculty member for each area of emphasis through a secret ballot. The rating given for each area represented by the majority vote will be recorded. Then, each voting member of the P&T Committee will contribute to the overall rating of the faculty member through a secret ballot. The majority vote will be recorded as will the number of people who voted for each rating level for the overall Performance Rating.

The Department Committee will assess each faculty member's performance and will complete an Assessment/Progress Report for each faculty member who has been considered. The Assessment/Progress Report will be signed by all members of the Committee who were present for the relevant deliberations. The completed and signed Assessment/Progress Report will be sent to the Chair of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

## **Rating for Research**

All faculty members should have established high quality ongoing research activities, and must have demonstrated significant independent scholarly activity including publications in refereed journals. Independent research activity is defined as providing the leadership role in identifying testable research hypotheses, acquiring the necessary funding, staff (e.g. graduate students, undergraduate students, technicians), collaborators and other resources to conduct the research, and transfer research outcomes to end users (e.g. peer-reviewed publications, presentations, stakeholder reports). In most cases this will entail submitting research proposals to funding agencies, acquiring research dollars sufficient to support the stipend and operating funds for a graduate student, and mentoring a graduate student through the completion of their degree and the publication of their research results in peer-reviewed journals.

In a two-year period, a faculty member with a research FTE of 20% will typically have evidence of *completed* and ongoing independent research. This will be represented by the completion or on-going supervision of at least two graduate students. A faculty member with more than 20% FTE for research will have evidence of proportionally more research as a principal investigator on one or more major projects, and will be supervising or have supervised to the completion of their degrees proportionally more graduate students. This will require the acquisition of research funds for graduate student stipends and research operating dollars. Evidence for this will include the scope and quality of the research program(s), and the number and quality of publications, especially in refereed journals, and presentations. The proportion of graduate students supervised will depend on the relative time commitment to mentor students in the various degrees MPH, MSc, PhD/DVSc and in the case of co-supervision, the relative contribution by each supervisor.

A rating of Unsatisfactory applies to those who have completed significantly less research (e.g. manuscripts published and submitted, presentations at conferences, research reports and graduate students completed) and have significantly less evidence of ongoing research (funding to support graduate students, current graduate students, successful grants, submitted grants) than would be expected from their assigned FTE for research. In addition, this rating will be applied only if the previous 2-year rating for research was less than very good.

A rating of Requires Improvement applies to those who have completed less research (e.g. manuscripts published and submitted, presentations at conferences, research reports and graduate students completed) and have less evidence of ongoing research (funding to support graduate students, current graduate students, successful grants, submitted grants) than would be expected from their assigned FTE for research.

A rating of Good applies to those who have completed the amount and scope of research expected from their assigned FTE and have evidence of substantial on-going research that is illustrated by manuscripts submitted, ongoing supervision of graduate students and presentations at scientific conferences.

A rating of Very Good is reserved for those who have completed significantly more research than would be expected from their assigned FTE for research based on the amount and scope of research that is illustrated by publications in peer reviewed journals, supervising graduate

students to the completion of their degrees, on-going supervision of graduate students, acquiring research dollars for projects and evidence of on-going research work including presentations at scientific conferences.

A rating of Outstanding is reserved for those who have evidence of an international reputation for their research (e.g. giving presentations to international audiences, invited to present internationally, conduct peer review of faculty from elsewhere, external PhD examinations, received awards for research) and have also completed significantly more research than would be expected from their assigned FTE for research that is illustrated by publications in peer-reviewed journals, supervising graduate students to the completion of their degrees, on-going supervision of graduate students, acquiring research dollars for projects and evidence of on-going research work including presentations at scientific conferences.

### **Rating for Teaching**

Teaching is rated based on undergraduate and graduate courses and half of the effort for supervising graduate students. A faculty member with a teaching FTE of 20% will have had responsibility, for at least one full course, as a major instructor or a coordinator. There must be evidence of teaching success as measured by on-going pedagogic leadership and a consistently good or improving record of teaching ability. Pedagogic leadership includes any of the following: contributions to curricular issues such as course/program structure, evaluation and coordination, contributions through teaching aids such as textbooks or chapters in textbooks, or through other information sources relevant to the discipline, and contributions to published peer-reviewed literature on teaching/learning principles. Interdisciplinary and collaborative teaching activities are seen as positive. Faculty members with more than 20% FTE will have proportionally more teaching responsibility and proportionally more evidence of pedagogical leadership.

A rating of Unsatisfactory is reserved for those who have assumed insufficient teaching for their assigned FTE for teaching, and/or who have insufficient evidence of on-going pedagogic leadership, and/or overall mean teaching evaluations less than 3 out of 5 and/or student comments that illustrate problems and a rating of less than very good for teaching from the previous T & P assessment. Specifically, this would include evidence of a lack of response to previous teaching evaluations < 3 out of 5 or to recommendations from previous T & P assessments to improve teaching.

A rating of Needs Improvement is reserved for those who have assumed insufficient teaching for their assigned FTE for teaching, and/or who have insufficient evidence of on-going pedagogic leadership, and/or overall mean teaching evaluations less than 3 out of 5) and/or student comments that illustrate problems, without explanation in the teaching dossier of a plan to address these problems.

A rating of Good is for those who have assumed sufficient teaching for their assigned FTE for teaching, have evidence of pedagogical productivity and on-going pedagogic leadership, and consistently good or improving record of teaching ability. (While teaching evaluations vary from undergraduate to graduate courses and also from lecture to clinical teaching settings, mean teaching evaluations representing good teaching will typically range from 3.1 to 4.1).

A rating of Very Good is reserved for those who have assumed proportionally more teaching responsibility and shown a higher level of pedagogical productivity based on their assigned FTE for teaching. They will have illustrated innovation and impact in pedagogy and received very good to excellent teaching evaluations.

A rating of Outstanding is reserved for those who have proportionally higher productivity or pedagogic leadership based on their assigned FTE for teaching or consistently exceptional teaching evaluations or evidence of an international reputation for their teaching (e.g. invited workshops, invited memberships on committees related to pedagogy) and/or evidence of teaching excellence through teaching awards.

## **Rating for Service**

### **Clinical Duty- Ratings Applied**

Faculty members with a clinical service component must show evidence of pedagogical leadership in their delivery of this service as outlined in the section on promotion and tenure (see above). Faculty members with more than 10% FTE in service must illustrate proportionally more leadership and/or time commitment to committee work at the University of Guelph.

A rating of Unsatisfactory is reserved for those who have not committed sufficient service to clinical duty based on their assigned FTE of service or who have significant problems in the conduct of their clinical duty (completion of medical records and other service related communications in a thorough and timely manner; conducting patient, herd/flock care in a competent, caring and compassionate manner; communication with colleagues and clients in a regular, professional and positive manner) and who have received a rating of less than very good in the previous 2-year evaluation.

A rating of Needs Improvement is reserved for those who have not committed sufficient service to clinical duty based on their assigned FTE of service or who have significant problems in the conduct of their clinical duty (completion of medical records and other service related communications in a thorough and timely manner; conducting patient, herd/flock care in a competent, caring and compassionate manner; communication with colleagues and clients in a regular, professional and positive manner).

A rating of Good is reserved for those who have committed sufficient service to clinical duty based on their assigned FTE of service and who maintain a consistent completion of tasks in the conduct of their clinical duty (completion of medical records and other service related communications in a thorough and timely manner; conducting patient, herd/flock care in a competent, caring and compassionate manner; communication with colleagues and clients in a regular, professional and positive manner) and evidence of innovative, scholarly service designed to advance the discipline/activity.

A rating of Very Good is reserved for those who have committed more time and/or evidence of scholarship to clinical service than is expected based on their assigned FTE of service, who have excelled in clinical duty based on completion of medical records and other service related communications in a thorough and timely manner and/or conducting patient, herd/flock care in a competent, caring and compassionate manner and/or communication with colleagues and clients in a regular, professional and positive manner and shown evidence of innovative, scholarly and “cutting edge” aspects, designed to advance the discipline/activity.

A rating of Outstanding is reserved for those who have illustrated more evidence of scholarship to clinical service than is expected based on their assigned FTE of service, who have excelled in clinical duty based on completion of medical records and other service related communications in a thorough and timely manner and/or conducting patient, herd/flock care in a competent, caring and compassionate manner and/or communication with colleagues and clients in a regular, professional and positive manner and shown evidence of innovative, scholarly and “cutting edge” aspects, designed to advance the discipline/activity and evidence of an international reputation for this work (e.g. industry award for service).

### **Service other than clinical duty**

A rating of Unsatisfactory is reserved for those who have not committed sufficient service to university committees based on the FTE for service and who received a rating of less than very good in the previous 2-year evaluation.

A rating of Needs Improvement is reserved for those who have not committed sufficient service to university committees based on the FTE for service.

A rating of Good is reserved for those who illustrate a high level of commitment to one or more university committees and service to society within their professional realm. Whereas service to society is valued, this rating is only appropriate if there is sufficient time dedicated to university service based on the assigned FTE for service.

A rating of Very Good is reserved for those with proportionally more service to the university than is expected by their assigned FTE and/or have taken significant leadership roles in their service to the university or to their profession.

A rating of Outstanding is reserved for those who have proportionally higher productivity based on their assigned FTE for service, significant leadership roles at the University (e.g. chair of the Board of Graduate Studies or a major working group) or evidence of an international reputation for this work (e.g. invited to provide evaluation for full professor at another institution, or invited membership of a major national or international panel or advisory group)

### **Feedback to Faculty**

At the conclusion of the evaluation, the Department T&P Committee will provide to the College T&P Committee an Assessment/Progress report for each faculty member signed by all Committee members, summarizing the performance of the faculty member and including the relevant recommendation. The College T&P Committee will provide in writing, through the

Dean, an assessment of the faculty member's performance signed by all members of the College Committee present at the deliberations. The Committee members' signatures indicate that the letter is an accurate reflection of the discussion of the committee. Faculty are encouraged to discuss their evaluation results with the Dean. The reports from the Department T&P Committee are retained only until the appeals process has concluded (or as otherwise agreed in future Collective Agreements). The reports from the College T&P Committee are retained for a period of 6 years (or as otherwise agreed in future Collective Agreements) in the personnel file held in the Dean's Office for each member of faculty.