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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 Department of Clinical Studies’ mission is to improve individual animal health by educating outstanding veterinarians and advancing scientific knowledge in the field of veterinary medicine.

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

1) 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:

Performance in all areas will be assessed in consideration of an individual member’s distribution of effort. In the case of teaching, the quantity of a faculty member’s teaching duty will be assigned by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member. The quantity of research or service in which a faculty member engages will be the responsibility of the individual faculty member in consideration of feedback given by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Chair.

A faculty member with teaching as the major area of emphasis should have:

i) Teaching:

   a. Contributed to the delivery of a quantity of undergraduate and graduate curricular content consistent with their assigned distribution of effort.
   b. Contributed to curricular development (course/program structure, content, method of delivery, evaluation, or management).
   c. Contributed to the goal of providing clinical case material to educate future veterinarians and specialists when applicable.
   d. Had responsibility as a course or rotation coordinator.
   e. Teaching that is consistently evaluated by the College T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, as at least good.

ii) Research and/or Scholarship:

   a. Completed and ongoing independent research and/or scholarship exclusive of the terminal degree requirements. Acquisition of research funding, which may be through internal funding applications, and publication of findings in refereed journals. Independent scholarship will include publication of book chapters, case reports, case series, and reviews articles or other teaching aids such as websites or other electronic material.
   b. Effectively advised (co-advised, active committee member) at least one graduate student/resident, through to the completion of an advanced degree.
   c. Research/scholarship that is consistently evaluated by Department T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, as at least good.
iii) Service:
   a. Service that is consistently evaluated by Department T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, as at least good.

A faculty member with research/scholarship as a primary career goal should have:

i) Teaching:
   a. Contributed to the delivery of undergraduate and graduate curricular content consistent with their assigned distribution of effort
   b. Teaching that is consistently evaluated by the College T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C (EVIDENCE), as at least good.

ii) Research and/or Scholarship:
   a. Completed and ongoing independent research and/or scholarship exclusive of the terminal degree requirements. Acquisition of research funding, including granting agencies external to the College, and publication of findings in refereed journals is expected.
   b. Effectively advised two or more graduate students, preferably through to the completion of an advanced degree.
   c. Research/scholarship that is consistently evaluated by Department T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, as at least good.

iii) Service:
   a. Service that is consistently evaluated by Department T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, as at least good.

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

A faculty member with teaching as a primary career goal should have:

i) Teaching:
   a. Achieved a national and international reputation as an educator in their area of expertise.
   b. Contributed to the delivery of a substantial quantity of curricular content consistent with their assigned distribution of effort.
   c. Contributed to curricular content (course/program structure, course/program development, evaluation or management) including course coordination.
   d. Teaching that is consistently evaluated by the College T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, of at least very good.

ii) Research/Scholarship:
a. Mature research/scholarship as judged, in part, by external referees who themselves are full Professors and experts in the faculty member’s discipline/area.
b. Completed and ongoing independent research or scholarship in addition to any interdisciplinary or collaborative activities.
c. Consistently and effectively advised (co-advised) graduate students through to the completion of an advanced degree.
d. Research/scholarship that is consistently evaluated by the College T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, of at least good.

iii) Service

a. Service that is consistently evaluated by Department T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, as at least good.

A faculty member with research/scholarship as a primary career goal should have:

ii) Teaching:

a. Contributed to the delivery of a substantial quantity of curricular content consistent with their assigned distribution of effort
b. Teaching that is consistently evaluated by the College T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, as at least good.

ii) Research/Scholarship:

a. Mature research or scholarship as judged, in part, by external referees who themselves are full professors and experts in the faculty member’s discipline/area.
b. Completed research and an ongoing independent research program (e.g., being a principal investigator on numerous major projects), in addition to any interdisciplinary or collaborative activities. Ideally, external funding should have consistently been acquired to support research, and publication of research findings should be in high impact journals in the appropriate discipline area.
c. Consistently and effectively advised graduate students through to the completion of an advanced degree.
d. Research/scholarship that is consistently evaluated by the College T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, of at least very good.

iii) Service

a. Service that is consistently evaluated by Department T and P committee, using criteria outlined in Section C, as at least good.

3) Performance Criteria for each area of effort, for the Assessment of Performance for the period of review:
Performance in all areas will be assessed in consideration of a member’s distribution in effort, rank and experience.

i) Teaching:

Unsatisfactory:

A faculty may be ranked as unsatisfactory if there is evidence to support any of the following:

**Quantity of Teaching:**

a. Failure to deliver assigned curriculum

**Quality of Teaching:**

a. Unprofessional behavior that does not support a learning environment for undergraduate and graduate students
b. Provision of poor quality or non-existent teaching material to support curricular assignments
c. Provision of poor quality or non-existent contribution to course development
d. Failure to deliver assigned responsibilities as a course coordinator if applicable

Needs Improvement/Developmental:

A faculty may be ranked as needs improvement if they deliver their assigned curriculum and there is evidence to support any of the following:

**Quantity of Teaching:**

a. Failure to meet current standards in delivering, supporting and/or developing curriculum

**Quality of Teaching:**

a. Failure to meet current standards in the quality of teaching materials provided to support curricular assignments

Good:

A faculty may be ranked as good if they deliver their assigned curriculum and there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. Provision of teaching material that is of a quality consistent with current standards
b. Delivery of teaching material that is of a quality consistent with current standards
c. Provides input into curricular development
d. Meets responsibilities as a course coordinator
Very Good:
A faculty may be ranked as very good if they deliver their assigned curriculum and there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. Provision of teaching material that is of a quality that exceeds current standards
b. Delivery of teaching material that is of a quality that exceeds current standards
c. Provides input that leads to significant curricular improvement

Outstanding:
A faculty may be ranked as outstanding if they deliver their assigned curriculum and there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. Exceptional quality and delivery of teaching material. For example, shown exceptional creativity in development and delivery of teaching material
b. Input into curricular development that leads to measurable improvement in teaching outcomes
c. Recognition of excellence and/or leadership in teaching by peers external to the Department

ii) Research/Scholarship

Unsatisfactory:
A faculty may be ranked as unsatisfactory if there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. There is inadequate evidence of any research or scholarly activity
b. There is failure to adequately supervise graduate student trainees in research scholarly/activities

Improvement Required:
A faculty may be ranked as improvement required if there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. There is a quantity or quality of scholarly activity that is below current standards
b. Graduate student supervision in research/scholarly activity does not meet current expectations

Good:
A faculty may be ranked as good if there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. There is a quantity or quality of scholarly activity that meets current standards
b. Graduate student supervision in research/scholarly activity meets current expectations
Very Good:

A faculty may be ranked as very good if there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. There is a quantity or quality of scholarly activity that significantly exceeds current standards
b. Graduate student supervision in research/scholarly activity exceeds current expectations

Outstanding:

A faculty may be ranked as outstanding if there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. There is a quantity or quality of scholarly activity that exceeds current standards and has made a significant contribution to the field concerned and/or resulted in a significantly better understanding of the discipline.
b. Individual is an outstanding example of a research scholar for peers and post-graduate trainees

iii) Service

Unsatisfactory:

A faculty may be ranked as unsatisfactory if there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. Failure to deliver or participate in assigned or self-subscribed service duties
b. Unprofessional behaviour that does not support the mission and vision of the Department, College, or University.

Improvement Required:

A faculty may be ranked as improvement required if there is evidence to support any of the following:

a. Delivery of assigned or self-subscribed service duties in a quality that does not achieve current standards
b. Participation in assigned or self-subscribed service duties in an insufficient quantity as assessed by current standards

Good:

A faculty may be ranked as good if there is evidence to support:

a. Delivery of assigned or self-subscribed service duties in a consistent and effective manner.
b. Reliable participation in assigned or self-subscribed service duties
Very Good:

A faculty may be ranked as very good if there is evidence to support:

a. Delivery of assigned or self-subscribed service duties in a manner that exceeds current expectations
b. Demonstration of leadership that exceeds expectations related to service duties

Outstanding:

A faculty may be ranked as outstanding if there is evidence to support:

a. Outstanding leadership resulting in positive change and evolution
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/Developmental</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</td>
<td>Performance requires improvement and/or development. Performance is improvement required in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration and 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 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).

Within each area of effort, the quality and quantity of contributions will be considered in light of a faculty member’s distribution of effort.

i) Teaching:

The following information will be used by the Department T&P Committee in the evaluation of teaching:

A. Quantity (contact hours) of undergraduate and graduate teaching including:

   a. Formal lectures
   b. Seminars and facilitated discussions
   c. Laboratories
   d. Clinical training in the OVC, including participation in consultations, case based rounds and delivery of structured clinical rotations.

   Quantity of clinical training as reported in weeks. A 50% teaching distribution of effort of in the Department of Clinical Studies equates to approximately 21 weeks of clinical teaching activity (approximately 4 weeks per 10% DOE in teaching). Laboratory and lecture duties are assigned, in addition to clinic weeks, according to departmental needs. In cases where there is a relatively large amount of lecture and laboratory teaching, the Departmental Chair in consultation with the faculty member, may reduce faculty member’s clinical week assignment.

   e. Alternative methods of delivering learning material
   f. Activities related to student (graduate and undergraduate) assessment
   g. Activities related to student mentorship such as advising of undergraduate students

Method of Evaluation:

Quantification of contributions through information provided in the teaching dossier, course outlines and schedules, course responsibility forms, and clinic schedules.

B. Quality of teaching

   a. Lectures
   b. Laboratories
   c. Clinical Training in the OVC including:
• Quality of instruction during Clinical activities
• Clinical case management and judgment
• Application of current literature and research to clinical practice
• Management of medical records
• Exemplifying clinical professionalism in conduct with clients, patients, colleagues and coworkers during activities related to the OVC.

d. Alternative methods of achieving student learning objectives
e. Contributions to curricular content

**Method of Evaluation:**

1. Teaching dossier
2. Teaching evaluations by students and peers and response to evaluations
3. Direct knowledge of members of T and P committee and/or written documentation regarding the quality of Clinical Training provided by faculty colleagues, OVC staff, referring veterinarians, para-professionals and undergraduate and graduate students. Letters of Clinical Assessment by Clinic Heads and Service Chiefs.

**C. Contributions to curricular development** (course/program structure, content, method of delivery, evaluation or management)

**Method of Evaluation:**

a. Teaching dossier
b. Direct knowledge of members of T and P committee and/or written documentation regarding curricular development by faculty colleagues, the department Chair and members of the College Curriculum Committee

**D. Course Coordination.**

**Method of Evaluation:**

a. Teaching dossier
b. Direct knowledge of members of T and P committee, the Chair, Associate Dean Academic and/or written documentation regarding the quality of Course coordination by faculty colleagues, the department Chair and members of the College Curriculum Committee

**E. Activities that support the Clinical Training environment in the OVC.** The Department recognizes that it is necessary to perform many duties to maintain the function of the OVC as a clinical training environment for undergraduate and graduate veterinary students. Activities that are recognized as contributing to the clinical training environment and therefore fall under the domain of teaching, include:

a. Functioning in an administrative role on behalf of the OVC-HSC
b. Service on committees essential for the operation of the OVC-HSC

c. The in-house provision of consultation to colleagues to assist in the diagnosis and management of the OVC-HSC caseload

d. The provision of advice (mainly over the telephone) to the public, the agriculture and animal health industries and the veterinary profession unrelated to animals in or being referred to the OVC-HSC

e. The continued auditing of case care while an OVC-HSC patient is convalescing at home through repeated discussions with owners and referring veterinarians.

f. Effective communication with clients, colleagues and co-workers so as to facilitate and promote OVC-HSC activities and case acquisition

g. Contribution to a professional training environment through collegiality and team work with other members within the OVC-HSC

h. Provision of emergency service coverage in the OVC-HSC, to a level agreed upon by the faculty and hospital and in accordance with the requirements of the service, as reported in number of weeknights and weekends on emergency duty.

i. Maintenance and administrative oversight of Animal Utilization Protocols relevant to supporting clinical teaching.

Method of Evaluation:

a. Teaching dossier

b. Direct knowledge of members of T and P committee and/or written documentation regarding quality of activities listed above by faculty colleagues, graduate students, referring veterinarians, department Chair, Clinic heads and the Associate Dean Clinical Programs

Research/Scholarship:

The following information will be used by the Department T&P Committee in the evaluation of research/scholarship:

a. Published works such as papers in refereed journals including prospective and retrospective studies, case reports studies, review articles, research review articles and contract research reports (published or protected by confidentiality agreements). Where reports of contract research are subject to confidentiality agreements, a letter from the research sponsor confirming that a report has been completed should be provided to the T and P committee.

b. Presentation of papers or poster sessions at research conferences.

c. Published materials including books, book chapters, multi-media and computer generated data.

d. Grants and contracts awarded including the type of award eg. grant vs contract, operating or equipment, shared or unshared indicating the principal investigator.
e. Invitation to present research at national and international scientific conferences.

f. Advisor, co-advisor or member of graduate committees.

g. Membership on graduate student thesis examinations (internal or external).

h. Number of graduate students supervised and the quality of the supervision

i. Evidence of ongoing pedagogic leadership. The latter includes contributions to pedagogy through published peer-reviewed literature on teaching/learning principles and/or by contributions through teaching aids such as textbooks, case-reports or through other information sources relevant to the discipline.

**Method of Evaluation:**

a. Research/Scholarship dossier

b. Written and signed evaluations from graduate students advised by the faculty

c. Written evaluations from colleagues assessing the general contribution faculty have made to graduate education through serving on advisory or examination committees, counseling, assisting graduate trainees with preparations for research presentations, defense, etc.

d. Success of the graduate students program (timeliness of progress, completion success etc).

Service:

**A. Service to the Department, College and University**

The faculty member, working with the Chair of the Department, has the responsibility of providing the T and P committee with documentation whereby the Committee can judge the quality and significance of their accomplishments.

**Method of Evaluation:**

a. Service dossier

b. Direct knowledge of members of T and P committee and/or written documentation from appropriate sources (as judged by the Chair and T and P committee) regarding the effectiveness and extent of administrative service

**B. Service to the Society and the Profession**

The following information may be used by the Department T&P Committee in the evaluation of service to society:

a. Delivery of continuing education or additional instructional material to student groups, interns, professional and para-professional groups and lay public.

b. Number, quality and relevance of oral presentations outside of research presentations as listed in (ii b).
c. Papers and extension notes published in non-refereed journals including papers and magazines associated with animal production groups, breed associations etc. The review of case reports for refereed and non-refereed journals is included here.
d. Material communicated outside the College using other media e.g. radio, television, videotape, computer programs, audiocassettes etc.
e. Extent and quality of involvement in professional and scholarly scientific organizations.
f. Review of manuscripts in refereed veterinary journals and of internal or external grant proposals.
g. Membership on editorial boards of peer reviewed research journals.
h. Membership on expert committees.