

5 June 2013

**PROVOST'S TEMPLATE DOCUMENT:**

Department Guidelines Document for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Assessment

For the Department of: Pathobiology

College: Ontario Veterinary College

Date of Approval by Provost:

*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 and Progress toward granting of Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor;
- 2) Promotion to the rank of Professor; and
- 3) 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 AND FURTHER INFORMATION:** 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 three possible considerations (i.e. 1 through 3 above) and established criteria.

## A) ACADEMIC MISSION OF DEPARTMENT:

The Department of Pathobiology is dedicated to the advancement of knowledge in animal and human health with emphasis on veterinary and comparative pathology, veterinary infectious diseases and immunology. Our faculty members study a wide range of infectious (including emerging and zoonotic pathogens) and noninfectious disease conditions in domestic and non-domestic species. Research ranges from studies of the basic understanding of the mechanisms of disease to the different protective and pathological responses of the host, impact of environment on host, and applied aspects of disease control and animal welfare. We offer advanced training in diagnostic anatomic and clinical pathology, zoo animal medicine and pathology, and laboratory animal science, as well as research training in our areas of expertise.

## 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:

Each aspect is interpreted in the context of the Distribution of Effort (DOE) of the faculty member.

#### i) **Teaching:**

The faculty member should have established a high quality record in teaching. Interdisciplinary and collaborative teaching activities are seen as positive. Faculty members should have evidence of consistently “Good” or above teaching ability. In the case of faculty members with didactic and/or clinical teaching as a major component of their DOE, there should be evidence of ongoing pedagogic leadership and scholarship. Teaching can be assessed through, but not limited to, student teaching evaluations and peer review. Pedagogic leadership includes contributions to pedagogy through published peer-reviewed literature on teaching/learning principles; contributions to curricular issues (course/program structure, evaluation or management, curriculum development and review), organizing and participating in teaching and learning seminars, and/or by contributions through teaching aids such as textbooks, websites or through other information sources relevant to the discipline. Those faculty members with teaching as a major component of their DOE should have had responsibility as a major instructor or a course coordinator. Faculty members who supervise graduate student pathologists or who have primary responsibility for diagnostic pathology of cases submitted to the Animal Health Laboratory should demonstrate conduct of these activities in a scholarly and professional manner. Evidence for this can be provided in a variety of ways such as, but not limited to, instructor evaluation by graduate student pathologists, reviews by department chairs, clinic heads, and the Animal Health Laboratory director.

#### ii) **Research/Scholarship:**

The faculty member should have established high quality ongoing research activities, and must have demonstrated significant independent, interdisciplinary and/or collaborative scholarly activity including publications, in refereed journals, arising from work undertaken since joining the Department. A faculty member with research as a major component of their DOE should have evidence of substantive *completed* and ongoing independent research (e.g., be a principal investigator on one or more major projects), in addition to any interdisciplinary or collaborative activities. Evidence for this will include the scope and quality of the research program(s), success at obtaining grants and contracts, training of highly qualified personnel (undergraduate and graduate students, technicians, postdoctoral fellows, research associates,

and/or visiting researchers/scientists), the number and quality of publications (especially in refereed journals), and presentations. Faculty members with research/scholarship as a major component of their DOE should strive for regular research publications in journals relevant to their discipline. The faculty member should have effectively advised one or more graduate students, preferably through to the completion of an advanced degree by the end of the probationary period.

### iii) Service:

The faculty member should be contributing actively and effectively to other activities of the Department, College, University or to the national or international scientific community. These other activities most often include, but are not limited to, committee work that is necessary for continued operation of the Department, College, or University. Participation on committees outside of the University, editorships, provision of continuing education, and other activities related to societal or professional issues are viewed positively.

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

Each aspect is interpreted in the context of the Distribution of Effort (DOE) of the faculty member.

### i) Teaching:

The faculty member must have demonstrated evidence of consistently satisfactory teaching ability, at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels. Satisfactory generally means an overall teaching evaluation of at least “Good” as indicated on the standardized student evaluation form. However, other methods of teaching evaluation may include, but are not limited to, peer review and expert review by teaching support services. For those faculty with teaching as a major component of their DOE there should be continued evidence for pedagogic leadership as described in section 1 part i.

### ii) Research/Scholarship:

Faculty Members will be considered for promotion to Professor only if they have demonstrated a high degree of scholarly maturity and experience, and a substantial record of contribution to the objectives and productivity of the Department, College and University.

The faculty member must have shown continued superior level of performance. Sustained productivity in terms of the quality and quantity of contributions to the literature, success in obtaining grants and contracts, training of highly qualified personnel (undergraduate and graduate students, technicians, postdoctoral fellows, research associates, visiting researchers/scientists), and evidence of general leadership in the discipline are expected. International recognition of superior reputation and performance, as judged by external referees is required. A satisfactory performance in the other areas of activity is a minimum requirement. Superior will mean an overall evaluation of “Very Good” or “Outstanding”, and Satisfactory will mean an overall evaluation of “Good”.

There must be substantial evidence of mature scholarship as judged, in part, by external referees who themselves are generally full professors and experts in the faculty member’s discipline area.

### iii) Service

as above for section 1 part iii

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

Each aspect is interpreted in the context of the Distribution of Effort (DOE) of the faculty member.

#### i) Teaching:

The faculty member should have established a high quality record in teaching. Interdisciplinary and collaborative teaching activities are viewed positively. A faculty member with didactic and/or clinical teaching as a major component of their DOE should have evidence of consistently “Good” or above teaching ability and of ongoing pedagogic leadership. Teaching can be assessed through, but not limited to, student teaching evaluations and peer review. Pedagogic leadership includes contributions to pedagogy through published peer-reviewed literature on teaching/learning principles; contributions to curricular issues (course/program structure, evaluation or management, curriculum development and review), organizing and participating in teaching and learning seminars, and/or by contributions through teaching aids such as textbooks, websites, or through other information sources relevant to the discipline. For those faculty members with teaching as a major component of their DOE, they should have had responsibility as a major instructor or a course coordinator. Faculty members who supervise graduate student pathologists or who have primary responsibility for diagnostic pathology of cases submitted to the Animal Health Laboratory should demonstrate conduct of these activities in a scholarly and professional manner. Evidence for this can be provided in a variety of ways such as, but not limited to, instructor evaluation by graduate student pathologists, reviews by department chairs, clinic heads, and the Animal Health Laboratory director.

In the biennial review, those faculty members with teaching as a major component of their DOE should have continued evidence of important contributions to pedagogy, major course responsibilities, active roles in curricular review, and development, promotion, and mentoring of teaching excellence.

#### ii) Research/Scholarship:

The faculty member should have established high quality ongoing research activities, and must have demonstrated significant independent, interdisciplinary and/or collaborative scholarly activity including publications, in refereed journals, arising from work undertaken since joining the Department. A faculty member with research as a major component of their DOE should have evidence of substantive *completed* and ongoing independent research (e.g., be a principal investigator on one or more major projects), in addition to any interdisciplinary or collaborative activities. Evidence for this will include the scope and quality of the research program(s), success at obtaining grants and contracts, training of highly qualified personnel (undergraduate and graduate students, technicians, postdoctoral fellows, research associates, and/or visiting researchers/scientists), the number and quality of publications (especially in refereed journals), and presentations. A faculty member with research as a major component of their DOE should strive for regular research publications in journals relevant to their discipline. The faculty member should have effectively advised one or more graduate students, preferably through to the completion of an advanced degree by the end of the probationary period.

In the biennial review, those faculty members with research/scholarship as a major component of their DOE should have continued evidence of strong research productivity in terms of quality and quantity of manuscripts published, successful competition for grants and contracts, and training of highly qualified personnel (undergraduate and graduate students, technicians, postdoctoral fellows, research associates, and/or visiting researchers/scientists).

### iii) Service:

The faculty member should be contributing actively and effectively to other activities of the Department, College, University, or to the national or international scientific community. These other activities most often include, but are not limited to, committee work that is necessary for the continued operation of the Department, College, or University. Participation on committees outside of the University, editorships, provision of continuing education, and other activities related to societal or professional issues are viewed positively.

## C) Evidence and Further Information

Each aspect is interpreted in the context of the Distribution of Effort (DOE) of the faculty member.

**a) Frequency of Assessment.** The assessment of biennial Performance Assessment will be done in the context of an individual's responsibilities and chosen career path. This is determined by agreement with the Dean as documented in the Distribution of Effort (DOE) - Form that is provided to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. For tenured faculty, assessment will be every two years. An evaluation will be undertaken automatically in the year following that in which a less than "Good" assessment is given. All faculty holding probationary or multi-year contractually limited appointments will be evaluated annually.

**b) Outcome and Implications of Performance Assessment.** The assessment will result in an overall rating of performance, as outlined in the Collective Agreement. In accordance with the Collective Agreement and faculty development principles, the University expects that faculty members will engage in aspects of all three of the following areas of activity: teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The performance evaluation will recognize those areas with the greatest emphasis within the distribution of effort (DOE). The increment increases awarded through the Performance Assessment process are an indication of continued career development. Performance will be judged on the premise that Guelph is a major University that is a recognized leader in the country and maintains high expectations of its faculty. The general expectation of a faculty member in Pathobiology is that their overall performance will be described as "Good". The method for assessing performance and the ranking procedures and criteria used are described in Section 'c' below.

All Faculty Members who are rated as "Good" or better will receive an agreed annual salary adjustment of a fixed sum from a performance increment pool determined under the Collective Agreement. The remainder of the performance pool is divided up among UGFA Members whose performance is "Very Good" or "Outstanding". Members rated as "Very Good" will be awarded 1 point, and as "Outstanding" will be awarded 2 points. These points will then be used according to the Collective Agreement.

**c) Procedures for Assessment for Performance Increment Recommendations.** In assessing **performance**, the Department T&P Committee will have available, and consider, information provided by the faculty on form FR-2 and whatever additional information that may be considered appropriate by the individual faculty member or the T&P Committee to achieve fair and satisfactory evaluation of the faculty member(s) given the agreed responsibilities and career path decisions described in the DOE-Form.

Performance will be assessed for each area of responsibility (Teaching, Research/Scholarship, Service) described in the DOE-Form, and judged by each member of the T&P Committee by assignment of a number between 1.0 and 5.0 based on the Performance Rating Descriptions and criteria described below: 1 - Unsatisfactory; 2 – Improvement Required/Developmental; 3 - Good; 4 – Very Good; 5 - Outstanding), for each area of activity. Each voting member of the T&P Committee will contribute to the scoring procedure by secret ballot, and the pooled score for each area of responsibility will be used to assess the overall Performance Rating, as outlined below.

**i) Teaching:**

Within the following areas of responsibility, performance will be rated as unsatisfactory, improvement required/developmental, good, very good, or outstanding according to the items listed below.

**1) Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching**

- a) Quality -**
- i) student evaluations of instructors are required for each graduate or undergraduate course in which the faculty member is involved in student contact for five or more hours. The standardized Department Teaching Evaluation hard-copy or electronic forms will be used for this purpose. All signed student comments must be submitted to the Committee. Unsigned student comments will not be provided to the T&P Committee, unless submitted by the faculty member.
  - ii) non-student evaluation of teaching competence. A faculty member or the Chair may request that arrangements be made for non-student evaluation of her/his teaching. The number and identity of the evaluators will be decided by the Chair and the evaluation will be done on a date unannounced to the faculty member. Peer evaluations or evaluations by an expert from Teaching Support Services may also be requested.
- b) Quantity -**
- i) hours of student contact (lectures, labs, clinical) and number of students.
  - ii) course coordination (the commitment of time to be estimated by the faculty member; as a guide 1 FTE = one-fifth total hours of the course)
  - iii) advising graduate students (normally half the time of advising is allotted to teaching and half to research; 1 FTE = advising 8 graduate students).

A Teaching Dossier is required of all faculty and must be updated/revised at least on a biennial basis. There is no detailed prescribed University of Guelph format. The essential function of a Teaching Dossier is to provide an outline of the philosophic basis of a faculty member's teaching. Therefore, this dossier will include a statement on teaching philosophy, experiences and objectives. As interpreted by the Department of Pathobiology, the dossier will not normally be more than 3-5 pages in length. Additional length/materials is/are expected if teaching is a major component of the DOE. The dossier may include examples of materials such as course outlines, assignments, instructional aids, final examinations, reports on classroom observations by peers, and measures of student achievements (such as entry-exit tests). Faculty members can submit whatever documentation they judge to be important.

Unsatisfactory: At the graduate and undergraduate levels one or more of: consistently poor teaching ratings, unresponsive to teaching ratings, does not seek assistance, misses classes, lacks organization, does not contribute to teaching at a level consistent with DOE.

Improvement Required/Developmental: At the graduate and undergraduate levels poor quality teaching ratings, making attempts to seek out peer reviews and assistance from Teaching Support Services.

Good: This is the expected level of teaching competence at the graduate and undergraduate levels for the department, meets the expectations of the DOE, achieves "Good" student teaching evaluations, adopts contemporary methods of teaching.

Very Good: At the graduate and undergraduate levels consistently achieves better than ‘good’ student teaching evaluations, recognized for leadership in pedagogy, partakes in curriculum development, leads in adopting leading edge teaching methodologies.

Outstanding: At the graduate and undergraduate levels as for Very Good in addition to consistently achieving ‘outstanding’ student teaching evaluations.

## ii) Research/Scholarship

Within the following areas of responsibility, performance will be rated as unsatisfactory, improvement required/developmental, good, very good, or outstanding according to the items listed below.

### a) Publications

The quality and number of publications. A suggested format to cite publications is appended (Appendix 1). As well, a faculty member may want to point out the specific qualities of a paper by submitting additional material such as a citation analysis of a paper or journal, reviewer comments or other documentation. Papers that have been published, are in press or papers that have been accepted but not yet published are listed. Manuscripts submitted but not yet accepted should not be listed here, but may be included under an additional section on form FR2.

### b) Grants and Contracts

The name and annual dollar value of grants should be indicated. As well, include the type of award, eg. grant vs. contract, operating or equipment; granter; ownership; ie. shared or unshared; and for shared grants the principal investigator, since this role usually carries special responsibility. In relation to the above, a list of currently registered projects should be provided. Grants applied for but not funded may also be included, as well as positive reviewer comments from unsuccessful applications.

### c) Presentations Given

A faculty member should list the scientific presentations (invited presentations, oral, poster, etc.) made at conferences or meetings. Those actually presented by the individual should be distinguished from those for which the individual was co-author, but did not actively participate in presentation.

### d) Other Evidence of Scholarly Activity

A faculty member should present any other evidence of scholarly activity such as invitations to present material at national and international meetings, conferences and workshops; membership on editorial boards; review of research grants; website maintenance and development, and membership on expert committees.

### e) Advising Graduate Students

- i) List students for whom you are principal advisor or co-advisor. Students should be identified along with the title of their research project and degree sought.
- ii) Membership in graduate student committees.  
Name of students, degree, and department.
- iii) Membership in graduate student examinations (internal and external).

iv) Graduate student(s) publications to which you have contributed but have not been a co-author.

#### **f) Evidence of Pedagogical Leadership**

Evidence of pedagogical leadership is particularly important for faculty with teaching as a major component of their DOE. The evidence may include, but is not limited to, contributions to textbooks, curricular discussions/revisions, contributions to the literature on education, development of significant teaching aids and/or new approaches to teaching, and evaluation of teaching methodology.

Unsatisfactory: Inappropriately low level of activity and failure in one or more of: publish original scholarly material, attract grants and contracts to support a research effort, train highly qualified personnel over a sustained period of time.

Improvement Required/Developmental: Any of the criteria for unsatisfactory but sporadic in nature, such as having publications in development but difficulty in moving them through the review process, loss of grants and contracts, hiatus in training of highly qualified personnel.

Good: Appropriate level of research productivity.

Very Good: Exceeds the expectations for research productivity of most faculty with similar DOE; striving to expand their research enterprise.

Outstanding: Leader in the field, superior level of research productivity; usually international recognition.

#### **iii) Service**

Within the following areas of responsibility, performance will be rated as unsatisfactory, improvement required/developmental, good, very good, or outstanding according to the items listed below.

**a) Consultation, Referral and Extension Activities**

Quality and quantity of consultation, including telephone consultations on behalf of the University, continuing education will be considered.

**b) Administrative Responsibilities in the OVCHSC or Other College or University Services**

**c) Committees**

Membership on and chairing of Department, OVCHSC, AHL, College and University committees. Faculty may wish to provide evidence of contribution to the work of committees.

**d) Service to Professional Organizations**

Activities in support of professional and academic organizations.

**e) Other Service to Society and the Community**

List memberships, additional participation/responsibilities.

Unsatisfactory: Does not engage or participate actively in committee work; inappropriate level of activity.

Improvement Required/Developmental: Inconsistent active participation in committee work or other service activities.

**Good:** This is the expected level of effort for most faculty in the department, active participation on a variety of committees some at least at the college level, enthusiasm to carry on the activities needed for function of the Department, College and University. An appropriate level of activity.

**Very Good:** Active participation on Department, College or University committees or on national or international committees at a level and intensity that exceeds faculty members rated as ‘Good’.

**Outstanding:** Leadership in areas of strong commitment either within the University or society.

**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 is required improvement in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration and 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 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.