

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**Policy for Tenure, Promotion and Performance Assessment Recommendations**

May 2012

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Deliberation Process .....</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| 1.1      | Timeline .....  | 2         |
| 1.2      | Composition of faculty assessment file .....                                  | 3         |
| 1.3      | Committee composition and rules of order.....                                 | 4         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Performance Assessment.....</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| 2.1      | Distribution of Effort.....   | 5         |
| 2.2      | Performance Raters .....  | 5         |
| 2.3      | Assessment of Scholarship .....   | 6         |
| 2.4      | Assessment of Teaching .....  | 7         |
| 2.5      | Assessment of Service .....   | 9         |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Continuation of Probationary or Contractually-limited Appointment.....</b> | <b>10</b> |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor .....</b>                      | <b>10</b> |
| 4.1      | External Assessors .....  | 11        |
| 4.2      | Decision Criteria .....   | 11        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Promotion to Professor.....</b>  | <b>12</b> |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Study/Research Leave Applications.....</b>                                 | <b>13</b> |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Professor Emeritus/Emerita Nominations.....</b>                            | <b>14</b> |
| <b>8</b> | <b>Adjunct Faculty Appointments.....</b>                                      | <b>15</b> |

Faculty members in the Department of Philosophy have the right to know explicitly the criteria that are used for Tenure, Promotion, and Performance Assessment (TPPA) purposes as well as reasons for the decisions. The process must be transparent, fair and equitable. The goal of the TPPA procedures is to identify, encourage, and acknowledge excellence over the range of a faculty member's responsibilities.

## 1 Deliberation Process

### 1.1 Timeline

The department TPPA committee meets annually, to consider applications for the granting of tenure and conferral of promotion; to assess performance and progress toward tenure and promotion for all probationary faculty; to assess performance for all contractually-limited faculty; to assess performance for any tenured faculty member who has been rated overall at less than Good in the previous year; to consider applications for Study/Research leave; to consider cases for Professor Emeritus status; and to consider cases for Adjunct Faculty status. In addition, biennially (in even numbered years) the committee conducts performance assessments, using performance raters, for all faculty members.

The normal sequence of dates is as follows:

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| April            | Election of department TPPA committee.  |
| <b>May 15</b>    | Deadline for applications for tenure and/or promotion.  |
| June 8           | Deadline for supporting material for provision to external assessors for tenure/promotion.  |
| <b>August 15</b> | Deadline for submission of material for performance assessment. Failure to submit a completed assessment file by this date will result in an Unsatisfactory performance assessment.                     |
| September 10     | Deadline for provision of complete faculty assessment files, including reports of external assessors where relevant, to the department TPPA committee.  |
| October 15       | Deadline for transfer of signed departmental recommendations, along with the assessment files, to the College TPPA committee.   |
| December 21      | Deadline for letters from the Dean, signed by the members of the College committee, giving the results of TPPA consideration. Recommendations for tenure and/or promotion are forwarded to the Provost. |
| January          | Deadline for faculty appeals, within fifteen working days of the date of issuance of the letter from the Dean.  |
| February         | Letter from the President informing faculty members who have been granted tenure and/or promoted.   |

The department chair will arrange to meet with each faculty member to discuss their TPPA material, prior to the commencement of departmental deliberations, unless the faculty member elects to waive this meeting. The Dean is available to meet, upon request, with all probationary faculty members.

## 1.2 Composition of faculty assessment file

The “TPPA window” mentioned below is the period from August 15 of the first year of the TPPA period to August 14 of the year the file is submitted. Material should be provided electronically/digitally whenever possible.

An assessment file must contain the following elements:

- i. In even-numbered years, a biennial report. Those submitting in odd-numbered years should provide an annual report.
- ii. A complete and up to date CV, in the form of an approved College template.
- iii. A Distribution of Effort/Workload form covering the TPPA window, signed by the faculty member, the chair and the Dean.
- iv. All written scholarly work published during the TPPA window.
- v. A description of work in progress, in the context of an ongoing research program. This is normally about a page long, and at most two pages. It should be at least partially re-written for each assessment, and should make explicit reference to work done during the TPPA window.
- vi. Where applicable, a written report on a Study/Research Leave that concluded during the TPPA window.
- vii. Teaching evaluations for all courses taught during the TPPA window, including any courses taught on overload. All signed student comments must be included; a faculty member can choose to include unsigned comments as well.
- viii. Course outlines/syllabi for every course taught during the TPPA window; a selection of assessment material (e.g. final exams) for every course taught during the TPPA window.
- ix. A teaching statement. This is normally about a page long, and at most two pages. It should be at least partially re-written for each assessment, and should make explicit reference to courses taught during the TPPA window.
- x. Information relating to service commitments during the TPPA window, such as letters of thanks for service, documents produced as part of a service role, descriptions of activities performed in a service role, etc.

Optionally, faculty members may include:

- i. Unpublished scholarly work, including work submitted for publication. Such work will not count directly towards a performance rater for scholarship, but may establish a context for ongoing research.
- ii. Evidence of quality and impact in any of the three areas of assessment, such as printed reviews of scholarly work, outcomes for students, etc.
- iii. Grant proposals completed during the TPPA window.
- iv. Short summaries of their work in each of the three areas of assessment: teaching, scholarship and service.

Beyond the components listed above, faculty should take care not to provide large amounts of extraneous material, and should strive to provide clear context for any additional material that she/he chooses to include.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to record her/his accomplishments and to provide accurate documentation of them to the department TPPA committee.

## 1.3 Committee composition and rules of order

### 1.3.1 Committee composition

The department TPPA committee is composed of four tenured faculty members, the College representative, and the department chair *ex officio*.

The four departmental faculty members are elected, for a two-year term, by the tenured, tenure-track or full time contractually-limited members of the department. The election is conducted by the chair and the most recently hired faculty member in the department; voting is by single transferable vote in a secret ballot. To be eligible for election, faculty members must be available for the meetings of the committee. If through illness or any other reason it appears that the elected committee member will be unable to attend the meetings of the committee, then she or he will be replaced by the faculty member who had been nominated and had received the next largest number of votes.

Faculty members can serve two consecutive terms as members of the committee (if re-elected), but then must step down for at least a term. Terms should be staggered so that half the committee is elected each year.

### 1.3.2 Rules of order

Quorum is five of the six members of the committee. The discussions and deliberations of the committee are strictly confidential.

Decisions are reached by majority vote through secret ballot voting. The chair and the four elected members of the department committee are eligible to vote; the College member of the department committee attends the department committee meetings in an *ex officio* capacity, and therefore is not eligible to vote at the department committee. If there is a tie vote, the chair has an additional vote, to break the tie.

Committee members are expected to recuse themselves from consideration of a particular case where a conflict of interest appears or is perceived to exist. However, no member present for the consideration of a case can abstain from voting. When the chair recuses her/himself (e.g. when her/his case is being considered by the committee), the department committee chooses one of the elected department members to act as chair of the committee while the matter is dealt with.

The committee makes its decisions based solely on:

- a) the material contained in the assessment file, and therefore accessible to the faculty member prior to the meeting of the department committee; and
- b) the judgment of the members of the committee bearing on matters of which they have direct knowledge.

Faculty members do not see the departmental recommendation to the College TPPA committee, except in the case that they appeal a College TPPA decision.

## 2 Performance Assessment

Performance assessment is conducted in every even-numbered year for all probationary faculty, tenured faculty, and multi-year contractually-limited faculty. Article 53 of the Collective Agreement between the University of Guelph and the University of Guelph Faculty Association provides for salary increments that are allocated on the basis of this biennial performance rating.

### 2.1 Distribution of Effort

All faculty members have responsibilities in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Each faculty member has a defined Distribution of Effort (DOE), mutually negotiated between the faculty member, the department chair, and the Dean. The default DOE is 40% scholarship, 40% teaching, and 20% service; in the Philosophy Department this DOE normally applies to faculty who teach four classes a year and do not have major service responsibilities. As faculty members' circumstances change (e.g. more administrative duties are assumed) the DOE should be adjusted to take this into account. The percentage of the DOE assigned to any one of the three areas of effort cannot, however, be less than 10% (that is, faculty cannot be relieved entirely of their responsibilities in any of scholarship, teaching or service).

The DOE is the basis for the assignment of duties, and may only be modified through negotiation and agreement of the Dean and the faculty member. It is also the basis for the relative weighting of the assessment of the faculty member's performance in the three areas. See Article 18 of the Collective Agreement between the University of Guelph and UGFA.

### 2.2 Performance Raters

There are five overall performance raters. These overall performance raters are determined through assessment of the faculty member's performance in each of her/his areas of effort: scholarship, teaching, and service. The faculty member's agreed-upon Distribution of Effort forms the context for the assessment of performance in each area of responsibility, and this then forms the basis for the overall performance rating. The committee will assess each area of responsibility and then recommend an overall performance rating.

The following descriptions of the performance raters are provided by the office of the Provost:

Overall Performance rater of **Unsatisfactory**:

An overall Unsatisfactory Performance rater is appropriate when the faculty member's performance has been assessed as unsatisfactory in at least two of the areas of teaching, scholarship or service.

Overall Performance rater of **Improvement Required/Developmental**:

An overall Improvement Required/Developmental performance rater is appropriate when the faculty member's performance has been assessed as improvement required (or need for development) in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship or service, and unsatisfactory in the other area of responsibility.

Overall Performance rater of **Good**:

An overall Good performance rater is appropriate when the faculty member's performance has been assessed as at least good in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship or service, and at least improvement required/developmental in the other area of responsibility.

Overall Performance rater of **Very Good**:

An overall Very Good performance rater is appropriate when the faculty member's

performance has been assessed as very good in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship or service and at least good in the other area of responsibility

Overall Performance rater of **Outstanding**:

An overall Outstanding performance rater is appropriate when the faculty member's performance has been assessed as outstanding in two of the areas of teaching, scholarship or service, and at least very good in the other area of responsibility.

The partial criteria outlined above are intended merely to serve as a guide in the committee's assessment of a faculty member's overall performance; the committee will use its discretion to determine the best fit for an overall performance rater. This will be particularly the case for faculty members with non-standard DOEs. The key criterion is that performance assessments be fair and equitable.

The departmental committee's recommendation to the College committee will include a performance rater for each of the faculty member's areas of effort and an overall performance rater. The committee must hold a secret ballot vote on the overall performance rater for each faculty member considered. The committee is not required to hold a secret ballot vote on the performance raters for the individual areas of effort; however, the committee must reach consensus as to the performance of the faculty member in each of these areas. If any member of the committee requests that a secret ballot vote be held, the committee must comply.

Performance raters are only used during biennial TPPA performance assessment of all faculty; they are not used for feedback to probationary faculty, with respect to performance and progress toward tenure and promotion, in odd numbered years.

### 2.3 Assessment of Scholarship

The primary basis for assessment of scholarship is work published or presented during the TPPA window. Forthcoming publications, not yet in print, are not normally counted towards the scholarship rater, since they will be counted in the subsequent TPPA period. Major external grants and academic honours received can also count towards assessment of scholarship.

The department committee will assess the quality as well as the quantity of the faculty member's scholarly contributions. In assessing the quality of work, the committee will use its own judgment but also will rely upon standard metrics of quality that are common in the profession. Thus, peer-reviewed publications will typically be weighted significantly more than non-peer-reviewed contributions; publications or presentations in very selective venues will usually be weighted more than those in less competitive arenas; and evidence of the impact of a researcher's work (such as reviews, discussions in print by other researchers, or invitations to present her/his work at conferences or departments) will be relevant.

The department committee will strive to assess a faculty member's scholarship in ways that are professionally appropriate to the sub-discipline, or interdisciplinary area, in which that work is performed. (For example, the normal modes and venues of presentation of research may vary by disciplinary area, with respect to multi-authored versus single authored papers, the salience of books versus articles, publications in specialist journals versus generalist journals, poster presentations versus oral presentations, and so on.)

The scholarly activities of members of the Philosophy Department need not be purely 'philosophical' in order to count towards a performance rater: work that would be treated as a scholarly contribution to another discipline should be counted as a form of scholarship for the

purposes of TPPA assessment. However, the committee will weight more heavily work that is, broadly, a scholarly contribution to philosophy, over work which does not make any contribution to an overall project that is mainly philosophical.

Faculty are encouraged to be as clear as possible, in their presentation of their scholarship, with respect to any issues that might be relevant to the committee in assessing that work. It should be made clear whether or not the work is peer refereed (i.e. whether it was accepted for publication primarily on the basis of evaluation by at least one professional peer); whether that refereeing was blind to the identity of the author; the contribution of the faculty member towards a multi-authored article; the process by which a book or book chapter was commissioned or accepted for publication; and so on. Faculty should also take care not to include in their biennial or annual report work that falls outside the TPPA window.

It is helpful to give some indication of the scholarly performance expected for the various raters. However, this can be no more than a rule of thumb, especially because of the role of quality in the committee's judgments. For example, a single very high-impact and high quality journal article might be sufficient for a rating of Outstanding; conversely four or more non-peer-refereed publications might not be sufficient for Outstanding.

For a two-year TPPA period, for a faculty member with a standard Distribution of Effort of 40% for Scholarship, the following are normal expectations:

Outstanding: four good-quality peer-reviewed articles, or a scholarly monograph.

Very Good: two or three good-quality peer-reviewed articles or book chapters, or an anthology/textbook.

Good: at least one good-quality article/chapter, and other professional activity such as book reviews or conference presentations.

Improvement Required/Developmental: one minor scholarly publication or some other professional activity such as book reviews or conference presentations.

Unacceptable: no publications and no other appreciable research activity.

## 2.4 Assessment of Teaching

The full range of teaching-related activities are relevant to the assessment of teaching. This includes:

- All courses taught during the TPPA window, including Distance Education, Guelph-Humber, and paid or unpaid overload courses.
- Undergraduate honours thesis supervision, and other forms of undergraduate mentoring.
- Graduate supervision (in Guelph Philosophy graduate programs or other ones); participation in departmental graduate examinations; and work performed as an external examiner for other doctoral programs.
- The development of wholly new courses (i.e. courses being taught for the first time as part of the philosophy curriculum or the first time in a new format, such as DE); the redevelopment of existing courses in order to improve their effectiveness.
- Guest lecturing.
- The pedagogical mentoring of teaching assistants, doctoral student instructors, and probationary faculty.

- Participation in pedagogical training and development as an instructor, including presentations at teaching workshops and publication of pedagogical reports. (Note: This is intended to cover the kind of reflection on, and communication of, one's own pedagogical experience that is often engaged in by successful teachers. Professional presentations and publications that are the result of research and scholarship on the topic of teaching and learning are included under the performance assessment of scholarship, not teaching.)
- Participation in pedagogical training and development as a participant, such as attending TSS workshops.
- Liaison and outreach activities with the undergraduate philosophy club; liaison and outreach activities with the philosophy graduate students association.

The following factors are weighed by the departmental committee in the performance assessment of teaching:

- Signed evaluations of teaching completed by students in the class as part of the regular course evaluation process.
- Unsigned evaluations of teaching completed by students in the class as part of the regular course evaluation process and submitted by the individual under review.
- Unsolicited but signed comments or petitions from students regarding teaching performance that are received by and submitted by the individual under review.
- Unsolicited but signed comments or petitions from students regarding teaching performance that are received by the chair of the department (and included in the assessment file with the faculty member's knowledge).
- Course materials, including documentation of course development or redevelopment. This can include online materials, such as a class website.
- A teaching statement, which includes reflections on teaching in general and a brief commentary on the courses taught (and other pedagogical activities undertaken) by the faculty member during the period under review.
- Numbers of undergraduate students taught during the period under review, taking into account the degree of Teaching Assistant support and the responsibilities of Teaching Assistant coordination.
- Numbers of graduate students supervised, and graduate examinations conducted, during the period under review. Faculty members who are not members of the graduate faculty cannot be penalized for lack of participation in graduate teaching, although they may be expected to be more active in undergraduate teaching as a result. Normally, being the advisor or co-advisor for a graduate student will be weighted more heavily than being a member of an advisory committee, unless the committee has appropriate evidence for a different weighting.
- Evidence of effectiveness of graduate supervision, such as documentation of successful student outcomes (e.g. placement, publications, etc.).
- Evidence of effectiveness of GTA supervision.
- Proportion of classes being taught for the first time.
- Documentation of pedagogical development activities.
- Direct knowledge by members of the departmental committee of the teaching or supervisory performance of the individual under review.
- Written reports of class visits by faculty peers to observe teaching, only when these visits occurred with the faculty member's permission and on the explicit understanding that the report will be used as part of the performance assessment process.



- Teaching awards, and the material prepared as a submission for a teaching award nomination.

The criteria used by the department committee for the assessment of teaching are primarily:

1. The *conscientiousness* with which the faculty member carries out his or her teaching duties: taking care in the planning of courses; preparing good course outlines; being available, on a reasonable basis, for student consultation; grading essays and mid-terms reasonably promptly and with suitable comments; submitting grades in an efficient and timely manner; dealing fairly with complaints and requests for special consideration; being knowledgeable about recent published works; being willing to teach more difficult or otherwise more onerous courses; being willing to carry a fair share of graduate supervisory duties.
2. The *effectiveness* of the faculty member in maintaining the interest of students in the courses, in deepening their understanding of challenging and appropriate course material, and in preparing them for future courses.

Normally, a recognised teaching excellence award (such as a COA Teaching Excellence Award) during the period under review will warrant an assessment of Outstanding for teaching.

## 2.5 Assessment of Service

There are four forms of service:

- service to the department;
- service to the University (beyond the department);
- service to the profession;
- service to the community that is related to the faculty member's employment at the University.

The assessment of service takes account of all four of these areas, and does not weight one over the others except insofar as faculty members have the right and responsibility to undertake a fair and reasonable share of administrative responsibilities in the department and the University.

Examples of service to the department include membership in departmental committees, coordinating social events, editing the website or newsletter, assisting in the production of departmental documents (such as quality assurance documents), rating scholarship applicants or applicants to graduate programs, and so on.

Examples of service to the University include membership on Senate and other University committees, assisting in the production of University documents (such as Senate policies), service with UGFA, participation in outreach and recruitment events, and so on. Faculty are also expected to attend convocation ceremonies with reasonable regularity.

Examples of service to the profession include serving as a peer reviewer for publishers or granting agencies, serving as an officer or board member of a professional organization, acting as a journal editor, organizing conferences and workshops, and so on.

Examples of relevant service to the community include media appearances regarding the faculty member's research, presentations to community groups, community service or public office in an area connected to her/his professional interests, and so on.

It is the responsibility of faculty to provide sufficient detail of their service activities to allow the department committee to make an assessment of them.

The criteria used by the department committee for the assessment of service are primarily:

1. the *willingness* with which the faculty member takes on service tasks;
2. the *effectiveness* of the faculty member in carrying out those tasks;
3. and the *amount of time* required by those tasks.

Normally, taking on and effectively carrying out a major service commitment (such as serving as Associate Chair, managing a quality assessment of undergraduate and graduate programs, or organizing a major conference) during the period under review will warrant an assessment of at least Very Good for service.

### **3 Continuation of Probationary or Contractually-limited Appointment**

The department TPPA committee meets annually to assess the progress of probationary faculty towards tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and to recommend (or otherwise) the continuation of probationary or multi-year contractually-limited appointments.

The committee must provide constructive feedback to the faculty member in each of the areas of effort (scholarship, teaching, and service), and must provide a recommendation with respect to the faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for the granting of tenure and promotion. Performance raters are not however assigned to either individual areas of effort or to the overall performance.

### **4 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

The Collective Agreement between the University and UGFA states (§21.6): “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 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 the University. The conferring of Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor obliges the University to support the career of the Member and it obliges the Member to continue to perform in a manner deserving of that support.”

The maximum duration of a probationary appointment is six consecutive years of full-time employment, exclusive of extensions granted for other reasons, such as parental leave, and not counting periods of unpaid leave. A faculty member may apply for the early granting of tenure and conferring of promotion to Associate Professor in either the third, fourth or fifth year of appointment. Otherwise, in the final probationary review, consideration for the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will occur and the decision will be to either grant tenure and confer promotion to Associate Professor or to not grant tenure and terminate the faculty member's appointment.

Applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must be made in writing to the Dean, through the department chair, by May 15.

#### 4.1 External Assessors

Written external assessments of the faculty member's research and other scholarly activities by experts in the faculty member's field are required to support a recommendation of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. External assessments are very important as part of the deliberations process, but are not determinative. Applications for tenure/promotion must include the name and full contact information for six possible external assessors. The department chair must meet with the faculty member, well prior to May 15, to agree to an acceptable list of six assessors. (If agreement cannot be reached between the chair and the faculty member on six appropriate assessors, the department TPPA committee will decide.)

To be considered acceptable, external assessors must have an "arm's length" relationship to the faculty member being considered for tenure/promotion. Accordingly, the following categories of individuals will normally not be considered as suitable external referees: the candidate's dissertation supervisor, the candidate's teachers, the candidate's spouse, individuals who have recently collaborated with the candidate in the production of scholarly works and publications, and individuals who hold grants as collaborators or are submitting grant applications as collaborators.

The faculty member must put together a package of supporting information that they wish to be sent to their external assessors, and must provide this package to the Dean by June 8. Whenever possible, this supporting information should be provided in electronic/digital form. Normally, the supporting information will include a complete and up to date CV, the faculty member's Distribution of Effort, and a sample of research publications; it may also include evidence of teaching effectiveness and other relevant information.

The Dean will select three of the six proposed external assessors and will secure written assessments from them. The Dean will provide copies of these letters of assessment to the department TPPA committee before the start of the committee's deliberations.

#### 4.2 Decision Criteria

Consideration for the conferring of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be given to the faculty member's lifetime contribution to scholarship, teaching 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 scholarship. However, an unsatisfactory record of performance in service contributions may be an important factor in the denial of tenure/promotion.

In philosophy, scholarly achievement takes the form primarily (though not exclusively) of original research in philosophy. Accordingly, it is a probationary faculty member's contributions of this nature that are primarily at issue in the committee's decision whether to recommend the granting of tenure. Probationary faculty are advised to direct the bulk of their pre-tenure scholarship efforts to producing original research in philosophy. Relatively little pre-tenure time should be spent writing book reviews, editing anthologies, editing or writing textbooks, arranging conferences, or writing encyclopaedia entries.

The standard for achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is guided by three considerations:

- a) A probationary faculty member must establish a record of good performance in the department over several years after being hired.

- b) A probationary faculty member must demonstrate an ongoing practice of publishing research results in good quality professional publications, and give evidence of an established and continuing research program.
- c) A probationary faculty member must demonstrate that they have reached a level of accomplishment appropriate to disciplinary expectations for an Associate Professor.

As a rule of thumb, a successful applicant for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will have published, or had accepted for publication, the equivalent of at least six peer-refereed research articles in good venues. (A substantial research monograph from a good academic press would normally count as roughly equivalent to five or six articles; some combination of, say, book chapters or edited anthologies might be equivalent to some peer-refereed articles, though a significant proportion of publications should still be peer-refereed.) In addition, she or he will have been active in the profession through participation in conferences, giving other sorts of research presentations, peer reviewing, publishing invited work, and so on.

The research profile of an applicant for tenure/promotion is a lifetime profile, and will often include work published before arrival at Guelph. However, there must normally have been sufficient scholarly work done since being hired at Guelph to establish a strong pattern of on-going research and publication.

To be granted tenure/promotion, a faculty member should have several years' experience as a teacher, and be able to demonstrate conscientious and effective teaching at the undergraduate level. Normally, a faculty member should also have significant involvement with—and be able to demonstrate good outcomes for—teaching and supervising at the graduate level.

In addition, a faculty member applying for tenure will typically have a history of regular participation in departmental or University committees, and in other forms of service to the profession or the community, such as conference organizing, refereeing work, or outreach. However, the primary responsibility of probationary faculty members is to develop well-established scholarly and teaching profiles, and service expectations for probationary faculty are lower than are normally the case for tenured faculty members.

## **5 Promotion to Professor**

The Collective Agreement between the University and UGFA states (§21.7): “Promotion to Professor recognizes long-term, established and outstanding Scholarship. It is granted in recognition of academic competence, maturity and normally an established international reputation for achievement and expertise in the Member’s field.”

Consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor will occur only on application of the faculty member, which must be made in writing to the Dean, through the department chair, by May 15.

Written external assessments of the faculty member’s research and other scholarly activities by experts in the faculty member’s field are required to support a recommendation of tenure and promotion to Professor. The process and timeline for obtaining these external assessments is the same as that for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, described above in section 4.1.

Promotion to Professor requires substantial progress beyond tenure/promotion to Associate. Normally at least five years will elapse between tenure and promotion to Professor, and normally the faculty member will have published the equivalent of at least one substantial research monograph or six good-quality peer-reviewed articles since their promotion to Associate Professor.

Consideration for the conferring of tenure and promotion to Professor will be given to the faculty member's lifetime contribution to scholarship, teaching and service. All the material that can be considered in making biennial performance assessments, in any of the three areas, is relevant to the evaluation of a faculty member for promotion to Professor. The faculty member's submission to the department TPPA committee should include copies of all scholarly publications for the entire career. The dossier should normally include complete teaching and service information for the previous five years (including teaching materials and student evaluations), as well as additional documentation—chosen by the faculty member from among, and summarizing, normally relevant material—that gives a picture of the lifetime record in these areas. Material in any of the three areas from appointments prior to arriving at Guelph are part of the lifetime record.

Promotion to Professor is open to all career paths. Faculty choosing an alternate career path emphasizing either service or teaching must exhibit a dedication to scholarship that is subject to peer review and that makes a significant contribution to the discipline. It is not assumed that every faculty member will have achieved the sufficient level of scholarly achievement, teaching excellence, or service to the University and community to merit promotion to Professor.

In the normal case, a faculty member with a standard 40% DOE devoted to research must show evidence of an established international reputation for philosophical achievement and expertise. This will typically be demonstrated primarily through a long-term pattern of publication in venues that are generally well-regarded by the English-speaking world's philosophical research community, or by a specialist subcommunity that does not primarily comprise Canadian researchers. In addition to this, in order to recommend conferral of the rank of Professor, the TPPA committee should be satisfied that the faculty member has been a diligent, conscientious and effective teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and has demonstrated a willingness and ability to discharge a fair share of administrative work for the department, college and University, and that there has been adequate service to society and the profession.

## **6 Study/Research Leave Applications**

The Collective Agreement between the University and UGFA states (§22.1): “Study/Research Leave with salary is an essential means of enabling Faculty Members to maintain and enhance their quality as scholars. Such Leave enables the University to maintain and enhance excellence through the Faculty Member's subsequent contributions to its teaching and research programs. To satisfy the purpose of this leave, it is necessary that scholarly objectives are being sought and that both study and research activities, whether singly or in some combination, are consistent with these objectives.”

Full-time faculty members are eligible to apply for Study/Research Leave to commence after six years of continuous faculty service (or its equivalent, including credit towards leave specified in the original letter of appointment) since appointment at the University. Only tenured faculty members may take a Study/Research Leave.

Following return from each Study/Research Leave, faculty are entitled to apply for one semester of Study/Research Leave after three years of active employment, or for two semesters after six years of active employment.

Application for Study/Research Leave must be in writing to the department TPPA committee through the chair of the department. Such applications must be submitted at least one year prior to the intended start date of the Study/Research Leave. The written application should include: a statement of goals; a plan of scholarly activity; an indication of when and where the Leave is expected to be taken; and an up to date Curriculum Vitae.

It is generally most efficient for Study/Research Leave applications to be considered as part of the normal annual deliberations of the TPPA committee. However, leave applications may be submitted at other times of year, and the department committee will consider all written applications for Study/Research Leave as soon as is practicable following their receipt; the committee must make its recommendations to the Dean within twenty days of receipt of the application.

The department committee will assess applications on the basis of their merit and their consonance with the statement of goals of the Study/Research Leave. A faculty member's record of using previous Study/Research Leave for scholarly purposes and the report from the previous Leave will be components in the assessment of the application.

Under exceptional conditions determined by department needs and priorities, and with the approval of the Dean, the University may require that an approved Study/Research Leave be delayed. Such delay cannot be for a period exceeding two years. The date to be used in establishing eligibility for a subsequent period of Study/Research Leave will be the date of return that would have occurred had the Leave not been delayed.

Similarly, under exceptional conditions, and with the approval of the Dean, the faculty member may delay an approved Study/Research Leave. Such delay cannot be for a period exceeding two years. The date to be used in establishing eligibility for a subsequent period of Study/Research Leave will be the date of return that would have occurred had the Leave not been delayed.

Within sixty days of the conclusion of the Leave, the faculty member will provide a written report describing what has been accomplished, in relation to the plan submitted. The report will be provided to the chair and made available to the department committee and Dean.

It is expected that a faculty member will return to the University of Guelph for at least one year following a period of Study/Research Leave.

## **7 Professor Emeritus/Emerita Nominations**

Nominations to the category of Professor Emeritus/Emerita are made by department or school promotion and tenure committees and are subject to final approval by the college promotion and tenure committee. This category is open only to retired professors of the University of Guelph (at any rank). The title granted will be at the rank at the time of retirement. A person employed full-time by the University in any capacity is not eligible.

The prime criterion for nominations will be a sustained and strong contribution to the University of Guelph; such contributions could be in teaching, research or administration. It is hoped that Professors Emeriti will maintain close ties with the University.

The names of Professors Emeriti will be listed in the graduate and undergraduate calendars under the appropriate department or school as long as the association continues. Professors Emeriti will have library privileges equal to those of faculty members, and shall have the right to participate in academic processions of convocation, to attend departmental seminars, to hear outside speakers invited to the University, and to use the mailing address of the University for scholarly purposes. At the discretion of the department chair and the Dean, a Professor Emeritus/Emerita may be allowed to apply for internal and external grants. All faculty awarded Professor Emeritus/Emerita status are eligible to be considered for University Professor Emeritus/Emerita status.

## **8 Adjunct Faculty Appointments**

The purpose of adjunct appointments is to recognize and encourage interactions between the University and persons in business, government, education and the arts for their mutual benefit. Adjunct appointments may also be granted to current faculty to recognize interaction between that individual and another academic unit. Adjunct appointments may be granted to persons within or without the University who are qualified to carry specific responsibilities within a department related to teaching or research. Adjunct appointments will carry the title of Adjunct Professor and as appropriate will be listed in the Undergraduate Calendar of the University.

Adjunct Professor is a status-only academic appointment, usually for a period of three years. As a status-only appointment, it is not normally remunerated by the University of Guelph.

Adjunct appointments are made with support from the department TPPA committee. The chair will complete the Request for Consideration of Adjunct Faculty Status Form, which must be approved by the Dean and the Provost. Following approval by the Provost, the appointee will receive a letter of appointment from the Dean outlining all conditions, rights and responsibilities associated with the Adjunct Appointment.

The following criteria will be used to judge suitability for Adjunct Professor appointments:

1. Evidence of significant and ongoing contributions to a field of expertise relevant to the program or department.
2. Demonstrated willingness and ability to contribute to a program/department.
3. Evidence of an appropriate level of scholarship, such as a relevant academic degree, recent contributions to relevant academic or professional literatures, or relevant professional practice.