

Approved by HHNS Faculty: August 1, 2008

Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion and Performance Assessment

Tenure and promotion decisions and the assessment of faculty performance are made within the framework of the Collective Agreement which is negotiated between the University of Guelph Faculty Association and the University of Guelph. The goals of these assessment and decision processes are to acknowledge success and to encourage continued excellence over the range of a faculty member's responsibilities.

Preamble

The University uses a system of peer evaluation to judge a faculty member's performance for the granting of tenure and/or promotion, and to award promotion increases, annual career increments and performance increments to a faculty member's base salary. This document outlines a) the information that is required, b) the criteria to be used, and c) the procedures that are employed by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee in making recommendations that will go forward to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee for decisions regarding each faculty member.

In compliance with the Collective Agreement, the assessment of performance must be done in the context of an individual's responsibilities. The faculty member's distribution of effort (DOE) is initially determined by the Letter of Appointment. This DOE may be amended, thereafter, but only with the faculty member's consent. The process for amending a faculty member's DOE is carefully outlined in the Collective Agreement. The DOE reflects the distribution of responsibilities in each of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship and service. It is important to note that the traditional departmental component referred to as research is now referred to in the Collective Agreement as scholarship, and this document will refer to this category as research/scholarship to encourage ease of interpretation of this document while also encouraging a progressive attitude towards evolution of these activities. Ideally, a faculty member's responsibilities should harmonize with his/her interests and abilities, and should also fulfil the missions of the Department, the College and the University in teaching, research/scholarship and service. Where it is deemed appropriate, faculty members may make either teaching, research/scholarship or service their primary scholarly activity. Typically, discussions centered on the DOE will take place between a Chair and a faculty member each year during the probationary period and biennially thereafter. The purpose of these discussions is to determine whether the current DOE best reflects the faculty member's responsibilities and career aspirations within the context of the needs of the Department.

The teaching component includes classroom, laboratory, applied teaching and distance education. Service is comprised of administrative responsibilities, participation on committees and service to society. The research/scholarship component may involve traditional discovery-based activities, or may involve other forms of scholarship, including integration, application and sharing of knowledge. These non-discovery forms of research/scholarship may be described in a Scholarship Portfolio.

A completed College Faculty Activity Report must be submitted for the purpose of assessing the progress of probationary appointees toward tenure, or for the assessment of applications for promotion to Professor, or for the assessment of faculty members for salary increases. In the latter case, information is requested pertaining to the last six years, whereas tenure and

promotion applications will include an account of lifetime contributions. The College Faculty Activity Report must include a Teaching Dossier and may include a Scholarship Portfolio, both of which will be described, as they apply to HHNS, later in this document.

Each of the three categories of the DOE must be a minimum of 10%. For example, a faculty member who has a DOE which is heavily weighted towards teaching or service will still be evaluated on a minimum of 10% activity in research/scholarship. These research/scholarship activities could be comprised of a variety of forms, ie. extending from discovery, integration, application and/or sharing of knowledge; however, they should be clearly distinct from student contact activities that are being assessed in the teaching category or the activities being assessed under service.

A. INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Within the following areas of responsibility, as described in detail in the College Faculty Activity Report, performance will be rated according to the items listed below:

1) Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching

a) Quality

- i) The Department will provide student evaluations of instructors for each graduate or undergraduate course in which the faculty member is involved in student contact. The Department-approved College Teaching Evaluation form will be used for this purpose.
- ii) In consultation with the Chair, a faculty member may request a non-student evaluation of her/his teaching. The number and identity of the evaluators will be arranged in consultation with the Department Committee, and the evaluation will be done at a mutually agreed time.
- iii) A teaching dossier is required of all faculty. Minimally, this should provide a statement of teaching philosophy, possibly divided into sections reflecting different types or levels of courses that the faculty member is involved in. Plans for future course development could also be included. It would not be considered a problem if this section were as short as 1 or 2 pages. Other materials are allowed, including course outlines and sample exams, but these are not needed for most candidates. The faculty member could consult with the Chair to determine if there is a need to add materials beyond a statement of teaching philosophy.

b) Quantity

- i) Hours of student contact (lectures, labs, tutorials) and number of students.
- ii) Course coordination (the commitment of time to be estimated by the faculty member; eg = one-fifth total hours of the course). Does this include lecture preparation, student administration, office hours, WebCT time, e-mail time etc?
- iii) Advising of graduate students and membership on advisory and exam committees.

2) Research/Scholarship

a) Publications

This will include the quality and number of peer-reviewed publications. A faculty member may want to point out the specific qualities of a paper by submitting additional material such as reviewer comments or other documentation. Additionally, the faculty member may provide a few sentences describing the significance of these papers and the original contribution that they represent (similar to NSERC F100). Discussion of journal quality (by those familiar with the field) may be included in the assessment in addition to consideration of the quality of individual research contributions. However, citation analyses and impact factors are problematic indices, particularly in comparisons across fields, and their use in the review process is not encouraged.

Papers that have been accepted but not yet published may be listed. However, the acceptance of these must be clearly documented and, in subsequent T&P assessments, these items must be clearly identified as having been submitted previously as accepted manuscripts. Manuscripts submitted to refereed journals may be listed. Consideration of submitted manuscripts will be mainly limited to candidates facing tenure decisions.

b) Grants and Contracts

A list of currently registered projects will be provided by the faculty member and the name and annual dollar value of grants will be indicated. As well, include the type of award (e.g., grant, contract, operating, or equipment), granting agent, ownership of award (i.e., shared or unshared) and, for shared grants, the principal investigator since this role usually carries special responsibility. The Department recognizes that different areas of research have different operating costs. Consequently, less emphasis will be placed on the amount of funding held than on the fact that funding has been awarded and, where appropriate, the fact of sustained research support.

c) Presentations Given

A faculty member should list the scientific presentations (oral, poster, etc.) authored or co-authored at conferences or meetings for which there were no proceedings published. A faculty member's personal presentations should be highlighted.

d) Other evidence of research activity

A faculty member should present other evidence of research activity such as patents, research contract reports, advising of postdoctoral fellows and collaborative activities. A faculty member may want to point out particular qualities of a patent or report by submitting additional material, and the faculty member may provide a few sentences describing the significance of these items and the original contribution that they represent (similar to NSERC F100).

e) Scholarship Portfolio

The Scholarship Portfolio is a new component of the HHNS version of the Faculty Activity Report, and it is designed to allow effective peer review of non-discovery type activities in research/scholarship. A Scholarship Portfolio may be prepared by any faculty member who wishes to describe scholarly activities that do not fit into categories

2 a)-d). This could highlight activities such as curriculum and course development, or design and implementation of programs that extend beyond the University. As mentioned earlier, these should not overlap with teaching contact hours and service responsibilities which are being assessed in other categories.

3. Service to the University and Society

- a) Membership on and chairing of Department, College and University committees, including the University of Guelph Faculty Association. Faculty may wish to provide evidence of quality of contribution to the work of committees.
- b) Service in the research community, including membership on editorial boards and grant review committees, organization of workshops, symposia or scientific meetings.
- c) Service to professional organizations.
- d) Other service to society and the community, such as membership on expert committees.
- e) Consultation, referral and extension activities on behalf of the University.

4. Personal Development

A faculty member may describe accomplishments and special circumstances not included above.

B. TENURE AND PROMOTION

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Awarding of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are linked in one step. This is a single decision that is made during the probationary period which normally does not exceed six years from the time of hire as an Assistant Professor, although this period may be extended (as described in the Collective Agreement). Tenure decisions will be based on performance in undergraduate and graduate teaching, scholarly research and service within the context of the DOE described in the Letter of Appointment, or as subsequently amended.

The probationary faculty member should pay close attention to the process of being considered for tenure and promotion. There are three possible routes by which this can take place, as follows.

1) During the third, fourth or fifth year of appointment, the probationary faculty member may apply in writing to the Dean, via the departmental Chair, to be considered for promotion and tenure. This letter should propose a list of at least three external reviewers that will be contacted for letters of support. These letters will only be available to the college committee, so discussions and recommendations at the departmental level will focus on the contents of the College Faculty Activity Report. The candidate and Chair will discuss the choices for external referees and pass on the list to the Dean. There is a risk to this process, in that the candidate has only one chance to apply before the final year of eligibility, and if not successful, will have to wait until the final year to be considered again.

2) The candidate may submit a completed College Faculty Activity Report, which the department T&P committee would review and potentially ask a strong candidate to consider an

immediate application for tenure and promotion. If this type of application is unsuccessful, it will not count against the ability of the candidate to initiate an application for tenure and promotion in subsequent years. In contrast, an unsuccessful candidate-initiated application will invalidate the departmental process from occurring, until the final year of the appointment, as described below.

3) The candidate will have to apply during the final year of their probationary appointment, irrespective of what has occurred up to that point.

The official date for submission of documents is currently defined as August 15th by the Collective Agreement (likely to be the following Monday if it falls on a weekend), and this is the due date for submission of College Faculty Activity Reports, as well as letters requesting tenure and promotion. In the past, there was an earlier date for some of these documents, and the new procedure may create some time constraints. In practice, all faculty, but especially probationary faculty, should strongly consider early submission of their documents. If the probationary faculty member is requesting consideration for tenure, the Chair can review the activity report and the suggested reviewers, and help the candidate strengthen the request for tenure before it is passed to the Dean and the activity report before it is passed to the departmental T&P committee.

The Chair may also counsel the applicant on whether the application is strong enough. If the probationary faculty member is not requesting consideration for tenure, early submission of the activity report will still allow the Chair to recommend improvements, and give the departmental T&P committee a chance to recommend that a strong candidate go forward for consideration. Lastly, the probationary faculty member in the final year should look for as much constructive input as possible before the August 15th deadline.

There must be evidence of an ongoing scholarly approach to teaching. Evidence for teaching effectiveness will include a teaching dossier which will contain, as a minimum, a statement of teaching philosophy and goals (illustrating their development over a period of years). The faculty member may provide course outlines, copies of examinations and/or lecture materials if he/she feels there is a special need to do so. Student evaluations in both undergraduate and graduate courses and signed comments will be provided by the Department to cover the faculty member's full probationary period, and the faculty member may choose to include non-attributed comments from students. In addition, the faculty member must include a current teaching dossier. Evidence should be presented to indicate participation in the graduate program by teaching courses, advising students, serving on advisory committees and/or serving on examination committees.

The faculty member must demonstrate sustained research/scholarly activity that has been conducted while on faculty at the University of Guelph and has attained some level of national recognition, if this is deemed applicable. This is a traditional criterion applied to discovery-type research. Activities in other areas of scholarship may be assessed in a less restrictive framework. For discovery-type research, the faculty member should have generated independent work from their research program at the University of Guelph, and should have been senior researcher on some of the work, which should include publication in peer-reviewed journals and might additionally comprise book chapters, authorship or editorship of books, and presentations at scientific meetings. Other types of publications such as reports on contract work which disseminate research results also may be submitted. To support a submission for tenure, the faculty member should present his/her choice of up to three pieces of research arising from work that was performed while on faculty at Guelph, and address the significance of these research items in an accompanying letter (similar to NSERC Form 100). The faculty member should discuss the reasons for any delays in establishing a research program. The contribution to training qualified research personnel will be considered. Faculty members who have a DOE

heavily weighted toward teaching must demonstrate substance in undergraduate teaching and creativity in pedagogy either in general or as it applies to the faculty member’s discipline. The faculty member should have been the primary creative force in the majority of this work.

Service is an important component of effort for probationary faculty, and there must be evidence of an effective contribution at some level (Department, College, University and/or the larger community). Evidence may include, for example, external letters of support addressed to the Chair.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is reserved for those faculty members who have attained high scholarly standing in their research discipline or in their pedagogy. Consistent and effective contributions to undergraduate and graduate teaching are expected. Decisions should be made within the context of the individual’s history of DOE, which may have changed over time.

Promotion to professor primarily acknowledges the attainment of an international stature by the faculty member. This will be demonstrated by evidence of scholarly research in their discipline or in pedagogy which may include publications in peer-reviewed journals, chapters in books and authorship or editorship of books. Other types of publications such as reports on contract work which disseminate research results may be submitted. Up to ten pieces of scholarship chosen by the faculty member will be evaluated. The scholarship must be evaluated by eminent external referees. The material submitted will be used in the determination of the degree to which the faculty member has established an international reputation.

Demonstration of initiative and leadership in service to the Department, College, and University is expected. Evidence of service to the broader scientific community is anticipated.

C. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

1. In addition to consideration for tenure and promotion, faculty members are also reviewed for performance of their duties on a biennial basis. The College Faculty Activity Report forms the basis for Departmental recommendations. An Assessment Report is completed by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, and this report is forwarded, with recommendations, to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.
2. The Collective Agreement does not provide “performance descriptors”, but the article entitled “Compensation” uses performance descriptors to determine the remuneration for Performance Increments, and in some cases, Annual Career Increments.

A: Tenure and Promotion Committees will use the Performance Raters that were in place previously as per the Collective Agreement, but with the process that was in place in 2003, i.e.:

PERFORMANCE RATING DESCRIPTIONS

Unsatisfactory	Improvement Required/Developmental	Good	Very Good	Outstanding
Performance is unsatisfactory. Performance is unsatisfactory in at least two of the areas	Performance requires improvement and/or development. Performance requires improvement in two of	Performance is Good. Performance is at least good in two of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship	Performance is Very Good. Performance is very good in two of the areas of teaching, research/scholarship	Performance is Outstanding. Performance is outstanding in two of the areas of

of teaching, research/scholarship or service.	the areas of teaching, research/scholarship or service, and is poor in the other area of responsibility.	or service and not Unsatisfactory in the other area of responsibility.	or service and at least Good in the other area of responsibility.	teaching, research/scholarship or service, and with international recognition, and at least Very Good in the other area of responsibility.
-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In terms of translating the performance descriptors into salary adjustments, an evaluation of Unsatisfactory or Improvement Required/Developmental would be associated with no performance increment in the two years that follow the assessment. A faculty member receiving an evaluation of Good will receive a salary adjustment equal to the standard Performance Increment in each of the two years that follow the performance assessment (e.g., \$450 for each of 2008-2009 and 2009-2010). Faculty members whose performance is rated as Very Good will receive 1 point toward additional salary provided from the Performance Pool (see Collective Agreement clause on Performance Increments for details on how the allocations will be made), and faculty members whose performance is rated as Outstanding will receive 2 points toward additional salary. There is no limit on the number of faculty within a College or Department that may be given Very Good or Outstanding performance assessment. Also, there is no ranking of faculty within a Department or College.

D. COMMUNICATION OF DECISIONS

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee will provide detailed feedback concerning decisions of tenure, promotion and performance ratings to each faculty member. It is expected that the Dean or designate will follow up this letter with an individual meeting with the faculty member to discuss this feedback and any changes to duties or responsibilities that may necessary to ensure future success in subsequent reviews.

E FACULTY LEAVE

Faculty Members on Leave with Salary. Faculty returning from Leave with Salary will be evaluated in light of the attainment of the goals stated in the application for leave. The report on the leave submitted within 2 months of the faculty member's return to campus will form the basis for the evaluation.

F. DEPARTMENTAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

1) Teaching

Effective teaching performance will normally be defined by an average score of 3.5 or greater considering all questions listed on the Department evaluation form that apply to the course and that are under the control of the faculty member. A faculty member must present a basic teaching dossier (statement of graduate and undergraduate teaching aims, directions and goals), and may also present materials such as course outlines, tests, examinations or lecture material for evaluation. Non-attributed comments may be included if the faculty member wishes to do so.

Graduate student advising will also be considered. A faculty member will be consistently involved in graduate student advising, with good success in graduation of students who contribute to research publication. Enthusiastic service on graduate advisory committees and examinations is expected. Unsatisfactory standing will be identified by any or all of the following: a pattern in which students switch advisors and/or fail to complete programs for reasons other than their desire to seize professional opportunities, a pattern of formalized and

substantiated complaints concerning the advisor-student relationship or the laboratory work environment, a pattern of lack of service on advisory and examination committees.

2) Research/Scholarship

Normally one peer-reviewed publication per year per 25% of the DOE associated with research/scholarship will be viewed as good performance. Manuscripts in press will be considered, but the faculty member must document their acceptance. Listed articles that have been considered in a previous Tenure, Promotion and Performance Assessment must be so identified. Documentation of the impact of scholarship activities may be submitted by the candidate to support their scholarship portfolio. Professional and informed review of scholarship activities may be solicited by the Chair and used to assess performance.

3) Service

Service to the University Community is expected of all faculty. Documentation of the impact of this service may be submitted by the candidate for evaluation. Professional and informed review of service activities may be solicited by the Chair and used to assess performance.