

2013

Criteria

Tenure, Promotion and Performance Review

School of Environmental Design and Rural Development
Ontario Agricultural College
University of Guelph



Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	2
A) ACADEMIC MISSION OF THE SCHOOL	3
B) CRITERIA for each of the possible considerations	3
1. Criteria – Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor	4
1.1 Teaching	4
1.2 Research and Scholarship	4
1.3 Service	4
2. Criteria – Promotion to the Rank of Professor	5
2.1 Teaching	5
2.2 Research and Scholarship	5
2.3 Service	5
3. Performance Criteria - Assessment of Performance for the Period of the Review	6
3.1 Teaching	6
3.2 Research and Scholarship	7
3.3 Service	8
3.4 Guidelines for Overall Performance Rating	8
C) EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS	9
1. Teaching	9
2. Research and Scholarly Activities	10
3. Service	12
D) GENERAL INFORMATION	14
1. Distribution of Effort	14
1.1 Teaching	14
1.2 Scholarly Activities (Research and Creative)	14
1.3 Service to the University and Society	15
1.4 Career Paths	16
1.5 Buyouts and Secondments	16
1.6 Annual Distribution of Effort	16
2. Faculty Reporting Process	16
3. Study/Research Leaves	17
4. Professor Emeritus	17
5. The SEDRD Tenure, Promotion and Performance Review Committee	18
5.1 Committee Composition	18
5.2 Committee Procedures	19
6. Appendices	20
6.1 Distribution of Effort Form	21
6.2 Teaching Dossier	22
6.3 Sabbatical Leave Form	23

GUIDELINES DOCUMENT FOR TENURE, PROMOTION AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

School of Environmental Design and Rural Development Ontario Agricultural College

Date of Approval by Provost:

INTRODUCTION

The information contained in Section A, B, and C of this document is to be considered by Tenure and Promotion Committees in the context of the relevant terms and conditions of the Collective Agreement between the University of Guelph and the University of Guelph Faculty Association (UGFA). Tenure and Promotion Committees are also directed to specifically reference the Tenure, Promotion and Performance Assessment Article (Article 21) of the Collective Agreement, the faculty member's agreed upon Distribution of Effort, and the Schedule of Dates Document provided annually by the Provost's Office.

Tenure and Promotion Committees are responsible for confidential deliberations related to the following possible considerations:

- 1) Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor;
- 2) Progress toward granting of Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor;
- 3) Promotion to the rank of Professor;
- 4) Performance Assessment.

This Document contains three sections:

- A) **ACADEMIC MISSION:**
Statement of the agreed upon department academic mission which forms the basis for criteria and evidence.
- B) **CRITERIA:**
Statement of the criteria (in addition to that in the Collective Agreement) which forms the basis of the Tenure and Promotion Committee deliberations and its recommendations for each of the possible considerations as indicated above; and
- C) **EVIDENCE:**
Evidence of scholarly contributions, activities and accomplishments in each area of effort, that is relevant and appropriate for consideration by the Tenure and Promotion Committee related to the four possible considerations (i.e. 1 through 4 above) and established criteria.

A) **ACADEMIC MISSION OF THE SCHOOL:**

The School of Environmental Design and Rural Development is dedicated to education, research and practice in the planning, design, conservation, preservation, management and development of cultural and natural environments in both Canadian and International settings. Each of the programs has a mission statement that reflects the individual discipline and acknowledges the collective spirit of each to SEDRD.

- Landscape Architecture – In the professional programs in Landscape Architecture by promoting the planning, design, construction, and management of landscapes with the commitment to the conservation, preservation, maintenance and/or improvement of physical, social, ecological and cultural environments.
- Rural Planning and Development and Capacity Development and Extension – In the professional programs in Rural Planning and Development and in the field of Capacity Development and Extension by enhancing human capacity and the quality of life of rural and remote people and communities, acknowledging and respecting the diversity of needs and perspectives, and by managing knowledge and enabling learning and communication processes. Development of the Planning Profession to advance the welfare and integrity of rural and remote communities and environments both in Canada and throughout the world.
- Rural Studies – The Ph.D. in Rural Studies includes two fields *Sustainable Rural Communities* and *Sustainable Landscape Systems*. The Ph.D. provides opportunities for advanced study and research on the integration of socio-cultural and bio-physical components of capacity development, design or planning of landscape systems and rural communities.

B) **CRITERIA** for each of the possible considerations:

Applications for Tenure and/or Promotion must be made in writing by the faculty member to the Dean, through the School Director, by May 15th.

Faculty members intending to submit an application for Tenure and/or Promotion must meet with the Director in April to commence the process of agreeing on a list of six acceptable External Assessors. If agreement cannot be reached, the School T&P Committee will decide on the acceptable assessors to be provided to the Dean.

Faculty members applying for Tenure and/or Promotion must provide the Director with their T&P material early in June. The Director will then forward the material to the Dean by June 8th, who sends the package to the External Assessors.

Information on providing appropriate evidence is available in section C.1.

1. Criteria, in each area of effort, for the 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:

The maximum duration of a probationary appointment is six consecutive years. For tenure to be granted there must be acceptable levels of performance in areas of teaching, scholarly productivity, university and professional service.

Granting of tenure will automatically confer promotion to Associate Professor. A recommendation for such promotion will require that, in addition to meeting criteria for tenure, the individual will have a continuing pattern of research, professional service, outreach and scholarship, and have made a consistently strong contribution to the teaching programs and administration of the School and the University. Minimum qualifications for considering the granting of tenure are listed below.

1.1 Teaching:

- Demonstrated ability as a teacher, at different levels and in various settings. An effective contribution to current curriculum and instructional development.
- Has made a solid contribution to graduate education as a supervisor and committee member.
- The assessment of teaching will be based on a dossier containing teaching evaluation reports and documented evidence of teaching innovation and excellence. The documentation of teaching evaluations should include the number of respondents to the evaluation.

1.2 Research and Scholarship:

- Evidence of research or scholarly activity beyond the thesis level. This would be indicated by peer-reviewed and professional publications, as well as some combination of: technical and occasional papers, contract reports, presentations of papers at professional meetings, research funding or creative works. This includes items “in press” or “accepted for publication”.

1.3 Service:

- An ongoing, diversified outreach and/or professional service program as indicated by projects, reports, papers and presentations, organization executives/board of directors, with a broad client community base.
- Contributions to School, College and University committees and handles tasks willingly and effectively.

The three areas of teaching, scholarly activity and service are typically expected to be good or better for a faculty member to be granted tenure.

The Committee must be satisfied that the individual applying for tenure will continue to make a constructive contribution to the School.

In making its recommendations on tenure, the Committee will consider the complete lifetime scholarly activity, service and outreach record of the individual, a teaching dossier containing teaching evaluation reports and relevant curriculum materials, and wherever appropriate service dossier.

2. Criteria, in each area of effort, for Promotion to the Rank of Professor:

Promotion from Associate Professor is not assured, regardless of the length of an individual's service. A recommendation that an individual be promoted to Professor will require:

2.1 Teaching:

- A sustained record of good to excellent teaching.
- Evidence that the individual has made a solid contribution to graduate education as a supervisor and committee member.
- The assessment of teaching will be based on a dossier containing teaching evaluation reports and documented evidence of teaching innovation and excellence. The documentation of teaching evaluations should include the number of respondents to the evaluation.

2.2 Research and Scholarship:

- A proven and continuing record of research and scholarship, judged not simply in terms of quantity but by quality and contribution to the discipline including satisfactory external assessment of scholarship. This means continuing output in terms of peer-reviewed and professional publications, plus some combination of technical and occasional papers, contract reports, presentations of papers at professional meetings, research funding or creative works. This includes items "in press" or "accepted for publication".

2.3 Service:

- Evidence that an individual has made an effective contribution towards providing leadership in the School.

- Active and effective participation in School, College and University administration.
- Demonstrated leadership in the profession or discipline and community outreach.

The assessment of research, creative and scholarly activity, and professional service, outreach and collaboration will be based on a lifetime summary and comprehensive curriculum vitae with relevant supporting materials (extent to which publications are in peer-reviewed journals and professional publications and materials, and reflect independent creativity). The Committee will consider both the breadth and depth of scholarly work and/or service, the extent of external recognition received, success in securing external funding for research and outreach, and evidence of leadership in University administration, educational development, or other career path focus areas.

3. Performance Criteria for Each Area of Effort, for the **Assessment of Performance for the Period of the Review:**

In accordance with the UGFA Collective Agreement (Article 21) and faculty development principles, the University expects that faculty members will normally engage in all three of the following areas of activity: teaching, scholarly activities and service/administration. The University has taken steps to accommodate a number of acceptable paths for career development. This is reflected in alternate career paths and diversity in the distribution of effort for faculty. It is therefore important that the performance evaluation process recognize those areas with the greatest emphasis within the distribution of effort. The salary steps awarded through the performance review 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.

3.1 Teaching:

On the basis of its evaluation of teaching and supervisory activities, the Committee will arrive at an overall assessment of teaching, using the following categories.

- **Unsatisfactory:**
A teaching performance that is unacceptable in terms of its quality (and/or quantity in some circumstances).
- **Improvement Required/Developmental:**
A teaching performance that is below acceptable standards in terms of its quality and/or quantity in some circumstances.
- **Good:**
A teaching performance that is expected in terms of its quantity and quality.

- **Very Good:**
A teaching performance that is higher than expected in terms of its quality and/or quantity in some circumstances.
- **Outstanding:**
A teaching performance that is exemplary in terms of its quality and/or quantity in some circumstances.

3.2 Research and Professional Scholarship:

Sole Authorship – Credit will be provided for sole authorship and quality of work, including: books, chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles, juried designs, professional reports and other publications.

Multiple Authorships – Normally, full credit will be given to each co-author. Co-authorship with students is part of a faculty member’s mentoring responsibilities and is encouraged. In interdisciplinary fields of research, co-authorship is expected and multiple authors are not unusual. The candidate should provide details of his/her role in a co-authored publication. The Committee will use its judgment to weigh its evaluation where numerous authors publish together.

Long Term Research – Long-term authorship patterns may be taken into account in cases of promotion. It is recognized that the nature of some research programs dictates long-term activity during which publications do not appear on an annual basis. Accordingly, faculty engaged in such research should outline in a written statement for the Committee the nature of the research program and the progress made in the current period of evaluation.

Research, Creativity and Professional Scholarship will be rated using the following categories:

- **Unsatisfactory:**
Performance that is clearly unacceptable and clearly below acceptable standards.
- **Improvement Required/Developmental:**
Performance that is below minimal acceptable standards, considering both quantity and quality; little evidence of research activity.
- **Good:**
Performance that is expected, considering both quality and quantity.
- **Very Good:**
Performance that is higher than expected, considering both quantity and quality. For example, this might be some combination of: a refereed journal article, a successful grant application, conference presentation, or an occasional paper.

- **Outstanding:**
Performance that is clearly exemplary, considering both quantity and quality. For example, this might be some combination of: a book, a major theoretical article, substantive journal articles, a successful grant application, conference presentations, or occasional papers.

3.3 Service:

On the basis of feedback from colleagues and clients working with the faculty member, an overall evaluation of service will be made:

- **Unsatisfactory:**
Performance that is unacceptable in the area of service to the University and society considering both quantity and quality.
- **Improvement Required/Developmental:**
Performance that falls below the expected contribution in service to the University and society, considering both quantity and quality.
- **Good:**
Performance that indicates an expected contribution in service to the University and society, considering both quantity and quality.
- **Very Good:**
Performance that indicates a higher than expected contribution in service to the University and society, considering both quantity and quality.
- **Outstanding:**
Performance that clearly indicates an exemplary contribution in service to the University and society, considering both quantity and quality.

3.4 Guidelines for Overall Performance Rating – Based on Assessment of Each Area of Effort:

All evidence of teaching, scholarly activity (research and creative); administrative activity, and professional service, outreach, and collaboration as described above will be carefully assessed by the Committee and reported to the College Committee.

Within ten working days, the completed assessment/progress reports will be signed by all Committee members present and forwarded to the Chair of the College Committee.

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. It is reiterated here that it is important that

the performance evaluation process recognize the greatest area of emphasis in the faculty member's distribution of effort.

Performance Criteria for Each Area of Effort				
Unsatisfactory	Improvement Required/Developmental	Good	Very Good	Outstanding
<p>Performance is unsatisfactory. Performance is Unsatisfactory in at least two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration</p>	<p>Performance requires improvement and/or development. Performance requires improvement in two of the areas of teaching, research or service/administration and less than good in the other area of responsibility</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>

C) EVIDENCE OF SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The following are examples of scholarly contributions, activities, and accomplishments in each area of effort, which are relevant and appropriate for consideration by the Tenure and Promotion Committee as part of its deliberations processes:

1. Teaching:

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the teaching programs of the School and to professional development in a manner consistent with a high level of professionalism and to a degree that is consistent with standard (or agreed upon modified) expectations.

Teaching Dossier – Consistent with the UGFA Collective Agreement, all faculty involved in instruction will be reviewed through the submission of a Teaching Dossier as part of the regular Tenure, Promotion and Performance Review process. Each faculty member's Teaching Dossier is unique to their own career path and distribution of effort. According to Faculty Policies, the Dossier will include, as a minimum, a teaching statement. The teaching statement usually includes:

- The faculty member's teaching goals and philosophy,
- A summary table and contextual statement of student evaluations, and
- A review of the teaching semester(s) and future plans.

In addition, the faculty members should submit supporting documentation of their teaching accomplishments. It is usual and advised for all submissions to be accompanied by an interpretive summary which could include:

- Number of courses taught (GTA support provided), number of graduate students supervised and graduate committee responsibilities (examinations and defences) with any notable anomalies,
- Representative student projects, course materials, manuals, special notes,
- Teaching innovations and materials used to promote student learning,
- Support for teaching and learning within the School and the University (e.g. guest lectures, teaching workshops, efforts to improve teaching), and
- Research related to teaching and learning.

Student Evaluations – Course Evaluations will be carried out using the School’s standard teaching evaluation form. Each faculty member is to submit for review, the score from: *OVERALL, what is your opinion of the overall effectiveness of the instructor as a teacher*, from the approved student evaluation form for all courses taught since the previous evaluation. All signed student comments must be submitted to the T&P Committee. Unsigned comments do not need to be provided, but comments must not be screened; that is, if you decide to provide unsigned comments – they must all be provided.

Teaching / Supervisory Activities – These include development of new courses, introduction of innovative teaching material or methods; training of teaching assistants, supervision of undergraduate and graduate theses and projects, membership of supervisory and examination committees, and additional teaching not counted towards teaching load. Training and professional development courses will also be eligible for evaluation. Note: heavy commitments to supervision, mentoring and follow-up with letters of reference take excessive amounts of time and can be considered in the overall assessment.

2. Research Scholarly Activities:

All faculty members are expected to be involved in scholarly (research and creative) activities consistent with DOE. Scholarly activity should be evident (such as URLs, or DOI numbers). The dissemination of results in appropriate format, including conference presentations, journal activities, monographs and books must be documented.

The Committee looks for evidence of peer-recognized excellence, appropriate to a faculty member’s stage of development, in some scholarly and professional media (including the impact of research excellence such as impact factors, or citations) or other recognitions. The range of activities undertaken or materials produced will vary depending on the faculty member’s career path.

As evidence, the Committee will consider the quantity and quality of research and creative activities in refereed venues of international stature. The essential condition for all this work, irrespective of its form and audience, is that it must be publicly accessible and must have been subjected to academic and professional peer review and evaluation (in press and accepted for publication items are included).

Materials to be Evaluated (as set out in the T&P form):

Faculty must draw a vertical line to differentiate new publications from those previously reported. Please see an example below showing the line in front of a publication:

| Caldwell, Wayne. 2009. The evolving nature of agricultural production: Implications for Planners. Plan Canada Vol. 49(4). Pp. 27-30

- **Books, Book Chapters, Monographs** (edited or written) – The Committee will consider the level of scholarly or organizational contribution when evaluating these materials.
- **Publications in Peer-Reviewed Journals and Peer-Reviewed or Juried Design Competitions or Reviews** – In evaluating a research publication or design scholarship, the Committee will take into account the balance between professional and peer-reviewed work and the quality of the venue (e.g. impact factors or success/rejection rates). Evidence of peer-reviewed excellence must be documented. Disclosure of conflict of interest must be indicated.
- **Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceedings** – A conference abstract or manuscript that is only informally refereed in its entirety would not normally be considered the equivalent of a peer-reviewed journal manuscript and should be listed separately from the peer-reviewed material.
- **Book and Article Reviews** – These will be considered as signs of scholarly activity but would not normally be given as much weighting as research publications.
- **Professional Journals.**
- **Technical Journals or Reports to Private or Government Agencies** – A publicly accessible technical journal article or report may be considered as evidence of scholarship (faculty should identify whether peer-reviewed or not). Care must be taken to avoid double counting of technical or scholarly reports if either is subsequently published in peer-reviewed journals. As a Professional School the Committee will consider alternative measures of merit other than peer-reviewed.
- **Conference Papers, Posters and Colloquia** – Conference papers and posters to scholarly bodies and colloquia given to academic and professional audiences are also considered as signs of scholarly activity. An invitation to deliver scholarly talks or major addresses to one's peers is a measure of leadership in the field (e.g. invited keynote speakers).
- **Exhibitions and other Evidence of Creative Professional Practice** – Materials need to demonstrate that the work has been subject to critical review by peers and is publicly accessible.
- **Popular Press – Letters, articles, editorials.**
- **Editing of Conference Proceedings.**

- **Juried Design Competitions** – Recognition will be given to creative activities subject to critical review by peers. Where independent and double-blind peer reviews constitutes the highest standard, a blind review by a jury of peers can be considered normal in juried design competitions.
- **Editing** – Editing of major works like journals and books may be identified as scholarly activities.
- Additional Evidence of Scholarship (e.g. patents, software packages, etc.).
- **Work Under Review.**
- **Grant Awards** – The award of a research grant is tangible evidence of accomplishment in the scholarly activity category and will be recognized by the Committee.
- **Contract (Research)** – Generally, when faculty members are directly paid for work from sources outside of the University (e.g. consulting activity) no consideration will be given by the Committee. However, if provided with sufficient supporting documentation, the Committee will consider the quality and scope of the project and the extent to which the work involves scholarly activity as opposed to a simple provision of services. If a peer-reviewed publication results from contract work, it will be assessed in the normal manner.

3. Service:

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the ongoing activities of the School, the College and the University. Service to the discipline, profession and to society are also expected of all faculty, to foster the goals of the University and the School. As part of their normal duties, faculty have the responsibility to provide service through participation in committees, bodies, programs, and activities such as professional bodies, community-based planning groups, government boards or commissions, and charitable or service organizations. Faculty members may provide a dossier detailing evidence of service, which could include feedback from colleagues and clients and letters of appreciation.

With the development of School research and outreach activities, it is expected that all faculty will make contributions to the interdisciplinary goals of the SEDRD programs. To achieve this, it is essential that faculty demonstrate a spirit of collegiality, which encourages active participation of the individual with other faculty or groups at the University, while actively introducing them to the School. Contributions may include collaboration in scholarly activity, interdisciplinary teaching and course design, joint publishing or conference contributions, interdisciplinary committees and programs.

Activities Evaluated – Service to the University:

- Graduate or undergraduate co-ordinator
- Student counselor
- Chairing School committees
- Membership on School and College Committees
- Chairing committees external to the School
- Membership on committees
- Serving on Senate and Senate Committees
- Special assignments or secondments
- Faculty Association Executive

Activities Evaluated – Service to Society:

- Service to non-academic community is service to society, such as: extension activities, consultancies/collaborations with governments, international development agencies, or the private sector, communities or other NGO's, or other activities which further the University's mission of service to society.
- Activity reports to stakeholders
- Synthesis of activities reported in professional or popular publications
- Integration of activities in teaching and scholarly activities
- Letters of evaluation or references
- Works subject to public scrutiny may be identified through documented public discourse.

Activities Evaluated – Professional and Disciplinary Activities:

These include:

- Executive or committee positions in professional organizations related to the discipline
- Serving as a co-operant to groups and organizations to enhance professional upgrading/training including international development contracts
- Serving as external examiner of graduate theses, refereeing for promotion or tenure, conference organizing, serving on editorial boards, and grant, paper and design reviews.

D) General Information:

The material in this section is above-and-beyond what is required by the University template, and is provided for further information.

1. Distribution of Effort:

Faculty in the School of Environmental Design and Rural Development will normally be engaged in several activities including teaching, scholarly activity and service to the University and society. Faculty members have the right to choose diverse career paths and different distribution of effort, in consultation with the School Director and Dean. All faculty members are expected to teach, participate in scholarly activity, demonstrate creativity and originality, and contribute service to the University appropriate to their rank.

1.1 Teaching:

This includes undergraduate and graduate courses, consultation with students, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, and participation on supervisory and examination committees. Teaching can also include the development, design and delivery of distance education, professional development courses, and training courses and programs. Innovation in teaching will also be recognized and encouraged. The Committee will consider the quality of all teaching activities, and only the quantity of teaching that exceeds normal expectations. A DOE for teaching of 40% would normally include four scheduled courses, some special studies involvement, and supervision of a normal number of graduate students (normal = an equitable distribution of graduate students per faculty member over time).

1.2 Scholarly Activities (Research and Creative):

The primary basis for assessing an individual's research record is the person's professional and scholarly materials and publications (including publications with graduate students), which will be judged in terms of quality and not simply quantity. A faculty member's scholarly work can include peer-reviewed research publications, design competitions, technical reports, professional and creative works and awards, presentations, book reviews, editorships and other activities. There will be recognition of innovation and its outcomes. For papers accepted for publication, galley proofs or evidence of final acceptance must be included. Other work in progress could be listed as "under review". The work under review will not be given consideration for merit, but will be noted as productivity.

In addition, the Committee will consider the extent to which the individual has succeeded in obtaining research support (especially from external agencies, and as appropriate to the research area), has participated in conferences, presented colloquia, etc. Obtaining support for research may be a positive indicator of ability in research, but failure to obtain support will not be used as a negative indicator.

Faculty must distinguish between contracts and research grants. Activities for which faculty members are paid as part of external remunerative activities (e.g. consulting, technical reports) will normally not be considered by Tenure and Promotion Committees in the assessment of performance for the purpose of merit (i.e. assigning individual and overall performance raters). Credit can come if the work provides scholarly activity (publications and/or use in teaching) beyond the expected service contribution or for unpaid service. Faculty members are encouraged to show the number of proposals submitted, even though unsuccessful.

1.3 Service to the University and Society:

This includes service to the School, the College or the University in the form of committee work, student counseling, Senate, cross-disciplinary project work, or other significant responsibilities.

The SEDRD's link with the professions of landscape architecture and planning are important and faculty leadership, liaison and efforts in professional development are to be recognized. Professional service includes involvement in professional organizations, seminars and conferences, and professional training and development.

Outreach includes all the simple and integrated outreach projects listed by faculty in their annual report, plus other forms of community/client and discussion, workshops, etc., undertaken by the faculty member. Community outreach offers great opportunities for teaching, scholarly activity and service; therefore, community outreach activities may appropriately be recognized under teaching or scholarly activity, as well as for service. The SEDRD's concept of outreach is unique. Outreach includes the following components:

- Service which implies a contractual relationship (may be explicit or implicit) with the community (broadly defined) outside the University. The researcher does not have the freedom to dictate the nature of the research in this situation.
- Graduate Student involvement in the collection and analysis of the data. Also possibly, Graduate Student involvement in the development of the research design, in a participatory manner with the community broadly defined.
- Development of the idea for the research in the context of a course and/or utilization of the results in the classroom.

Consistent with the University's commitment to international programs, faculty efforts in the international area are to be distributed across teaching, scholarly activity or service depending on the nature of the work.

The contribution made to the School, the College, the University and society is not necessarily equal, and the expectation is that progressively higher quality and public recognition standards are anticipated from those of higher rank.

1.4 Career Paths:

The University and SEDRD recognize that a single, standard distribution of effort may not adequately address the need for individual career development. Alternative career paths must be recognized and agreed to by the Director and the Dean, and must not adversely affect the programs of the School. A one-page career path statement must be submitted to the Director.

1.5 Buyouts and Secondments:

In the short term (one semester or longer), the distribution of effort may be altered to reflect approved buyouts from teaching, secondments, or other re-assignment of activities. Any changes should be formalized through a revised distribution of effort (DOE) form with a note of explanation. The DOE is approved by the Director and then forwarded on to the Dean for final approval.

1.6 Annual Distribution of Effort:

The faculty member will propose and submit to the Director a personal “distribution of effort” before September of each year using the form in Appendix A. A meeting will be held between the Director and the faculty member to finalize the annual distribution of effort ratios and specific assignments. The result of this process will provide a context for evaluation of the faculty member by the T&P Committees.

2. Faculty Reporting Process:

The documentation of an individual’s work will be the responsibility of the faculty member. All faculty will be reviewed by the Committee at least every second year according to University policy. A typical reporting period is from September 1 to August 31 of the previous year (or two). The following considerations will be deliberated annually:

- Tenured or tenure-stream faculty applying for promotion,
- Feedback for Probationary faculty with respect to progress towards granting of tenure,
- Feedback for faculty members who received an overall performance rater of less than “good” in the previous biennial review,
- Annual performance assessment for multi-year contractually limited faculty members,
- Tenured or tenure-stream faculty members who received a performance rating of “unsatisfactory” or “improvement required” as a result of the previous year’s performance assessment.

Faculty members shall, by August 15th, provide:

- Completed Progress/Performance Assessment Templates,
- A teaching dossier (Appendix B),
- A service dossier (whenever appropriate),
- Evidence of scholarship including published papers, books, professional and technical reports, competitions and creative works, or any other relevant materials. Papers in press should be included and accompanied by final acceptance. A cover letter may be included that summarizes the individual's most important contributions and accomplishments during the period.

Faculty members who were on leave for part or all of the period in question must provide a summary of their leave accomplishments.

3. Study/Research Leaves:

All faculty are encouraged to apply for sabbatical leave as outlined in the University of Guelph (UGFA) Collective Agreement. An application for leave submitted to the Director will be subject to approval of the SEDRD Committee and the College Committee.

The application will set out the period of time sought for leave, the proportion of salary expected and the disposition of on-going duties. Of particular concern will be the activities proposed to be undertaken during the period of leave. These should be outlined in as much detail as possible indicating their academic benefit to the individual and therefore to the University prior to taking the sabbatical leave.

Assessments will be based on the level of achievement of the activities outlined in the approved leave proposal at the next Committee review following the faculty member's return to normal duties. A leave report will be submitted by the faculty member together with whatever supporting tangible evidence that they may deem appropriate within 60 days of completion of the Leave. The report (see Appendix C for a sample) should:

- Speak to the objectives of the application,
- Identify accomplishments
- Explain value to the School and the University.

4. Professor Emeritus:

Upon retirement a faculty member will automatically be reviewed for the award of Professor Emeritus at the next School Committee deliberation. The Dean's Council has approved the following *Process and Criteria* for College Professor Emeritus:

- The retiring professor or his/her colleagues will submit a lifetime C.V. with a cover letter to indicate the case for the award.

- Following support from the School T&P Committee, the nomination is passed to Dean's Council and if supported, to the College T&P Committee (which has the authority to make final approval according to policy).
- Sustained and strong contribution to the University is interpreted as valued contributions in teaching, scholarly activity or service (not necessarily all three according to policy guidelines).
- Consideration of the award should not depend on whether the recipient has committed, or is likely to continue to contribute, to the output of the department. This, and appropriate department support, would become a matter for discussion between the retiring professor and the Director.

5. The SEDRD Tenure, Promotion and Performance Review Committee:

In a collegial organization such as a university, a periodic review of each colleague's activities by his/her peers is a valuable means of maintaining the standards of excellence to which its members aspire. Such a review is intended to both evaluate the previous period of each colleague's activities and to give direction for guidance in the next subsequent period. The Committee will meet on a regular basis to review individual faculty progress over the years. By these means, the judgement of the Committee's members is brought to bear as to the progress which has been achieved toward excellence, as this is collectively defined, and as to each faculty member's contribution to this goal.

5.1 Committee Composition:

The composition of the School's T&P Committee shall be:

- Director of the School (who will act as Chair of the Committee and who will be provided with a second vote to break a tie),
- Four tenured faculty members from the School, elected for a two year term by the faculty members of the School,
- A College Member (full-time tenured from within the College). The College Member shall be elected for a two-year term by the faculty members in the College, and will be a non-voting member,
- A School Executive Assistant (recording activity, but not participating or voting).

5.2 Committee Procedures:

- The Director will arrange, with each faculty member, a time to meet prior to the commencement of deliberations.
- The Director will meet with each probationary faculty member to review his/her assessment file prior to the commencement of Committee deliberations.
- The Dean is available to meet, upon request, with probationary faculty members.
- The Committee shall meet each fall to deliberate as required. Members of the Committee will review the submitted materials in preparation for the meeting. All Committee members will review all files, but each file will be assigned first and second readers. First readers will know the file in detail; second readers will thoroughly review the file. The Director will make a statement on the individual's career path and distribution of effort. The first reader will elaborate on the contributions to service, teaching, and scholarly activities. The second reader will provide additional statements on the file. Following an open discussion, a vote will be conducted in all cases.
- An assessment, process discussion and initial evaluation is conducted covering the categories of Teaching, Scholarly Activities (Creative and Research), and Service to the University and Society. The evaluation process will follow that described in section B and C. At this stage the Committee will further discuss the past history of the individual including the faculty member's response to comments from previous evaluations. The Director will make available the contents of previous Committee letters to the faculty member from past evaluations and the approved DOE for the relevant years.
- The Committee will then jointly agree upon the final assessment report to the College Committee. In evaluating a faculty member's performance the Committee will base its assessment on the specific goals, objectives, the career path agreed upon, the individual's rank, DOE, and quality and importance of the contribution made by the individual. The Committee has the option to review submissions from previous years. Where it is not meaningful to rate an individual separately on teaching, scholarly activity, professional service, outreach and administration (e.g. persons who were on leave for all or a substantial part of the period of evaluation), the Committee discusses that person's record of activities during the period under consideration. Faculty members who were on leave for part or all of the period in question must provide a brief summary of their leave accomplishments.
- It is the responsibility of the Committee to carefully assess faculty submissions, evaluate them and provide comments for the future guidance of the faculty member.

- In accordance with University policy, the proceedings of the Committee are confidential. It is not appropriate or necessary for individual members of the Committee to discuss with or justify to individual faculty members the Committee's procedures, the application of criteria, or the Committee's decision.
- The assessment will be forwarded to the College Committee for further review and recommendations as to potential awards.
- Written assignments, signed by the Director and School Committee, summarizing the performance of the faculty member will be provided to the College Committee.

6. APPENDICES

- A. Distribution of Effort Form**
- B. Teaching Dossier**
- C. Sabbatical Leave Form**

APPENDIX A - DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT

September 1, 2013

Professor
School of Environmental Design and Rural Development
Ontario Agricultural College
University of Guelph

Dear :

This will confirm that, effective September 1, 2013, we have agreed that your official Distribution of Effort will be:

Previous DOE		New DOE	
Teaching		Teaching	
Research		Research	
Service		Service	

Please sign below if you agree with the above new distribution of effort.

Professor

Wayne Caldwell, Director, SEDRD

Robert J. Gordon, Dean, OAC

Dean's Comments: _____

APPENDIX B – GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING DOSSIER

School of Environmental Design and Rural Development
Ontario Agricultural College
University of Guelph

GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING DOSSIER

1. Teaching Philosophy, Practices and Goals
2. Course Development and Modification (by course):
 - General Innovation
 - Development of Teaching Materials
3. Products of Good Teaching
 - Students Advised and Thesis Titles
 - Activities of Some Former Students
4. Steps Taken to Evaluate and Improve my Teaching
5. Presentations, Research and Publication on Teaching
6. Administrative and Committee Work Related to Teaching
7. Information from Students:
 - Course Evaluations
 - Typical Comments from Student Evaluations
8. Appendices

APPENDIX C – SABBATICAL LEAVE FORM

School of Environmental Design and Rural Development
Ontario Agricultural College
University of Guelph

SABBATICAL LEAVE REQUEST FORM

Name:

School/Department:

1. Dates and Locations (include beginning and end dates, and itinerary):
2. Hosting Institution (if any) (attach letter from institution):
3. Brief Description of Proposed Activities (for major publications include letter from publisher):
4. Specific Outcomes:
5. Timeline to Completion of Proposed Outcomes:
6. Benefits to Faculty Member:
7. Benefits to School/Department:
8. Funding Support (if any) (attach confirmation letter):
9. Management of Supervisory and Teaching Commitments including:
 - Proposal for covering normal assignments.
 - Work that will be continued while on leave, e.g. supervisory activities
10. Update on previous sabbatical report: