

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENCES PROMOTION GUIDELINES

Preamble

General guidelines have been established through a Collective Agreement between the University of Manitoba and the University of Manitoba Faculty Association for the composition of the committee to be used in promotion decisions. The Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences uses a Faculty-based Nucleus Committee, to which is added department representatives for each promotion committee.

The Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences will maintain a Faculty-based Nucleus Committee for promotion, composed of one tenured, full professor from each Department, elected by the Department Council. Two members will be selected by the Dean from the faculty-based Nucleus Committee to serve on each individual promotion committee.

PROMOTION COMMITTEE

Composition of the Committee

1. the Dean (or designate) shall be the Chair of each promotion committee and shall serve in a non-voting capacity (Article 20.A.2.3 of the Collective Agreement);
2. the Head of the candidate's department shall serve on the committee in a non-voting capacity (Article 20.A.2.1);
3. gender parity will be sought on all promotion committees. Where gender parity is not feasible, there shall be at least one member of each gender on each promotion committee (Article 20.A.2.);
4. three faculty members with gender representation if possible, and an alternate, shall be elected by, but not necessarily from, full-time faculty members of the department in which the candidate is a member. The elected department representatives on the promotion committee shall normally be of at least the academic rank applied for by the candidate;
5. at the time the committee is established, in the event that one of the three faculty members elected by the department is not able to serve, the alternate will serve on the committee;
6. two members shall be selected by the Dean from the faculty-based Nucleus Committee to serve on each promotion committee. The members shall not be from the same department as the candidate who is to be considered for promotion.
7. members of the faculty-based Nucleus Committee shall meet once a year, preferably in the spring, to monitor the consistency with which standards have been applied throughout the year, and to review the effectiveness of these criteria.

Criteria for Evaluation of an Application for Promotion

The procedures and policies for promotion within the Faculty are governed by Article 20 of the Collective Agreement. Article 20.A.1.3 states that "The dean/director, after receiving the advice of his/her faculty/school council, shall be responsible for establishing the criteria for promotion and the weightings of these criteria, if any, to be used in the making of a promotion recommendation." This document describes the criteria and their weightings.

The promotion from one rank to another is granted in recognition of achievement, rather than career progress. While evidence that the achievement has been sustained over a reasonable period of time is an essential component in considering promotion, length of service alone should have no bearing on promotion decisions. The purpose of promotions is to foster and reward excellence in teaching, research and service.

Article 20.A.3.1 of the Collective Agreement states that "the matter of promotion shall be discussed by the Department Head and the faculty member" prior to the commencement of promotion proceedings. The Faculty criteria require that a similar discussion be held with the Dean. Promotions from rank to rank are to be based upon the contribution that a faculty member has made to the discipline, the Department, the Faculty and the University while at the current rank over a period of time, taking into account academic attributes and performance of assigned and other duties. The duties specifically assigned to the faculty member during the period under consideration must be taken into account in the application of the criteria and weightings. These duties are determined by the Department Head, in consultation with the faculty member and are to be reviewed as part of the annual activity reporting process. At least the past five years of Annual Activity Reports shall be considered by the Promotion Committee as part of the assessment process. However, all activity reports shall be available to the committee as required.

Article 20.A.1.2 describes the academic attributes normally to be considered in establishing the Faculty criteria and weightings to be used in assessing the suitability of a faculty member for promotion. The criteria and weightings to be considered in promotion deliberations are described below under the sub-headings teaching, research and service. These items are not meant to exclude any additional evidence provided by the faculty member that is consistent with the Collective Agreement. In the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, the normal weightings of teaching, research, and service are 45:40:15 unless modified as part of the annual activity report. Such changes shall be taken into account by the committee.

Competence in teaching performance shall be assessed by examining evidence, and appropriate supporting documents, such as:

1. record of courses taught over the period in question;
2. student evaluations of courses taught by the applicant;
3. graduate students supervised (name of student, period of supervision, thesis title, status of thesis) and an indication of the quality of supervision as measured by solicited student input;
4. evidence of involvement in curriculum development;
5. a statement of the teaching philosophy of the candidate;
6. written comments or letters from students;
7. assessment by colleagues of seminar, colloquia or extension presentations;
8. published teaching materials, e.g., texts, notes, computer software, extension publications
9. evidence of collaboration with colleagues in course development and presentations;
10. awards for teaching diploma, undergraduate or graduate;
11. other activities that enhance the broader learning environment and experience of students, both in and outside formal classes.

Competence in research performance shall be assessed by examining evidence and appropriate supporting documents, such as:

1. Research output: refereed publications and scholarly works as appropriate to the discipline or evidence of the impact on agricultural and food sciences or the agri-food industry of non-published scholarly or technical reports to private or governmental agencies; (This accommodates people such as Agricultureconomists and others who present their results in fora other than refereed journals);
2. in assessing the evidence of research output, the Committee will consider the quality of that output as the key indicator of competency;
3. evidence of the development of an independent research program, individual or collaborative, by the researcher since completion of the PhD degree;
4. evidence of the ability to sustain and support a research program at an adequate funding level;
5. evidence of collaboration with colleagues;
6. input from knowledgeable colleagues in writing as to the significance of the candidate's published work;
7. assessment of the extent of an individual's contribution to joint-authored publications (where the candidate is not the senior author)
8. invitations to deliver scholarly talks, or major addresses at other institutions or major national or international conferences;
9. other forms of peer recognition (journal reviews, reviews of grant applications, book chapters, etc.)
10. evidence of effective supervision of graduate student research.
11. recognition by peers in terms of awards

Service

Service includes internal and external activities related to the research and teaching function of the University. The Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, being a professional faculty and considered to be the centre for agricultural research for the province, has a special mandate for service to the agricultural industry. The promotion committee, in considering the service aspect of the promotion procedures, shall pay particular attention to the service contributions of the candidate to the agricultural industry. In consideration of effective service, the following items may be considered:

1. membership on University, Faculty and Departmental committees (include name of committee, length of appointment, role);
2. other university service (administrative appointments, liaison activities, etc.);
3. service to professional organizations;
4. service to the agricultural industry (extension activities, participation on committees, media interviews and articles, etc.);

It is important that the Committee be able to assess the *effectiveness* of the contribution and it would, therefore, be helpful to include:

1. letters from chairs of committees;
2. letters from individuals in the community and industry served by the member;
3. reports prepared by the member as part of service provided in the community;
4. awards for service.

Other considerations specific to the current rank of a faculty member

For promotion from the rank of Instructor I to Instructor II the candidate shall normally have:

1. a completed Master's Degree (or equivalent) and at least five (5) years experience in a university or equivalent position;
2. successful teaching performance.

For promotion from the rank of Instructor II to Senior Instructor the candidate shall normally have:

1. a completed a Doctoral degree (or equivalent) and at least ten (10) years experience in a university or equivalent position;
2. successful teaching performance sustained over a reasonable period of time; or demonstrated competence in research, taking into account the duties specifically assigned to the faculty member during the period under consideration.

For promotion from the rank of Lecturer to Assistant Professor the candidate shall normally have:

1. a completed Ph.D. (or the equivalent);
2. successful teaching performance and competence in or potential for research.

For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor the candidate shall normally have:

1. successful teaching performance sustained over a reasonable period of time;
2. research and/or scholarly work that clearly demonstrates through publications, sustained research commitment, ability and success;
3. demonstrated competence in service taking into account the duties specifically assigned to the faculty member during the period under consideration.

For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor the candidate shall normally have:

1. successful teaching performance sustained over a reasonable period of time;
2. research and/or scholarly work sufficiently distinguished that clearly demonstrates through publications sustained research commitment ability and success;
3. demonstrated competence in service.

External review process for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

In the case of each applicant being considered for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, two external reviewers who are established scholars (normally themselves tenured and at the rank of Professor) shall be invited to comment on the research and scholarly work of the applicant as follows:

1. a confidential evaluation of the applicant's publications from the point of view of whether they are sufficiently distinguished, both in quantity and quality, to justify promotion to Full Professor.

In all communications with the outside evaluators, there shall be no hint of whether or not the Dean or Department Head is already favourably or unfavourably disposed with respect to a possible promotion.

The Dean shall draw up, in consultation with the Department Head, a list of outside evaluators (normally the list is decided upon by the Department Head and the candidate and presented to the Dean at the time the promotion material is presented). The final list shall be shown to the applicant who may request the deletion of any name for cause. The Dean or his delegate, normally the Associate Dean (Academic), shall select the outside evaluators and carry on all correspondence with them.

Both the Department Head and the applicant shall receive a copy of each evaluator's report as soon as is practical. Unless the evaluator has agreed to give up anonymity, the applicant shall not be told the name of the evaluator and shall receive a copy of the report from which any means of identifying the author has been deleted.

Promotion Procedures

1. The candidate being considered for promotion shall be invited to meet at least once with the Promotion Committee.
2. The documentation submitted to the committee shall not include form B outlining the Department Head's recommendation.
3. The committee should meet to decide if any additional information is required in order to make a decision with respect to the candidate. The requirement for any additional information shall be conveyed by the Chair of the committee to the candidate and the Head. This information shall be obtained by the Chair of the committee.
4. The Head of the department shall provide the committee with a description of the assigned duties when the appointment was accepted. Any changes to these duties during the term of appointment under consideration shall also be provided.
5. The committee shall vote by secret ballot. The ballots shall be prepared by the Chair and distributed to the voting members. The record of the meeting must contain specific reasons for the vote related to the criteria and weightings.