

## **Criteria for Renewal, Promotion, and the Award of Tenure in the Department of Physics**

**Approved by Physics Department Council: March 29, 2023**

**Approved by Faculty of Science Council: May 5, 2023**

**Approved by UCAPT: May 25, 2023**

It is the responsibility of all Department of Physics faculty applying for promotion and tenure or for promotion, hereafter the *candidate*, to provide adequate information for the Physics Department RTP committee and UCAPT to make an informed decision on any application. Candidates should use the *criteria*, and recommendations for *evidence* and *performance standards* provide below, along with guidance from the Head as documented in progress reports, to put a strong application forward.

The criteria for promotion and tenure at the University of Windsor are detailed in Senate Bylaw 23: “*Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion*” (Last updated 09 December 2016). The following information is intended to further amplify and clarify the material already contained in the Senate Bylaws, and to provide AAU-specific criteria and evidence that the Physics Department RTP committee should apply and consider when evaluating each candidate.

As specified in Senate Bylaw 23, Candidates may follow the AAU criteria and standards in place at the time of their initial appointment or any AAU criteria and standards approved thereafter.

### **Department of Physics Guiding Principles:**

Both the granting of tenure and the promotion of a faculty member to a higher rank are serious and irrevocable steps. In this context, there should always be positive definite reasons to recommend tenure and/or promotion rather than an absence of reasons to deny tenure or to defer promotion. In addition to meeting the specific professional/academic criteria described below, a candidate is expected to act and behave in a responsible manner and in the best interests of the Department and the candidate’s colleagues. The candidate should also be, in general, prepared to assume various ad-hoc responsibilities in the Department and exercise a positive and stimulating influence on colleagues and students. Compatibility and good relations with other members of the Department have always been valued by the Department.

### **Evaluation Criteria, Evidence, Performance Standards**

All candidates will be evaluated in the three areas of “Teaching”, “Research (Scholarship)”, and “Service”.

The evaluation criteria and evidence presented are identical for candidates applying for renewal, promotion, or tenure, but the required performance standards for a successful application are dependent upon rank.

Provided here are the evaluation criteria and potential sources of evidence as well as the rank-specific performance standards that will be used to evaluate each candidate.

**Teaching ability and interest.** High quality teaching is very important but difficult to assess precisely except in the extreme cases of very good or very bad performance. SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching) scores can be utilized as a numeric indicator of high-quality teaching, however, caution must be taken when utilizing SET scores as a quantification of teaching ability. SET scores alone should never form the basis of an evaluation of teaching ability and interest. The following additional measures of high-quality teaching should be considered:

- 1a) The effective design, planning, development, preparation and delivery of relevant teaching and learning materials and activities for existing undergraduate and graduate courses.
- 1b) The effective design, planning, development, preparation and delivery of new undergraduate and graduate courses, including the re-design, expansion, or improvement of laboratory sections and laboratory materials; development of new lecture materials; development of new computational tools and assessments; creation of syllabi, and other new course materials (e.g., rubrics, guidance documents, marking schemes).
- 1c) The candidate's day-to-day availability to students, and willingness to assist students outside of formal class hours.
- 1d) The development or revision of curriculum at the course level or program level, including development of program level learning outcomes, curriculum mapping activities, and other Department-wide curriculum development activities.
- 1e) The adoption and successful implementation of new instructional techniques designed to enhance student learning, comprehension, and engagement as well as incorporation of novel teaching and learning strategies in their courses, such as developing effective learning environments, and incorporating high impact practices.
- 1f) The candidates interest in undertake continuing teaching methodology self-assessment and professional development.
- 1g) The successful training of highly-qualified personnel (e.g., undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows) takes a significant amount of time and can be an important teaching component. These activities should be considered as an indicator of teaching ability and interest, even if such activities can also be counted as a measure of research productivity.
- 1h) Any other actions or activities that effectively promote or encourage students' academic pursuits or stimulate interest in the continued study of physics.

See "TABLE 1: Teaching ability and interest" for Criteria and rank-specific Performance Standards.

---

**Success in research.** It is generally agreed that the candidate’s performance under this heading will be regarded as the most important criterion, except when his/her performance in other areas important to the development of the Department are judged to be of exceptionally high calibre. The opinions of the Committee Members as to the candidate’s ability, commitment to their research program, and the soundness of the research will form part of the final opinion rendered. In forming that opinion, the following measures of success in research should be considered:

- 2a) An active research group led by the candidate is present with evidence of HQP involvement; evidence of significant time, effort, and/or resources being invested in the activities of the group is present; new and significant research output resulting from activities undertaken since appointed are evident.
- 2b) Supervision of student research theses and projects, and involvement on student thesis committees both inside and outside the department.
- 2c) Research success should not be exclusively gauged by the number of publications, but there should be evidence in the form of published work that research of acceptable standard is being done.
- 2d) Publication in peer-reviewed journals is the standard measure of research output, but the following should also be considered: peer-reviewed monographs, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, book chapters, books edited, and technical reports.
- 2e) Participation in professional research activities in the candidate’s field including talks/posters delivered at academic conferences; organizing/Chairing sessions at conferences.
- 2f) Teaching at outside research workshops; summer-school instruction; conference half-day courses. (These activities could also be reflective of teaching ability and interest.)
- 2g) Invitations to give seminar/colloquia nationally and internationally.
- 2h) Work performed as an invited referee or expert reviewer, associate editor or editor for external publications (journals), or participation on grant review committees (where such invitations serve to demonstrate research competence or expertise.)
- 2i) Successful research grant support obtained from sources outside of the University. Of particular importance is funding from a recognized federal agency such as a tri-council agency or CFI, or from a significant peer-reviewed national research body or foundation, or from a government agency that enables an independent research program to be established, including HQP training and support.

See “TABLE 2: Success in Research” for Criteria and rank-specific Performance Standards.

---

**Participation in Service.** Service may be performed at the Departmental, Faculty, University, or Professional levels, but is expected that there is significant evidence of service to, and within the Department of Physics. When judging the service contribution of a candidate, the committee should consider both the participation and the effectiveness of the candidate. Service can be considered to include:

- 3a) Participation on Departmental, Faculty, University, and Windsor University Faculty Association (WUFA) committees.
- 3b) Activities within the Department of Physics requiring significant amounts of time (such as Faculty Phone Campaign, recruiting visits to schools, Open Houses, Information Fairs, outreach activities, Science Academy, Science Rendezvous) when those activities are not directly related to a Committee.
- 3c) Serving as Chair of graduate theses committees or as equity assessor.
- 3d) Service to professional societies (serving on committees, elected offices or councils, ad-hoc activities, governing boards, etc.)
- 3e) Contribution to government and community agencies and services that utilize the candidate's professional expertise.
- 3f) Contributions to academic publishers such as work performed as a referee, associate editor or editor. (If the candidate is invited to participate due to research expertise, this may also serve as evidence of research excellence, as noted in 2h above).
- 3g) Any other actions or activities that can be considered as service to the Department, Faculty, University, or community that are not reflected in any of the other criteria.

See "TABLE 3: Participation in Service" for Criteria and rank-specific Performance Standards.

**TABLE 1: Teaching ability and interest.**

No candidate is expected or required to meet all of the listed criteria. The candidate should present a preponderance of evidence that the completion of multiple criteria satisfies the requirements for promotion. Successfully meeting all or most of the criteria will generally be evidence of successfully meeting the requirements for promotion. Failing to meet all or most of the criteria will generally be evidence of a failure to meet the requirements for promotion.

Criteria	Performance Standards		
	Renewal	Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	Promotion to Professor
SET Scores (see end of table for interpretation)	An “overall evaluation of teaching ability and performance” score of <4 in both course and instructor feedback would typically be deemed unacceptable. If the score is less than 4, continued year to year improvement, participation in teaching development activities to address the issue, and /or unusual “outlier” course results will be considered mitigating factors.	An “overall evaluation of teaching ability and performance” score of <5 in both course and instructor feedback would typically be deemed unacceptable. If the score is less than 5, continued year to year improvement, participation in teaching development activities to address the issue, and /or unusual “outlier” course results will be considered mitigating factors.	An “overall evaluation of teaching ability and performance” score of <5 in both course and instructor feedback would typically be deemed unacceptable. If the score is less than 5, continued year to year improvement, participation in teaching development activities to address the issue, and /or unusual “outlier” course results will be considered mitigating factors.
The effective design, planning, development, preparation and delivery of relevant teaching and learning materials and activities for <u>existing undergraduate and graduate courses</u> .	Candidates typically will have been assigned pre-existing courses and will have delivered them effectively using a combination of newly developed material and pre-existing materials.	Candidates typically will have developed their own teaching and learning materials demonstrating their effectiveness.	Candidates typically will have developed their own teaching and learning materials demonstrating their effectiveness.
The effective design, planning, development, preparation and delivery of <u>new undergraduate and graduate courses</u> , including the re-design, expansion, or improvement of laboratory sections and laboratory materials; development of new lecture materials; development of new computational tools and assessments; creation of syllabi, and other new course materials (e.g., rubrics, guidance documents, marking schemes).	Candidates for renewal are not typically required or expected to have developed or delivered new courses. Any evidence of such activities will be deemed as evidence of meeting this criteria.	Typically the candidates will have demonstrated the ability to develop at least one new course at any level. Complete redesign of a lab section is usually considered adequate for this criteria.	Candidate typically will have demonstrated the ability to develop and deliver multiple new courses/labs at all levels of the curriculum.
The candidate’s day-to-day availability to students, and willingness to assist students outside of formal class hours.	Candidates are expected to be available to the students in their courses and research students in person and electronically. Partial evidence is provided in SET A11.	Candidates are expected to be available to the students in their courses and research students in person and electronically. Partial evidence is provided in SET A11.	Candidates are expected to be available to the students in their courses and research students in person and electronically. Partial evidence is provided in SET A11.
The development or revision of curriculum at the course level or program level, including development of program level learning outcomes, curriculum mapping activities, and other Department-wide curriculum development activities.	Candidates for renewal are not typically required to engage in such activity, but are expected to participate in discussions and contribute opinions when such activities are discussed (i.e. in Physics Council.)	Candidates typically should have engaged in such activities at the course level by serving on Departmental PDC committees, creating learning outcomes for courses, developing PDC forms for courses, etc.	Candidates typically should have engaged in such activities at a high level by engaging in program curriculum mapping and Department level activities, (program LO’s, program development, etc.).
The adoption and successful implementation of new instructional techniques designed to enhance student learning, comprehension,	Typically candidates will not have demonstrated activities related to this criteria.	Typically candidates will have demonstrated an interest in and the application of high-impact practices and novel learning	Typically candidates will have demonstrated an interest in and the application of high-impact practices and novel learning

and engagement as well as incorporation of novel teaching and learning strategies in their courses, such as developing effective learning environments, and incorporating high impact practices.		strategies. Typically evidence of the implementation in the candidate's courses and their effectiveness will be present.	strategies either in their own courses or as an academic activity. Evidence of implementation in the candidate's courses or engagement in academic activities related to teaching and learning will typically be present.
The candidates interest in undertaking continuing teaching methodology self-assessment and professional development.	Typically the candidate will have undertaken some activities related to teaching professional development	Typically the candidate will have undertaken activities related to teaching professional development and will have demonstrated application of these activities in their courses or in documented improvements in teaching assessments.	Typically the candidate will have undertaken activities related to teaching professional development and will have demonstrated application of these activities in their courses or in documented improvements in teaching assessments.
The successful training of highly-qualified personnel (e.g., undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows) takes a significant amount of time and can be an important teaching component. These activities should be considered as an indicator of teaching ability and interest, even if such activities can also be counted as a measure of research productivity.	Candidates typically will have been engaged in the direct supervision and/or co-supervision of at least one graduate student and at least one undergraduate student. Failure to supervise any students will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement.	Candidates typically will have been engaged in the direct supervision and/or co-supervision of several graduate students and several undergraduate students. Typically at least one graduate student at the MSc level will have been awarded a degree and one PHD student would be under supervision at the time of promotion. Failure to supervise any graduate students will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement.	Candidates typically will have been engaged in the direct supervision of multiple graduate students and multiple undergraduate student. More than one graduate student at the MSc level and the PhD level will have been awarded degrees. A continued and persistent record of supervising students at all levels with no unaccounted for breaks should be evident. Failure to have supervised several graduate students to completion will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement.
Any other actions or activities that effectively promote or encourage students' academic pursuits or stimulate interest in the continued study of physics (i.e. mentoring Physics Club, offering First Year seminar, providing informal seminars for students, mentoring/assisting students in research activities like going to conferences, etc.)			

## Evidence

Evidence to be considered in support of the evaluation criteria described above could include, but is not limited to:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Electronic curriculum vitae (eCV) (required)</li> <li>•Teaching dossier highlighting and contextualizing teaching impact – not required but highly recommended.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Development of new courses and continued development of previously taught courses</li> <li>•Student evaluation of teaching (SET) scores</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Representative examples of teaching materials (e.g., course syllabi, rubrics, lab exercises, project guidelines, etc.)</li> <li>•Performance reviews from Dept. Head</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Feedback (e.g., student, peer, alumni, etc.) solicited or unsolicited.</li> <li>•Other indicators of teaching excellence (e.g., awards)</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--

## SET

The starting point for use of SET performance as an indicator will be obtained from UCAPT reports:

### TABLE 1a – (A1-A12) Instructor Feedback

a) The candidate's weighted average on all "instructor" evaluations between Fall 20\_\_ and Winter 20\_\_ is \_\_\_\_\_.

### TABLE 1b – (B1-B12) Course Feedback

c) The candidate's weighted average on all "course" evaluations between Fall 20\_\_ and Winter 20\_\_ is \_\_\_\_\_.

**TABLE 2: Success in Research.**

No candidate is expected or required to meet all of the listed criteria. The candidate should present a preponderance of evidence that the completion of multiple criteria satisfies the requirements for promotion. Successfully meeting all or most of the criteria will generally be evidence of successfully meeting the requirements for promotion. Failing to meet all or most of the criteria will generally be evidence of a failure to meet the requirements for promotion.

Criteria	Performance Standards		
	Renewal	Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	Promotion to Professor
An active research group led by the candidate is present with evidence of HQP involvement; evidence of significant time, effort, and/or resources being invested in the activities of the group is present; new and significant research output resulting from activities undertaken since appointed are evident.	Candidates typically will have begun setting up a research facility (if applicable); will have begun travelling to other research centers (if necessary/applicable); or will have begun creating a research group of HQP/collaborators/co-investigators.	Candidates typically will have created a fully operational research group. Typically this would include development of a research facility that is operational, producing results, and is utilized by HQP and/or creation of a research group of active HQP and collaborators that is producing results with a significant presence on campus.	Candidates must have an active, productive research group with a significant presence on campus that must engage multiple HQP.
Supervision of student research theses and projects, and involvement on student thesis committees both inside and outside the department.	Candidates typically will have been engaged in the direct supervision and/or co-supervision of at least one graduate student and at least one undergraduate student. Failure to supervise any students will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement. Candidates typically will have served on a least one student thesis committee.	Candidates typically will have been engaged in the direct supervision and/or co-supervision of several graduate students and several undergraduate students. Typically at least one graduate student at the MSc level will have been awarded a degree. Supervisions one or more PHD students at the time of promotion serves as additional evidence. Failure to supervise any graduate students will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement. Candidates typically will have served on several student thesis committees, both inside and outside the department and will have Chaired at least one PhD defense.	Candidates typically will have been engaged in the direct supervision of multiple graduate students and multiple undergraduate student. More than one graduate student at the MSc level and the PhD level will have been awarded degrees. A continued and persistent record of supervising students at all levels with no unaccounted for breaks should be evident. Failure to have supervised several graduate students to completion will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement. Candidates must have served on several student thesis committees, both inside and outside the department and must have Chaired several PhD defense.
Research success should not be exclusively gauged by the <u>number</u> of publications, but there should be evidence in the form of published work that research of acceptable standard is being done.	Candidates typically will have published several papers in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the candidate's field. An average of one a year would be typical with more reflecting greater productivity. Papers may be written with previous supervisors or collaborators reporting on work done prior to arriving at the University. Failure to publish any papers at all will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement.	Candidates typically will have published multiple papers in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the candidate's field. A three year average indicative of one a year or more (3 spanning the 3 year period) would be typical, with more reflecting greater productivity. Papers will typically be written with the candidate as PI/sole author or may include HQP co-authors. Papers should report on original work performed at the University of Windsor. Failure to publish any papers at all will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement.	Candidates typically will have published multiple papers in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the candidate's field. A three year average indicative of one a year or more (3 spanning the 3 year period) would be typical, with more reflecting greater productivity. Papers written with the candidate as PI/sole author or with HQP co-authors should be evident. Papers should report on original work performed at the University of Windsor. Failure to publish any papers at all will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement.

Publication in peer-reviewed journals is the standard measure of research output, but the following should also be considered: peer-reviewed monographs, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, book chapters, books edited, and technical reports.	The presence of these publications in lieu of some publications in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the candidate's field may be considered as evidence of publication sufficient to meet this requirement.	The presence of these publications in lieu of some publications in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the candidate's field may be considered as evidence of publication, but typically candidates must also present evidence of publication in peer-reviewed journals in addition to these. Publication in only these places will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement. Publication of book chapters, etc. in addition to the peer-reviewed papers required above will typically be interpreted as evidence of meeting the requirement.	The presence of these publications in lieu of some publications in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the candidate's field may be considered as evidence of publication, but typically candidates must also present evidence of publication in peer-reviewed journals in addition to these. Publication in only these places will typically be interpreted as evidence of a failure to meet this requirement. Publication of book chapters, etc. in addition to the peer-reviewed papers required above will typically be interpreted as evidence of meeting the requirement.
Participation in professional research activities in the candidate's field including talks/posters delivered at academic conferences; organizing/Chairing sessions at conferences.	Candidates typically will have attended several academic conferences/meetings and delivered several contributed or invited papers prior to renewal.	Candidates typically will demonstrate consistent participation at academic conferences with evidence of contributed and invited papers. Candidates typically will have some experience organizing and/or chairing sessions at such conferences. Candidates typically will have begun sponsoring the participation of their HQP at such conferences.	Candidates will typically demonstrate consistent and active participation at academic conferences that includes the presentation of papers (contributed and invited), the sponsoring of HQP to deliver results obtained by the group at such conferences, the organizing and chairing of sessions at conferences, of symposia, of meetings, or of conferences.
Teaching at outside research workshops; summer-school instruction; conference half-day courses. (These activities could also be reflective of teaching ability and interest.)	Candidates typically may not have participated in such activities but participation typically will be interpreted as evidence of meeting this requirement and evidence of research success.	Candidates typically may not have participated in such activities but participation typically will be interpreted as evidence of meeting this requirement and evidence of research success.	Candidates typically may not have participated in such activities but participation typically will be interpreted as evidence of meeting this requirement and evidence of research success.
Invitations to give seminar/colloquia nationally and internationally.	Candidates typically may not have participated in such activities but participation typically will be interpreted as evidence of meeting this requirement and evidence of research success.	Candidates typically will have participated in at least one, possibly several, invited seminars / colloquia.	Candidates typically will have participated in several invited seminars / colloquia.
Work performed as an invited referee or expert reviewer, associate editor or editor for external publications (journals), or participation on grant review committees (where such invitations serve to demonstrate research competence or expertise.)	Candidates typically may not have participated in such activities but participation typically will be interpreted as evidence of meeting this requirement and more broadly as evidence of research success.	Candidates typically have performed at least one or several such duties and failure to participate in any such duties will be interpreted as evidence of failure to meet this requirement.	Candidates typically have performed such duties several times and failure to participate in any such duties will be interpreted as evidence of failure to meet this requirement.
Successful research grant support obtained from sources outside of the University. Of particular importance is funding from a recognized federal agency such as a tri-council agency or CFI, or from a significant peer-reviewed national research body or foundation, or from a government agency that enables an independent research program to be established, including HQP training and support.	Candidates typically have applied for one or more such grants. Successful receipt of an NSERC Discovery Grant is typically considered evidence that this requirement has been met. Failure to obtain any external support is not necessarily evidence of failure to meet this requirement if evidence of continual re-application, application to multiple sources, and continual engagement in activities (i.e. peer-	Candidates typically have applied for one or more such grants. Successful receipt of an NSERC Discovery Grant capable of supporting the candidate's independent research program is typically considered evidence that this requirement has been met. Failure to obtain any external support is typically evidence of failure to meet this requirement unless evidence of extreme circumstances are presented.	Candidates typically have applied for and held several such grants from a tri-council or other agency. External support is typically continually held with few or no breaks in support and such support has allowed the continual operation of an active research program including HQP training and support. Failure to successfully receive more than one external grant (a grant that is continually renewed is counted as multiple grants each



	mentoring) intended to maximize the chance of a successful application are present.		time it is renewed) is typically evidence of failure to meet this requirement.
<b>Evidence</b>			
Evidence to be considered in support of the evaluation criteria described above could include, but is not limited to:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electronic curriculum vitae (eCV) (required).</li> <li>• Letters of Reference (required): Letters of peer review are given serious consideration in the tenure decision, and at least three are required. Outside evaluation provides arm's length judgement of the quality and quantity of publications and the recognition of the scientific community of the candidate's research efforts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion and tenure dossier highlighting research impact – not required but highly recommended.</li> <li>• The number and quality of published peer-reviewed journal publications, as recognized by the standards in the candidate's field, impact factors, reputation, etc. Book chapters, conference proceedings, on-line media outlets, and similar publications can also be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record of presentations (contributed, invited, keynote, plenary) and participation at regional, national, and international conferences.</li> <li>• Record of research grant acquisition and contracts received.</li> <li>• Samples of scholarly writing / research publications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research performance (e.g., journal publications, conference presentations) and graduation of supervised and co-supervised HQP, including post-degree career paths (i.e., careers in science or moving on to advanced degrees).</li> <li>• Other indicators of research excellence (e.g., awards, invited seminars, participation on research-related boards).</li> </ul>

**TABLE 3: Participation in Service.**

No candidate is expected or required to meet all of the listed criteria. The candidate should present a preponderance of evidence that the completion of multiple criteria satisfies the requirements for promotion. Successfully meeting all or most of the criteria will generally be evidence of successfully meeting the requirements for promotion. Failing to meet all or most of the criteria will generally be evidence of a failure to meet the requirements for promotion.

Criteria	Performance Standards		
	Renewal	Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	Promotion to Professor
Participation on Departmental, Faculty, University, and Windsor University Faculty Association (WUFA) committees.	Candidates typically will have served on Departmental committees and evidence of activity and interest in such service is present.	Candidates typically will have served on significant Departmental committees (RTP, Appointments, Curriculum) that have involved substantial work with significant and demonstrated outcomes. Candidates typically will have served on at least one committee at the Faculty of Science level or higher (i.e. a Faculty Appointment committees, Faculty Council, etc.)	Candidates will have served on significant Departmental committees (RTP, Appointments, Curriculum) that have involved substantial work with significant and demonstrated outcomes. Candidates typically will have served on at least one committees at the Faculty of Science level or higher (Faculty Appointment committees, Faculty Council, etc.) and will have demonstrated service in some way to a University committee.
Activities within the Department of Physics requiring significant amounts of time (such as Faculty Phone Campaign, recruiting visits to schools, Open Houses, Information Fairs, outreach activities, Science Academy, Science Rendezvous, Science Olympiad) when those activities are not directly related to a Committee.	Candidates typically will have volunteered their time, expertise, and/or resources to Departmental activities such as those listed. Candidates will have demonstrated a willingness to volunteer and participate in such activities.	Candidates typically will have volunteered their time, expertise, and/or resources to Departmental activities such as those listed. Candidates will have demonstrated a willingness to volunteer and participate in such activities. In addition, candidates typically will have taken the lead in at least one or several such initiatives, working independently and/or overseeing the activities of others, including student volunteers. Candidates will have demonstrated a willingness to take leading roles in such activities if possible.	Candidates typically will have volunteered their time, expertise, and/or resources to Departmental activities such as those listed. Candidates will have demonstrated a willingness to volunteer and participate in such activities. In addition, candidates typically will have taken the lead in at least one or several such initiatives, working independently and/or overseeing the activities of others, including student volunteers. Candidates will have demonstrated a willingness to take leading roles in such activities if possible.
Serving as Chair of graduate theses committees or as equity assessor.	Candidates typically will have served on several graduate student thesis/dissertation committees either within or outside the program	Candidates typically will have served on several graduate student thesis/dissertation committees either within or outside the program. Service as Chair of PhD thesis defences is desirable.	Candidates typically will have served on several graduate student thesis/dissertation committees, including service as Chair of PhD defences and External Examiner of PhD theses.
Service to professional societies (serving on committees, elected offices or councils, ad-hoc activities, governing boards, etc.)	Candidates typically will be members of at least one professional society (CAP, APS) and will be engaged with it in some way, including attending conferences/congresses hosted by the society.	Candidates typically will have contributed service to one or more professional societies in some way including those listed. Failure to participate with a professional society or organization in any meaningful way will generally be evidence of a failure to meet this requirement.	Candidates typically will have contributed service to one or more professional societies in some way including those listed. Failure to participate with a professional society or organization in any meaningful way will generally be evidence of a failure to meet this requirement.

Contribution to government and community agencies and services that utilize the candidate's professional expertise.	Candidates typically may not have participated in such activities but demonstrated participation typically will be interpreted as evidence of meeting this requirement and evidence of research success.	Candidates typically will have demonstrated service to one or more such agencies/institutions (including funding agencies as external or "expert" reviewers).	Candidates typically will have demonstrated service to one or more such agencies/institutions (including funding agencies as external or "expert" reviewers).
Contributions to academic publishers such as work performed as a referee, associate editor or editor. (If the candidate is invited to participate due to research expertise, this may also serve as evidence of research excellence, as noted in 2h).	Candidates typically may not have participated in such activities but participation typically will be interpreted as evidence of meeting this requirement and evidence of service participation.	Candidates typically have consistently served as academic external referees for several peer-reviewed journals relevant to the candidate's field. Failure to contribute in any meaningful way to any academic publisher will generally be evidence of failure to meet this requirement.	Candidates typically have consistently served as academic external referees for several peer-reviewed journals relevant to the candidate's field. Failure to contribute in any meaningful way to any academic publisher will generally be evidence of failure to meet this requirement.
Any other actions or activities that can be considered as service to the Department, Faculty, University, or community that are not reflected in any of the other criteria..	Participation in such activities, where demonstrated and recognizable as service that brings benefit to the Department, Faculty or University will be evidence of meeting this requirement.	Participation in such activities, where demonstrated and recognizable as service that brings benefit to the Department, Faculty or University will be evidence of meeting this requirement.	Participation in such activities, where demonstrated and recognizable as service that brings benefit to the Department, Faculty or University will be evidence of meeting this requirement.
<b>Evidence</b>			
Evidence to be considered in support of the evaluation criteria described above could include, but is not limited to:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electronic curriculum vitae (eCV) (required).</li> <li>• Promotion and tenure dossier highlighting service impact – not required but highly recommended.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented/reported participation on Physics and University committees.</li> <li>• Documented/reported participation with external professional societies and organizations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented community service.</li> <li>• Consistent participation in Physics council meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External evidence of volunteerism/service from media (social media and traditional.)</li> </ul>