

Windsor Law RTP Criteria – January 2021
Approved by UCAPT March 1, 2021

This version includes contains updates to the RTP Criteria document that was passed at Faculty Council on November 26, 2018 and approved by UCAPT on 4 March 2019. The proposed edits to the UCAPT-approved document (in track changes) were put forward by Law's RTP Committee following feedback from Faculty Council members and UCAPT. The amendments were adopted by Faculty Council on January 13, 2021. Also new are the proposed criteria for the Academic Clinic Professor position in the Appendix.

General Preamble

- 1) This document contains assessment criteria and standards for Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) in the Faculty of Law, University of Windsor with respect to teaching, research and service. The Faculty's Committee on Renewal, Tenure and Promotion ("the Committee") intends this document to be consistent with University of Windsor Senate-approved Renewal, Tenure and Promotion policies, outlined in Bylaw 23 (Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion), and the University Committee on Academic Promotion and Tenure (UCAPT) guidelines for the evaluation of Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion. When completing UCAPT evaluation forms, the Committee's ratings will be informed by these criteria to the extent possible.
- 2) With respect to specialized positions in the Faculty (at the time of writing, Legal Research & Writing, Academic Clinic Professor and Externship Professor), the Committee will interpret the present criteria with reference to the specific duties of each of the specialized positions and will take into account existing or future position-specific criteria. The Committee will also recognize that teaching, research and service may not only look different but that the proportion of time spent on each may be different from other positions. Position-specific information on the specialized positions can be found in Appendix A.
- 3) Candidates hired prior to the adoption of these criteria may elect (at the time of application for renewal, tenure or promotion) to be assessed according to these criteria or the criteria in place at the time of their hiring.
- 4) Bylaw 23 emphasizes demonstrated competence and engagement in teaching, scholarship and service: *it is the responsibility of the candidate to make a solid, evidence-supported case that the candidate has met the Faculty's criteria and standards in these areas.* This case, which should include a teaching dossier, research statement, CV, publications for external review and a record of service

contributions, will be augmented by the RTP submission components outlined in the [UCAPT Resource Guide](#).

- 5) Standards for achievement of tenure and promotion will be interpreted in a way that reflect the variety of practice, context and endeavours typical of a diverse and accomplished faculty complement. The Committee may find that it is impossible to evaluate candidates on all indicators, and that is to be expected. Some variations in achieving the criteria or indicators are to be expected.
- 6) With respect to candidates for renewal, the Committee will determine whether candidates are within range of, and making satisfactory progress towards, the standards for renewal, tenure or promotion.
- 7) The Committee will take an equity-informed approach in its assessments. Diversity is to be honoured as integral to the quality of the University's intellectual mission, in both discipline and methodology. Thus, scholarship, teaching and service in non-traditional areas and methodologies and/or by members of historically disadvantaged groups and/or designated groups will be considered equitably. When asked to do so by candidates and provided with an explanation of the interruptions, the Committee will take into consideration both career interruptions and special circumstances that may have affected the productivity of candidates during the period under consideration. Career interruptions and special circumstances occur when, for health, administrative, family or other reasons, a researcher is taken away from normal teaching, research or service work for an extended period of time.

Teaching Standards

Preamble

Contextual factors are critical to a clear understanding of an instructor's practice and instructional profile when applying the criteria. Accordingly:

Candidates are required to submit ECVs and teaching dossiers. With respect to the latter, candidates are referred to the UCAPT-approved [teaching dossier template](#). The teaching dossier will allow candidates to make the case that they meet the standards set out below using multiple forms of evidence. The general expectation is that candidates will provide evidence demonstrating effective practice across all the criteria. While they may not be able to provide evidence for all indicators or standards for any given criterion, they should provide evidence demonstrating that they generally meet the criteria. The Committee will also consider the Dean's evaluation of candidates' teaching effectiveness and SET scores. SET scores will be considered as perceptions of instructional effectiveness in Criterion 2, below, bearing in mind recognized limits of SET scores.

- 1) In assessing teaching, the Committee will be cognizant of and value various teaching methodologies, including Indigenous teaching methodologies where employed. Where Indigenous teaching methods are employed, the Committee will ensure that, if at least one member does not have knowledge of relevant Indigenous teaching methodologies, that an external assessment by an independent reviewer with knowledge of the relevant methodology will be sought.
- 2) Where invited to do so by candidates, the Committee will take into account candidates' statements regarding significant variations in teaching context in assessing instructional competence. This may include factors such as the number of new course preparations compared to the norm, new or experimental curricula, classroom design suitability, course format, required or large-enrolment courses, courses that have traditionally been difficult or uncomfortable for students, the relative correspondence between course content and the candidate's areas of specialization. Social context (this may include social markers of race, gender, indigeneity, disability and sexuality) will be considered with respect to student perceptions of teaching effectiveness and other measures of assessing institutional competence.
- 3) With respect to candidates for renewal, the Committee will determine whether candidates are within range of, and making satisfactory progress towards, the standards for Permanence/Associate Professor.

Criterion 1: Design and planning of learning activities		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Planned learning activities to develop the student's learning	Course outlines are consistent with bylaw and policy and clearly outline intended learning outcomes, activities and assessments.	Course outlines are consistent with bylaw and policy and clearly outline intended learning outcomes, activities and assessments.
Planned learning and assessment activities linked to learning outcomes	Planned learning activities clearly and effectively support student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes and are consistently at an appropriate level of difficulty.	Planned learning activities clearly and effectively support student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes, are consistently at an appropriate level of difficulty and may also provide flexibility to support or challenge learners.
Sound knowledge of the course content and material		
Course materials are current	Course designs show sound knowledge of the course content and material, with evidence of efforts to remain current.	Course designs show sound knowledge of the course content and material, with evidence of efforts to remain current. Learning materials are often innovative, reflecting leadership in curriculum development and pedagogical innovation.
Criterion 2: Instructional methods		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Demonstrates ongoing attention to student learning	Evidence of instructional practices that support student development of intended learning and of continuing efforts to respond to student needs.	Consistent evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning and of continuing efforts to respond to student needs.
Student perceptions of instructional effectiveness	Student perceptions of instructional competence as demonstrated by average SET composite instructor scores higher than 4.6 over the years	Student perceptions of instructional competence as demonstrated by average SET composite instructor scores higher than 5 over the years

Demonstrates effective teaching and learning methods	prior to application. Year over year trends will be considered here. Evidence of effectiveness in the teaching dossier such as positive peer reviews and self-assessment.	prior to application. Year over year trends will be considered here. Evidence of effectiveness in the teaching dossier such as positive peer reviews and self-assessment.
Clarity of communication and explanation	Evidence of effort to explain content clearly with appropriate use of examples.	Evidence of consistent clarity in explaining content, with effective use of examples.
Stimulation of interest	Evidence of efforts to inspire student interest in course material.	Consistent evidence of efforts to inspire student interest in course material.
Encouragement of student-faculty interaction and student-student interaction that promotes learning	Evidence of efforts to promote faculty-student and student-student interaction.	Evidence of consistent efforts to promote faculty-student and student-student interaction.
Willingness to engage in and mentor students in independent and professional learning activities	Has contributed to involvement of students in research programs, projects or professional activities. This might include graduate supervision, student contributions to publications or research projects or involvement with professional or clinical co-curricular activities.	Has led or made major contributions to the involvement of students in research programs, projects or professional activities. This might include graduate supervision, student contributions to publications or involvement with professional or clinical co-curricular activities.
Criterion 3: Assessment and feedback to students		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Quality of assessment tools in terms of clarity; alignment with course learning outcomes; appropriate level of difficulty	Assessment tools usually have clear instructions and expectations, align well with course learning outcomes and are at an appropriate level of difficulty. Faculty are encouraged to use a variety of assessment tools, and such	Assessment tools consistently have clear instructions and expectations, align well with course learning outcomes and are at an appropriate level of difficulty. Faculty are encouraged to use a variety of assessment tools, and such variety can

Feedback on assessment in terms of substantive and constructive feedback provided; feedback appropriate to the nature of the assessment tool; timeliness of feedback	variety can be taken into account in assessing the quality of this indicator. Substantive, regular and constructive feedback to students; feedback is appropriate to the nature of the assessment tool; feedback is usually provided within a reasonable time.	be taken into account in assessing the quality of this indicator. Substantive, regular and constructive feedback provided to students; feedback is appropriate to the nature of the assessment tool; feedback is consistently provided within a reasonable time.
Criterion 4: Developing effective environments, student support and guidance		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Available for consultation	Evidence of reasonable availability outside of class time, e.g., provides regular hours or periods of consultation, potentially through a variety of media (e.g. email, online, face-to-face or by telephone).	Available to students outside of class time, e.g., has consistent office hours, is available over different media of communication and is reasonably flexible about accommodating student consultation needs.
Effective advising/counseling	Provides counseling and advising to select students and can provide evidence of a degree of effectiveness.	Generally effective, supportive, and knowledgeable as an advisor or student counselor. Refers students to other services when appropriate. Is available to discuss student difficulties and is reasonably open to students seeking counseling.
Demonstrates respect for students and systematically attends to ensuring students demonstrate respect for others	Demonstrates respect for students with evidence of efforts to ensure students demonstrate respect for their peers in an open and inclusive learning environment. For example, generally answers students patiently, is attentive to discussions that could alienate or disenfranchise students and has a teaching	Demonstrates respect for students with evidence of efforts to ensure students demonstrate respect for their peers in an open and inclusive learning environment. For example, generally answers students patiently, is attentive to discussions that could alienate or disenfranchise students and has a teaching plan to deal with such situations if they arise. Promotes

	plan to deal with such situations if they arise. Promotes respectful discussion.	respectful discussion and may provide Faculty-wide leadership in this regard.
Criterion 5: Improvement-oriented self-assessment and continuing professional development		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Participation in teaching-related professional development	Some evidence of participation in workshops, forums, conferences or peer-led activities intended to enhance teaching and learning.	Consistent efforts have been made to engage in professional development related to teaching over time, e.g. self-directed reading, workshops, forums, conferences or peer-led activities intended to enhance teaching and learning.
Self-evaluation leading to changes in teaching practice	Provision of several examples of changes to teaching practice based on reflection, course-based feedback or data, or engagement with professional development.	Evidence of a consistently thoughtful and reflective approach to teaching, with ongoing examples of efforts to improve teaching emanating from that approach.
Criterion 6: Professionalism and personal effectiveness		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Is aware of and consciously developing the professional qualities of: taking ownership and management of teaching role; demonstrating effective preparation and prioritization; communicating effectively in both formal and informal contexts;	Consistent application of professional ethical standards in relation to students. No evidence of pattern of substantiated student complaints with regard to these professional qualities.	Consistent application of professional ethical standards in relation to students. No evidence of pattern of substantiated student complaints with regard to these professional qualities.
Applying professional ethical standards in teaching and working with students		

Research Standards

Preamble

- 1) Candidates must provide the Committee with a research statement. The statement should provide a narrative of the research work and accomplishments of the candidate carried out prior to tenure (for permanence/promotion to associate professor) or following tenure (for promotion to full professor). The statement should also set out a future plan for the scholarly work of the candidate.
- 2) The Committee will obtain and submit 3 independent external evaluations of the quality of the faculty member's scholarship in compliance with the procedures outlined in Bylaw 22 Section 5.2.3. To the extent possible, with respect to position-specific positions in the Faculty, reviewers of the scholarship of candidates in clinical, applied or placement-focused academic positions in the Faculty – currently the Legal Research & Writing, Academic Clinical Professor and Externship Professor positions – will have expertise relevant to the approaches and methodologies typical of those positions.
- 3) The Committee will consider the candidate's research statement, the parts of the ECV that relate to research, the Dean's evaluation of research and the evaluations of external reviewers.
- 4) The Committee will recognize the rich diversity of research contributions in the Faculty. Further, research will be understood broadly to include traditional scholarly work, community engaged research, and research linked to the distinctive nature of the specialized positions in the Faculty, as well as creative activity related to the discipline of law, including performances, films or exhibitions, which have undergone jury or curator selection.
- 5) The Committee will be cognizant of and value various research methodologies (including doctrinal, socio-legal, community-based and Indigenous research methodologies) and recognize that candidates may work with more than one methodology. Interdisciplinary scholarship, including the scholarship of teaching and learning and Indigenous Studies, will be treated equally with more traditionally legally focused work.
- 6) The Committee will recognize that Indigenous colleagues may work either in a western conventional academic tradition ("those individuals who engage in a program of research and inquiry in accordance with the principles of the western academy and whose effort is primarily but not exclusively reflected in the production of written work") or a dual academic tradition which combines both conventional academic and traditional Indigenous approaches to research ("A dual tradition scholar is an individual whose scholarship is based in and informed

by principles and methods appropriate to an exploration and explication of traditional aboriginal knowledge as well as those of the western academic disciplinary tradition”).¹ Although all colleagues are expected to produce some conventional written scholarship, colleagues working in a dual tradition are not expected to produce the same amount of written scholarship as those working in a conventional tradition only. Colleagues who work or plan to work in a dual tradition should indicate so in their research statements as soon as is reasonable in the RTP process.

- 7) The Committee will ensure that the work and practices of dual tradition scholars is peer reviewed by assessors with relevant knowledge and experience. Advice on suitable assessors will be sought from Indigenous scholars with relevant experience and elders and community cultural leaders where required.

Criterion 1: Expertise in research, relevant methodologies and effective and ethical project management		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
An active, well-constructed research plan and a history of successful plans or programs	The candidate demonstrates an ongoing, clearly focused and active research program, with a continued pattern of producing quality scholarship. Strong evidence of an established research program with a promising trajectory and evidence of sustained evidence and success. Clearly focused research plan articulated in a research statement. Conformity with relevant institutional, disciplinary and funding agency ethical and research guidelines	Well-articulated and successful research agenda. Ongoing history of research goals, being met or exceeded, of re-evaluation and planning reflecting the development of new directions and expanding reach or depth. Evidence of leadership in research agenda and strong evidence of continuing productivity (e.g. pending publications, publications under review, grants submitted). Conformity with relevant institutional, disciplinary and funding agency ethical and research guidelines
Criterion 2: A record of refereed publications or other demonstrated scholarly outputs		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Publishes in journals or with publishing houses with a strong academic	Publications include peer-reviewed scholarship and are generally published in well-	Publications include peer-reviewed scholarship and are generally published in well-respected journals

¹ These definitions are drawn from Trent University's "Indigenous Studies Tenure Process and Criteria" document (2015).

<p>reputation. However, many other types of research activity can enrich law scholarship. The latter might include contributions to casebooks with original academic analysis or law reform reports</p> <p>Pace and quantity of research outputs is consistent with disciplinary standards for strong scholarly performance</p> <p>External referees' reports indicate that research activity is of high quality</p>	<p>respected journals or through publishing houses with high quality academic reputations.</p> <p>Candidates should normally have at least four peer-reviewed journal articles or equivalent and have a demonstrated record of productivity, including during the pre-tenure period at the University of Windsor. For co-authored pieces, candidates should indicate their percentage contribution.</p> <p>External referees' reports indicate that publications are generally of good quality.</p>	<p>or through publishing houses with high quality academic reputations.</p> <p>Candidates should normally have six peer-reviewed journal articles or equivalent following tenure and have a demonstrated record of ongoing productivity prior to making application for promotion. For co-authored pieces, candidates should indicate their percentage contribution.</p> <p>External referees' reports indicate that publications are generally of excellent quality.</p>
Criterion 3: Evidence of original and impactful contributions to legal research or law-related creative activity		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Original and impactful contributions to the candidate's research area(s)	<p>Some evidence of original and impactful research on legal scholarship and/or law and policy reform.</p> <p>Impact can be demonstrated by evidence of reliance by other scholars, courts, lawyers, community groups, media, academic societies or policy-makers.</p>	Compelling evidence (using the measures set out for Level A) of original and sustained impact on legal scholarship and/or law and policy reform & legal practice.

Recognition/ leadership within area(s) of research	<p>Diverse measures of impact are to be expected. These measures may include: judgment citation counts (collected by the candidate), scholarly citation counts (collected by the candidate) and SSRN (or similar repository) download statistics, evidence of influence on law reform, policy or other law-related or community initiatives, use of research as course content by other professors, conference organizing and by positive external peer reviews of the candidate's research portfolio.</p> <p>Some evidence of emerging recognition as a legal scholar in Canada.</p> <p>This evidence could include research awards or other similar recognition; the awarding of external research grants; expert evidence before legislative body or in court/tribunal proceedings; peer reviewer requests by academic journals; conference, continuing legal education and academic collaboration invitations; positive external peer review of candidate's research portfolio; leadership level service to academic societies; recognition by academic societies or the academic community more generally.</p>	<p>Evidence of national recognition such as research awards or other similar recognition; the awarding of external research grants; expert evidence before legislative body or in court/tribunal proceedings; peer reviewer requests by academic journals; conference, continuing legal education and academic collaboration invitations; positive external peer review of candidate's research portfolio; leadership level service to academic societies; recognition by academic societies or the academic community more generally; requests to review promotion of candidates at other law schools; keynote addresses; or the conferring of such recognition through fellowships and other awards.</p>
Criterion 4: Creation of research opportunities, collaborations and capacity through community partnerships and research funding		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)

<p>Ability to attract internal or external research funding, including grants or contract funding</p> <p>Evidence of the development of internal and external partnerships, collaboration and other engagement that directly contributes to research capacity, policy development, law reform and/or social change</p> <p>Demonstrate ability to attract and successfully mentor and train students in research</p>	<p>Candidates will demonstrate achievement of this criterion through at least <i>one</i> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Significant research or contract funding; ii) Community, professional or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively or intellectually; iii) Commitment to the supervision and mentorship of students in research. 	<p>Candidates will demonstrate achievement of this criterion through at least <i>one</i> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) History of regular, repeated and evolving success in granting competitions, including those considered competitive within the discipline, given the career stage of the candidate, including both grants or contract funding; ii) Sustained evidence of community, professional or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively or intellectually; iii) Clear and sustained commitment to the supervision and mentorship of students in research.
---	--	--

Service Standards

Preamble

- 1) Candidates must provide the Committee with a service statement. The statement should provide a narrative of the service work and accomplishments of the candidate carried out prior to tenure (for permanence/promotion to associate professor) or following tenure (for promotion to full professor). The statement may also set out a plan for future service goals and activities. The committee will consider the candidate's service statement, CV, the report from the Dean and other submitted evidence (e.g., media reports; feedback from participants in programs, services and other initiatives; letters of recognition, appreciation and awards; and evidence of contributions to initiatives).
- 2) Typically -and the committee will recognize that this may be higher in the specialized positions- approximately 20% of a faculty member's workload is devoted to Service. This would generally involve approximately 335 hours over a 48-week work year or about seven hours a week on average. However, the assessment of service considers more than time served: as with all aspects of promotion and tenure criteria, the nature, quality and impact of the individual's contributions are also considered. Individuals make contributions to the institutional mission in diverse ways, contributing to collegial governance and to the necessary management, fostering, and enhancement of scholarly practice, knowledge creation and knowledge mobilization as these occur within the institution, in the community and in relevant professional or disciplinary societies. These contributions can take many forms. In addition to evidence of a spirit of willing cooperation to participate in an equitable number of committee assignments, the Committee will assess the quality and depth of an individual's contributions to service, taking into account dimensions such as:
 - Degree of consistency and flexibility in assuming service roles where the individual's knowledge and good judgment could benefit the Faculty
 - The individual's effectiveness in forwarding projects and objectives of service
 - Effectiveness in collaboratively forwarding projects and objectives of service and/or in building teams and networks to further the institutional mission through service
 - Degree of leadership, responsibility and agency demonstrated, in both formal and informal roles
 - Evidence of a reputation for excellence and integrity in service
 - Scope of service beyond the departmental or local level

- 3) Committee membership should be assessed in light of the individual's actual service through that committee and the degree of activity of that committee. Membership on committees that were not active in the year of membership do not constitute a service contribution but might be seen as contributory evidence of willingness to serve. Candidates are strongly encouraged to briefly describe the nature of service work undertaken rather than simply providing titles or committee names.
- 4) Service contributions to the development, operation and management of academic programs may overlap with contributions to teaching or research. For instance, the development of course infrastructure, streams or academic programs have clearly defined and interconnected teaching and service components. Original contributions to policy, institutional practice or partnership based in disciplinary expertise may overlap with research. Candidates are welcome to apply these contributions as they see fit to make their case but should be aware that the Committee will consider the degree to which contributions are being attributed to multiple elements of their case.
- 5) While service to academic, professional and broader communities is valued, as set out in Criteria 2 and 3, service to the Faculty & University, as set out in Criteria 1 will be most heavily weighted in evaluating whether a candidate has met the Service requirement for RTP purposes.
- 6) As with other aspects of these RTP criteria, the Committee will take an equity-informed approach to its deliberations.

Criterion 1: Service and leadership contributions to the University, in particular through the lens of the mission, vision and values of the Faculty of Law		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Scope and quantity of service is consistent with the requirements of the Faculty	Substantial service to the Law School is mandatory. Candidates are encouraged to contribute at the University level.	Substantial service to the Law School is mandatory, as are some contributions at the University level.
Evidence of willingness to undertake necessary Faculty responsibilities, particularly those that are sometimes considered to be more onerous or challenging	Willing to undertake necessary Faculty responsibilities, particularly those that are sometimes considered to be more onerous or challenging.	Evidence of consistent responsibility, leadership, initiative and agency in undertaking Faculty responsibilities, particularly those that are sometimes considered to be more onerous or challenging.

Effectiveness and impact of an individual's service and contributions	Evidence of tangible, quality contributions consistent with mission, vision, and values of the Faculty of Law and/or the University.	Evidence of tangible, quality contributions consistent with mission, vision, and values of the Faculty of Law and/or the University.
Effective collaboration and teamwork	Evidence of efforts to work collaboratively - such as through involvement in faculty learning or research communities - and efforts to enhance faculty, staff, and student sense of belonging.	Evidence of efforts to work collaboratively, such as through involvement in faculty learning or research communities, peer mentorship (including potentially teaching, research or grant review), and systematic efforts to enhance faculty, staff and student sense of belonging.
Criterion 2: Contributions to or Engagement with the Community: Community activities, organizations or publics at large involving professional skills and knowledge or creating links between scholarship and programs in the University and those in the community		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Evidence of willingness to engage with communities, broadly defined	Evidence of contributions at the local, provincial, national or international levels. Examples of service might include membership on band councils, non-profit organizations or advocacy groups.	Evidence of significant contributions at the local, provincial, national or international levels. Service statements must be included at the professor level.
Evidence of the impact and integrity of an individual's service and contributions	Examples of impact and integrity might include: inclusion of the candidate's written or oral statements in policy; depositions; successful external community-based projects and/or use of research in policy, law, funding or approaches to practice; successful elections or nominations to leadership positions; or other recognition by the community.	Evidence of impact might include: inclusion of the candidate's written or oral statements in policy; depositions; successful external community-based projects and/or use of research in policy, law, funding or approaches to practice.

Criterion 3: Contributions to one's professional or disciplinary societies and/or the justice-sector more broadly		
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Evidence of willingness to engage with communities, professional or disciplinary societies and/or the justice sector more broadly	Evidence of regular service contributions at the local, provincial, national or international levels. Examples of service may include: board membership of academic or professional organizations, editorial board membership and disciplinary conference organization. Leadership roles in activities under this criterion should be noted in candidates' research statements as well in the service statement.	Evidence of regular service contributions at the local, provincial, national or international levels. Examples of service may include board membership of academic or professional organizations, editorial board membership and disciplinary conference organization. Leadership roles in activities under this criterion should be noted in candidates' research statements as well in the service statement and are expected at the professor level.
Evidence of the impact of an individual's service	Examples of the impact of an individual's service may include contributions to the development of policies, procedures and mechanisms to support disciplinary practice; evidence of contributions to the development of programs, services and resources for practitioners and the organization of disciplinary events.	Examples of the impact of an individual's service may include contributions to the development of policies, procedures and mechanisms to support disciplinary practice; evidence of contributions to the development of programs, services and resources for practitioners and the organization of disciplinary events.
Evidence of a reputation for integrity in service	A reputation for competence and integrity in service may be demonstrated through election or appointment by disciplinary peers, invited memberships on boards or committees, engagement with equity and inclusion within the discipline or evidence that service has been valued by interdisciplinary peers.	A reputation for excellence and integrity in service may be demonstrated through election or appointment by disciplinary peers, invited memberships on boards or committees, engagement with equity and inclusion within the discipline or evidence that service has been valued by interdisciplinary peers.

Appendix A.

PROPOSAL TO CONVERT LEGAL RESEARCH AND WRITING LECTURERS TO TENURE TRACK APPOINTMENTS AT THE LECTURER LEVEL

INTRODUCTION:

The Faculty of Law's five year plan, *Investing in Excellence 2000 – 2005*, established as one of its goals "[to] enhance the reputation of the Law School as a national leader in research and education on Access to Justice by providing clinical and experiential learning opportunities to all law students."

The Faculty recognized that, in order to reach that goal, one of the issues that needed to be addressed was the Legal Research and Writing Program. Specifically, the Report suggested that the Faculty move "...[To] professionalize our legal writing instruction along the lines of comparable models commonly found in the United States." This, however, required resolution of the employment status of those Faculty members charged with the development and delivery of the Legal Research and Writing (LRW) Program. Windsor was a pioneer in its Legal Research and Writing Program; nevertheless, as the LRW positions were funded from "soft" money rather than from the Base Budget, there was a negative impact on faculty retention and development and, consequently, on the further growth and enhancement of the Legal Research and Writing Program as the foundation of our clinical and experiential curricular goals.

From 2000 - 2005, a number of developments occurred:

1. The funding for the LRW positions was moved from "soft" funds to Base Budget;
2. The contracts of LRW Instructors were lengthened from 9 months to 10 months, then to 12 months, and now are 24 month LT contracts;
3. The LT Contracts were set at the Lecturer level which occasioned increased levels of compensation;
4. A third LRW position was added to reduce the Student/Instructor ratio;
5. Funding for Research Assistants was provided; and
6. Funding for professional development conferences and symposia was provided.

Although it is obvious that a great deal of progress has been made towards the goal of developing a professional and permanent LRW teaching staff, one of the outstanding issues from *Investing in Excellence 2000 – 2005* remains the

employment status of the Legal Writing and Research faculty. Currently, LRW instructors are appointed as Lecturers for a two-year Limited Term. However, at the University of Windsor it would currently be exceptional for LRW Lecturers to reach the goal of Tenure under the provisions contained in the Collective Agreement and the current Senate Bylaws. This compromises the goal of retaining and developing the faculty who teach in this program.

In 2006, a new five year plan covering the period 2006 - 2011, was adopted. In *Raising the Bar*, the University of Windsor, Faculty of Law, reaffirmed its commitment to strengthen the Clinical Law Program. Further, the Faculty of Law reaffirmed its desire to create the leading Legal Writing and Research Program in Canada with a permanent and professional teaching faculty. LRW is the foundational course for all clinical and experiential programs at the Faculty of Law. Therefore, in order to reach this goal of creating a permanent and professional teaching faculty in LRW Program at Windsor, a job description has been created which is modelled upon the leading LRW Programs in the United States.

In the United States, under the *American Bar Association Standard 405* accreditation procedures, law schools are mandated to afford legal writing teachers such security of position and other rights and privileges as may be necessary to attract and retain a faculty that is well qualified. At the University of Windsor, the opportunity to provide LRW faculty with tenure and promotion becomes possible under the proposed revisions to the Senate Bylaws governing appointment, promotion and tenure. (Even under the existing Bylaw 20, a lecturer can achieve tenure "in special circumstances" so long as criteria are established.)

Therefore, pursuant to the Bylaws and the Collective Agreement, this proposal outlines the following,

1. The criteria for appointment of a Lecturer to teach Legal Research and Writing;
2. The criteria for renewal of a Lecturer who teaches Legal Research and Writing;
3. The criteria for tenure of a Lecturer who teaches Legal Research and Writing; and
4. The criteria for promotion to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor.

Supplementary materials entitled "Legal Research & Writing Faculty Position Description Development Process" provide the background for the job description. Supporting this document and available upon request is the following information:

1. Excerpts from the Faculty of Law's 5 Year Plans, *Investing in Excellence* and *Raising the Bar*;
2. Information concerning work done to create a job description for LRW faculty including Collective Agreement negotiations;
3. Excerpts from relevant University Senate Bylaws addressing promotion and tenure;
4. Information from both Canadian and U.S. law schools concerning LRW programmes, including detailed summaries of the three top-ranked U.S. programs and a complete summary of the Association of Legal Writing Directors 2006 Annual Report;
5. American Bar Association Accreditation Standards for Legal Writing programs; and
6. Supplementary documents including a PowerPoint overview of the job development process.

DESCRIPTION OF POSITION OF LECTURER IN LEGAL RESEARCH AND WRITING:

Each person appointed as Legal Research and Writing Lecturer is responsible for the following:

1. Teaching assigned sections of a mandatory first year Legal Research, Writing and Advocacy course which include:
 - a. Developing course materials;
 - b. Teaching Canadian legal research skills;
 - c. Teaching legal writing skills;
 - d. Teaching Canadian legal citation;
 - e. Teaching legal argumentation;
 - f. Teaching written and oral advocacy;
 - g. Creating research, writing and advocacy assignments;
 - h. Administering the first year moot program;
 - i. Evaluating students progressively;
 - j. Liaising with Law and Reference Librarians regarding Computer Assisted Legal Research Instruction;
 - k. Working co-operatively with other LRW faculty on matters related to common curriculum initiatives, e.g. moots;
 - l. Incorporating best practices into both instruction and evaluation methods; and
 - j. Liaising with other faculty members in order to coordinate assignments.
2. Providing the following service to the Law School, University, and general Community:
 - a. Coaching the student finalists in the Lerner's Cup;
 - b. Advising the Zuber Moot Court Committee;
 - c. Coaching finalists in Zuber Moot Court Competition; and
 - d. Participating in committee and/ or administrative service approved by Faculty Council based upon the report of the Nominating Committee.
3. Criteria for appointment as a Lecturer in Legal Research and Writing:

Pursuant to existing Bylaws 23A and B and proposed Bylaw 23, Section 6, candidates seeking appointment as a Lecturer in Legal Research and Writing must possess an LL.B. degree or equivalent

and must have experience in or demonstrate a potential for effective teaching in the area of legal research and writing and must demonstrate a potential for scholarship as defined below. The initial probationary appointment will usually be at the rank of Lecturer. Subsequent renewals may lead to tenure for qualified candidates who possess a graduate degree in Law or in a discipline that equips a candidate for teaching legal research and writing.

RENEWAL AND TENURE FOR LRW FACULTY AT THE LECTURER LEVEL:

The criteria for renewal and tenure of a LRW faculty member, as developed by the Faculty of Law pursuant to existing Bylaw 23 A and B and proposed Bylaw 23, take into account the following factors:

1. The lecturer position in LRW is primarily one of teaching and mentoring; these activities are foundational to the development of expertise in the specialized communication systems used in the practice of law and central to the intellectual development of law students;
2. Teaching, evaluation, feedback and revision requirements are significantly different and more intensive than in the traditional law school course. Scholarship is evidenced most significantly in the development and systematic revision of teaching materials and the dissemination of these materials rather than in traditional research and publication in refereed journals usually required for tenure. It is noted that, at the present time, because research on the pedagogy of legal research and writing is relatively new, there are few traditional outlets for the dissemination of this scholarship;
3. Thus, scholarship manifests itself primarily through the development of problem-based learning methods in the creation of assignments including, for example, legal research exercises, memorandum of law hypothetical problems, moot court advocacy problems, assignments for facta preparation. It is also manifested through a familiarity with developments in the field of legal research and writing which inform the materials and teaching in the course.

PROCESS FOR RENEWAL:

The process and time lines for renewal will comply with the existing and proposed Senate Bylaws, the Collective Agreement and the UCAPT form on renewal.

CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL:

Teaching Ability and Performance:

LRW Lecturers must achieve competent performance and exhibit the potential for superior performance in teaching effectiveness which will be assessed using the following criteria:

- a. A demonstrated command of legal analysis, legal writing and oral advocacy as evidenced in course content and teaching materials;
- b. Organization of course material, manifested in course outlines, assignments, and tests that meet the learning objectives developed for the course;
- c. Regular and systematic review and revision of learning objectives for the course and consequent updating of the course and methods of evaluation;
- d. Presentation of well-organized classes that motivate students' learning and aid them in the acquisition of the knowledge and skills that will enable them to conduct research and create various types of writing products required in both the academic and professional context;
- e. Clear and effective communication of course content;
- f. Attention to students' questions and the provision of responses that are clear and effective;
- g. A consistent pattern of sensitivity to student difficulties and an openness to students' comments and suggestions;
- h. A consistent pattern of being accessible to students and approachable for individual consultation and help. This includes availability to students by e-mail, after class and during office hours (indicated by posted and observed office hours);
- i. A consistent pattern of timely and helpful feedback to LRW students on various LRW assignments;
- j. Absence of an unusual pattern of academic appeals;
- k. Adherence to Senate Bylaws regarding the completing of student grade appeals;

I. Rescheduling of cancelled classes.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness may be found in the SET scores, Teaching Dossier, observation of teaching by AAU Head, self-assessment and, where possible, external evaluation of course material, research, moot court, and role playing problems, and any other relevant material.

Scholarship

LRW Lecturers must achieve competent performance in scholarship the effectiveness of which will be assessed using the following criteria:

- a. A familiarity with the developments in the pedagogy of legal research and writing which demonstrably informs the materials used in the teaching of the Legal Research and Writing course;
- b. In keeping with the best practices in the field, the development and subsequent revision of problem-based learning exercises, *e.g.*, legal research exercises, memorandum of law hypothetical problems, moot court advocacy problems, assignments for *facta* preparation, *etc.*;
- c. Attendance at professional conferences and participation in conference proceedings;
- d. Informing colleagues about developments in legal research and writing;
- e. Dissemination and/or publication of materials developed for the teaching of legal research and writing;
- f. Articles in professional (but not necessarily refereed) journals;
- g. Chapters in books.

Items (f) and (g), although desirable, are not required for renewal or tenure.

Service to University and Community

LRW Lecturers must achieve competent performance the effectiveness of which will be assessed according to the following criteria:

- a. Coaching the student finalists in the Lerner's Cup;
- b. Advising the Zuber Moot Court Committee;
- c. Coaching finalists in the Zuber Moot Court Competition; and

- d. Participation on at least one Faculty of Law standing committee and regular participation in the admissions process.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE

In order to qualify for tenure, candidates must have a graduate degree in Law or a discipline that equips a candidate for teaching Legal Research and Writing.

Teaching Ability and Performance:

LRW Lecturers who have demonstrated that they have, on a consistent basis, exhibited superior performance according to the criteria set out for renewal, above, and who have exhibited the potential for continuing superior performance will be eligible for tenure. Teaching effectiveness shall be the main consideration for evaluating the performance of a Legal Research and Writing Lecturer for tenure.

Scholarship:

LRW Lecturers who have demonstrated that they have, on a consistent basis, exhibited competent performance according to the criteria set out for renewal, above, and who have exhibited the potential for continuing competent performance will be eligible for tenure.

Service to University and Community

LRW Lecturers who have demonstrated that they have, on a consistent basis, exhibited competent performance according to the criteria set out, above, for renewal and who have exhibited the potential for continuing competent performance will be eligible for tenure.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND/OR FULL PROFESSOR:

Candidates for appointment at or promotion to the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate or Full Professor, must comply with the requirements of the existing and proposed Senate Bylaws regarding the Criteria for Promotion at these ranks.

Transitional Provisions for Incumbent LRW Lecturers:

Whereas this proposal describes the Tenure process that will apply to new LRW appointees, it does not address the special circumstances of incumbent LRW faculty. The current group of LRW Lecturers were initially appointed after external searches. Subsequent appointments followed searches which were either external or internal. Incumbent LRW faculty have established their expertise in the discipline and certainly fulfill the requirements of the position. Nonetheless, the Bylaws and the Collective Agreement must apply to these

appointments. Consequently, it is recommended, regarding incumbent LRW lecturers, that only a limited search consistent with the Bylaws and the Collective Agreement be conducted. Incumbent LRW lecturers who apply for and are appointed to one of the new, tenure-track positions will have available the full probationary period in which to be considered for tenure. They can, however, in consultation with the Dean, apply earlier believe they have met the established criteria.

Academic Clinic Professor

Commented [CW1]: Note, the criteria for this position have been substantially revised.

Introduction

The position of Clinic Professor is unique amongst tenure-track positions in the Faculty of Law. The Academic Clinic Professor supports and enhances the reflective and competency-based approach of Windsor Law's poverty law clinical programs (Community Legal Aid, Legal Assistance of Windsor, Chatham-Kent Legal Clinic and Community Legal Assistance Sarnia). Specifically, the Clinic Professor will provide pedagogical links between the academic and clinical curricula and act as a thought leader on curriculum and policy at both the clinics and the law school.

The requirements of the position of Clinic Professor for the purposes of Renewal, Tenure and Promotion Tenure (RTP) are enumerated below. This document serves as an interpretation of the University By-laws, provisions of the Collective Agreement, and the Faculty of Law's criteria, on RTP as they are to be applied to the individual holding the position of Clinic Professor.

Teaching

The Academic Clinic Director's teaching responsibilities will involve:

- 1) The teaching of the Clinic Seminar which explicitly links clinic practice to clinic and poverty law theory and policy;
- 2) Designing and acting as the instructor for the Clinic Practice program including assessment, evaluation, supervision (all in consultation with clinic lawyers and the Executive Director), and mentorship;
- 3) Involvement in clinic law student orientation where appropriate (depending on the needs of the clinic and in consultation with the Executive Director of the clinics and clinic lawyers and staff);
- 4) Selection of students for the Clinic Practice program which includes the promotion of the program and overseeing the student application processes (in consultation with the clinics).

Other teaching assignments may arise in consultation with the Clinic Professor.

Research

The Clinic Professor is expected to publish in peer-reviewed journals and in other recognized publications. However, because of the nature of the position, special consideration will be given to the publication of reports, policy documents, and curriculum-related clinical publications including conference papers, as well as publication in non-traditional journals, including professional, multidisciplinary, trade, and other related journals. For the purposes of granting tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates should normally have at least two peer-reviewed journal articles and the equivalent of two other peer-reviewed publications. The latter might include: reports, policy documents, curriculum-related publications including conference papers, law student clinic-related training and orientation material that is of significance to the broader clinic community, as well as publication in non-traditional journals, including professional, multidisciplinary, trade, and other related journals. For promotion to full professor, candidates should normally have at least three peer-reviewed publications and the equivalent of three other peer-reviewed publications.

Service

It is recognized that consultation and collaboration with the Executive Director and clinic staff and lawyers, are very important aspects of the work of the Clinic Professor and as such, the Clinic Professor will attend clinic staff and supervisors meetings when appropriate or necessary. This will generally be considered part of the Clinic Professor's service obligations. The Clinic Professor will also normally be expected to sit on the following boards and committee (other committee assignments, such as Academic Planning and/or Curriculum Reform may be made in consultation with the Clinic Professor):

1. Legal Assistance of Windsor Board
2. Community Legal Aid Board
3. Clinic and Experiential Learning Committee

Grant writing, time and resources permitting, for funding to support clinical legal education initiatives will be expected.

Externship Professor

The Externship professor will be charged with developing, maintaining and directing a for-credit Externship Program at the Faculty of Law, University of Windsor.

Teaching Responsibilities will include:

- 1) Teaching the field integration course(s) (currently titled "Learning in Place"),
- 2) Developing and maintaining the structure for the placement portion of the program, including assessment tools for placement supervisors,
- 3) Developing, maintaining, and growing the number of externship placements,
- 4) Educating lawyer supervisors on their placement responsibilities, responding to issues that arise in placements, and assessing placements for quality,
- 5) Developing policies related to the Externship Program,
- 6) Co-supervising the Experiential Education Coordinator,
- 7) Other teaching assignments per workload and other considerations, in consultation with the Dean of Law. In recognition of the administrative and teaching workload, the Externship Professor will normally not teach outside the program.
- 8) In addition, the Externship Program Director may act as the Chair of the Clinical and Experiential Learning Committee.

Research and Writing

The Externship Professor will stay up-to-date on current research and practice trends in place-based and work-integrated learning. The Externship Professor will research and write in the usual fashion, although additional consideration will be given to policy, community-engaged and/or creative, and other works that might fall outside traditional scholarship in the field of law but reflect norms of scholarship around place-based learning,

Service

The Dean of Law and the Nominations Committee will consider the substantial administrative duties inherent in the position in annual service and committee assignments.