



For faculty hired on or after July 1, 2019

Contents

1.0	Introduction:	3
1.2	School of Social Work: Adjudication Process	3
1.3	Cross-Category Contributions	4
1.4	Hybrid Appointments	4
2.0	Evaluation of Research and Scholarship	4
2.1	Sources of Evidence:	4
2.2	Criteria for Evaluation	5
2.3	General Considerations in Decision Making	5
2.4	Publication Requirements:	6
2.5	Other Publication Considerations	7
	Table 1: School of Social Work Research and Scholarship Evaluation Rubric for Promotion to Associate and Full Professor	8
3.0	Evaluation of Teaching	14
3.1	Sources of Evidence:	14
3.2	Criteria for Evaluation	15
3.3	General Considerations for Decision Making:	15
	Table 2: School of Social Work Teaching Evaluation Rubric	17
4.0	Evaluation of Service	23
4.1	Sources of Evidence:	23
4.2	Criteria for Evaluation	24
	Table 3: School of Social Work Service Evaluation Rubric	25
	Appendix A: Research and Scholarship Activities	0
	Appendix B: Teaching and Advising Activities	1
	Appendix C: Service Activity	2

School of Social Work, University of Windsor
Criteria for Contract Renewal, Tenure & Promotion
Tenure-Track Faculty (hired on or after July 1, 2019)¹
Re-approved by School Council June 8, 2021
Re-approved by UCAPT – October 4, 2021

1.0 Introduction:

Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion awards recognize professional excellence in an individual's academic career. No single model can fully delineate competence and excellence across all disciplines. Standards for achievement of tenure and promotion reflect the variety of practice, context and endeavours typical of a diverse and accomplished faculty complement. The evaluation of candidates for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion must reflect their assignment. The specific profile, research agenda, and teaching context of specific researchers may also be taken into account in identifying the critical determining factors.

This document establishes the assessment criteria for Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion in the School of Social Work at the University of Windsor. The School of Social Work intends this document to be consistent with the University of Windsor Senate approved Tenure and Promotion criteria and procedures outlined in [Bylaw 23](#), and to supplement those criteria.

1.2 School of Social Work: Adjudication Process

Faculty members in the School of Social Work will be assessed with regards to their contributions in three general areas of activity: scholarship, teaching and service. The Committee will consider the candidate's research statement, their teaching dossier, the parts of the ECV that relate to research, teaching and service, the Head's evaluation of research, teaching and service, and the evaluations of three external reviewers, as well as the RTP submission components outlined in the [UCAPT Resource Guide](#). **It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case for his or her promotion.** The department will offer preliminary opportunities for readings of submitted documents to suggest areas that might benefit from more complete documentation

Social Work's Renewal, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee will use the following scale, based on the rating system employed in the University's UCAPT rating system, in determining recommendations for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion in each of teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service:

- Excellence (6 to 7 on 7-point scale)
- Good/ (5 to 5.9 on 7-point scale)
- Competent/Good: (4 to 4.9 on 7-point scale)

¹ In accordance with 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 thereafter. Therefore, any faculty member hired on or before June 30, 2019 may choose to follow these criteria.

- Poor: (1 to 3.9 on 7-point scale)

Successful performance for promotion to full professor will focus on the period when the candidate held the position of associate professor but will take into consideration the candidate's entire career. It is expected that normally a candidate for full professor will have spent a minimum of five years at the associate professor rank. Evaluation of the candidate will be based on the relevant Senate bylaws and the Collective Agreement. See [Bylaw 23](#), section 6 and [Article 13](#) of the Collective Agreement for relevant details.

1.3 Cross-Category Contributions

Within the profession of Social Work, contributions to the organization of scholarly meetings, research networks, and the funding of important projects supporting students and collaborators have both a service component and a scholarly component when the contribution is a service in which intellectual skills and scholarly background are necessary. Similarly, contributions to the development of teaching (through, for example, involvement at the Centre for Teaching and Learning) do not constitute direct teaching or supervision of students (the core of the teaching area) but are nevertheless contributions to teaching, just as they constitute service work.

The Social Work RTP Committee will be guided by the case made by the candidate, but that generally speaking candidates should ensure that any given contribution is only considered in one area.

1.4 Hybrid Appointments

In the case of hybrid appointments between disciplines within the university, both disciplines will contribute to the evaluation of the candidate. See [Bylaw 22](#), Section 3.1.2.

In the case of hybrid appointments involving the university and an outside agency, expectations regarding teaching, research and service will be adjusted to reflect the proportion of the candidate's time committed to the School of Social Work.

2.0 Evaluation of Research and Scholarship

2.1 Sources of Evidence:

The assessment of successful research performance when considering a faculty member for tenure and promotion will take into account several sources of evidence.

1. The candidate's CV
2. Three external letters of reference
3. A research statement outlining research agenda, progress on the agenda and methodological approaches
4. Other relevant documents submitted by the candidate. Candidates for promotion to full professor are strongly encouraged to provide as much evidence as possible relating to the quality of his/her research and its national or international recognition.

2.2 Criteria for Evaluation

The Committee, utilizing the rating scale outlined above, will judge research and scholarship on six criteria. For tenure, candidates must reach a level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) on all criteria. For full professorships, candidates must reach a level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7)

Criterion 1: Expertise in research and relevant methodologies:

Criterion 2: A record of high-quality refereed publications or other demonstrated scholarly outputs relevant to their areas:

Criterion 3: Evidence of qualified independent and/or collaborative original contributions to research, which have an impact on the field of expertise (see Publication Requirements section below for more detail)

Criterion 4: Effective research supported by successful grant/contract funding.

Criterion 5: Demonstrated ability to successfully mentor and train students in research.

Criterion 6: Influence on and contributions to the academic and broader national/international community.

Candidates must consult the rubric, provided on pp. 6-11, which is the basis for assessment of these criteria.

2.3 General Considerations in Decision Making

The School's expectations with respect to the research and scholarship of candidates for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion are sensitive to the extraordinary diversity of fields and subfields within the professional discipline of Social Work with distinct canons and expectations. These may include factors such as:

- Typical size and availability of research grants
- Typical manuscript acceptance rates
- Research population requirements (e.g., university undergraduates vs. medical patient or public-school participants)
- Temporal requirements of research design (e.g., cross-sectional vs. longitudinal)
- Differential publication lags
- Relative value of publication venue (e.g., peer reviewed journal articles, books, chapters in books, book reviews are evaluated more highly in some areas than others)
- Most appropriate publication venue (e.g., Social Work journal versus other discipline or discipline nonspecific publication)
- Number of REB approvals required (e.g., university plus hospital, public school, First Nation, and/or agency)
- Community collaboration requirements (e.g., formal agency/community approval/collaboration required)
- Norms of interdisciplinary research and fields

Candidates are encouraged to include information regarding such variations, supported by evidence, in their research statement. The committee will take these factors into account in assessing candidate's achievements.

2.4 Publication Requirements:

While the School sets high standards for scholarship, it recognizes that the form this may take (e.g., books, chapters in books, refereed journal articles, conference papers, published conference proceedings, policy reports, grant reports,) will vary widely. The publication activity of the candidate will reflect the strength and success of his or her research program. The diversity of professional activity within the discipline creates the possibility that some candidates will have successfully published a larger number of refereed papers while others, working in certain applied areas, will have been more active in the preparation of practical applications for practice or applied contexts. Candidates are encouraged to articulate the nature of their research and publication plan as an element of their research statement in order to assist the committee in its decision making.

The candidate must meet at a minimum these publication requirements:

The successful research productivity standard for the AAU requires the completion of the following during the tenure review period:

5 peer reviewed journal articles, chapters, or other recognized outputs

OR

1 authored book and 2 peer-reviewed journal articles (distinct in content from the book)

OR

1 textbook and 3 peer reviewed journal articles (distinct in content from the book)

OR

1 edited peer-reviewed volume and 3 peer reviewed journal articles (distinct in content from the book)

Successful performance for promotion to full professor will focus on the period when the candidate held the position of associate professor but will take into consideration the candidate's entire career. It is expected that normally a candidate for full professor will have spent a minimum of five years at the associate professor rank with an expected performance of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) as noted in the rubrics for Teaching, Research, and Service. Evaluation of the candidate will be based on the relevant Senate bylaws and the Collective Agreement. See [Bylaw 23](#), section 6 and [Article 13](#) of the Collective Agreement for relevant details.

The RTP committee will also take note of other forms of academic research and publication. These may include:

- Textbooks
- Reports (including government reports)
- Applications and success in securing internal and external research funding
- Research awards
- Presentations at peer-reviewed academic conferences

Quality and originality as well as quantity of publications are important hallmarks of scholarship. In evaluating a candidate's publications, the committee will give consideration to:

- The quality of the publication venues (e.g. publisher, journal titles)
- The length of the material
- Citations
- Whether the publications are first-authored or multi-authored
- External reviewers' assessment of the quality of the work
- Other relevant factors identified by the candidate. The candidate is strongly encouraged to provide as much evidence as possible relating to the quality of his/her research.

2.5 Other Publication Considerations

Multi-authored work: The School encourages research collaboration and, therefore, treats co-authored publications as potentially as valuable as single authored publications when it comes to assessing scholarship. Candidates are asked to provide a statement of their specific contributions to co-authored publications (e.g., documentation from performance reviews,). The Social Work RTP Committee may also gather data from external reviewers who are positioned to make judgments on the magnitude and quality of the contributions that the candidate has made to joint research projects and co-authored publications, so that it can make an informed assessment of the quality of the candidate's work. In case of multi-authored work, at least one of the peer reviewed publications must be first authored.

Collaboration with Graduate Students: Within the professional discipline of Social Work and, in particular, within the University of Windsor School of Social Work, the graduate student whose Master's thesis or PhD dissertation and/or other scholarly research work provides the basis for a published article is given first authorship, regardless of the extent to which the student contributed to the preparation of the published article.

A rubric for the assessment of these criteria has been provided on p. 8-13.

Please refer to [Appendix A, Research and Scholarship Activities](#), which provides a sample set of comparative indicators of research and scholarship contrasting competence with good to excellence.

Table 1: School of Social Work Research and Scholarship Evaluation Rubric for Promotion to Associate and Full Professor

The rubric provides descriptors for the indicators associated with each criterion.

Criterion 1 Standard for (level): *At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.*

Criterion 1: Expertise in research and relevant methodologies	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. An active or well-constructed research activity plan, and a history of successful plans or programs	Research activities do not demonstrate a clearly focused research program, or the program may consist of goals with minimal evidence of implementation or completion. What evidence of progress there is does not suggest regular effort and progress towards established goals.	Evidence of organized research activity and an emerging research focus. The candidate provides evidence that research goals are being met, including articles and grant applications submitted for review, on a regular basis. Clear research statement.	The candidate demonstrates an ongoing, clearly focused, and highly active research program, with a continued pattern of quality articles published and under review. 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	Well-articulated and successful research agenda. Evidence that research goals are being met and exceeded, of ongoing re-evaluation and planning reflecting the development of new directions and expanding reach or depth. Evidence of leadership in meeting research agenda, and strong evidence of continuing productivity (e.g. publications, pending publications, under review, grants submitted).

Criterion 2 Standard for (level): *At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.*

Criterion 2: A record of high-quality refereed publications or other demonstrated scholarly outputs relevant to their areas	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Publishes in journals or with publishing houses with a strong academic reputation	Publications, if they occur, have not been peer-reviewed, or in journals, or with publishers limited academic reputations, or been self-published	Publications have been peer reviewed and are generally published in well-respected journals or through publishing houses with high quality academic reputations.	Publications are published in journals or with publishing houses with strong national or international reputations.	Many publications are published in journals or with publishing houses of elite national or international reputations.
i. Research dissemination at the national and/or international level	Research dissemination is not at the national or international level	Research dissemination is often at the national or international level.	Research dissemination is consistently at the national or international level	Research dissemination is consistently recognized widely and national and/or international levels.
ii. Quantity of publications	Very limited or no publications	Has typically met the departmental productivity standard (see p. 4-5).	Has consistently met and in some areas exceeded the departmental productivity standard (see p. 4-5).	Consistently exceeds the productivity standard (see p. 4-5).
iii. Peer review indicates that publications is of high quality	Peer review indicates that publications or creative activity is of uneven quality.	Peer review indicates that publications are of satisfactory quality.	Peer review indicates that publications are of good quality.	Peer review indicates that publications are of excellent quality.

For more information about the assessment of publication quality and productivity, please see section 2.4

Criterion 3 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.

Criterion 3: Evidence of qualified independent and/or collaborative if relevant, contributions to research, which have an impact on the field of expertise.	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
<p>i. Contributions to the field of study i.e., social work practice- influenced thinking and/or practice in the field, including extent to which research is considered, referred to, read; citation in documents; citation counts, publication rates, confidential external reviews of impact</p>	<p>Little evidence of contributions to the field.</p>	<p>Evidence of contributions to the field: some evidence that the research has been read, considered, referred to by others in the field or as the basis for practical applications.</p>	<p>Evidence of contributions that are influencing the evolution of the field, practice, or thinking within the discipline or as practical applications</p>	<p>Evidence of major contributions with significant impact within the discipline or through practical applications.</p>
<p>ii. National recognition/ leadership within the area of research specialty</p>	<p>Little evidence of recognition as a contributor to the field nationally/ internationally</p>	<p>Some evidence of emerging recognition within the area of research specialty, including potentially invitations to give addresses, residencies, or research partnerships.</p>	<p>Strong evidence of national recognition within the area of research, including invitation to give keynote addresses, offer master classes, fellowships, major residencies or exchanges.</p>	<p>Strong evidence of national and emerging international recognition either in the area of research including keynotes, guest residencies, major and highly competitive research fellowship, residencies or exchanges.</p>

Criterion 4 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.

Criterion 4: Effective research supported by successful grant/contract funding	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Ability to attract internal or external research funding	Efforts to or success in acquiring research funding have not been consistent with the satisfactory standard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of external grant proposals** • Submission of internal research grants 	Funding of external research grants judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors.	History of regular, repeated and evolving success in major granting competitions, including those considered being the most highly competitive within the discipline, given the career stage of the candidate. This could include PI or Co-PI (co-applicant) of a major research grant.
ii. Ability to foster partnerships that directly contribute to research capacity or the development of research infrastructure, where relevant	No or little evidence of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Some degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually. (Including efforts for the secondary data analysis, Research Data Centre)	Strong degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Exceptional degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.
iii. Engagement in grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field	No or little evidence of in grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.	Some evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.	Strong evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.	Exceptional evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.

**** Evidence of attempts/success with Tri Council, government, foundation, agency or social service organizational grants.**

Criterion 5 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.

Criterion 5: Demonstrated ability to successfully mentor and train students in research	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Successful graduate and undergraduate students supervision and mentorship	There is little evidence of successful graduate and undergraduate student supervision, mentorship, and PhD membership	Some evidence of successful graduate and undergraduate student supervision, mentorship and PhD committee membership	Strong evidence of regular successful graduate and undergraduate student supervision and mentoring. This includes membership on graduate student committees, both internal and external to the university.	Exceptional evidence that the candidate supervises, and mentors graduate and undergraduate students to high achievement; this includes Chair of PhD Dissertation Committee(s) and successful dissertation defense
ii. Evidence of collaboration with graduate and undergraduate students on publication, research or creative activity	No evidence of collaboration or publication, research, or creative activity with graduate or undergraduate students.	Some evidence of collaboration or publication, research, or creative activity with graduate and undergraduate students	Strong evidence of collaboration or publication, research, or creative activity with graduate and undergraduate students	Exceptional evidence of collaboration or publication, research, or creative activity with graduate and undergraduate students

Criterion 6 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; at the level of Good/ (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.

Criterion 6: Influence on and contributions to the academic and broader national/international community.	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Evidence of capacity to build productive research collaboration	No or little evidence of research collaborations	Evidence of involvement in research collaborations	Evidence of leadership roles or strong demand for involvement in research collaborations	Leadership in developing and sustaining research collaborations on a national and international scale.
i. Publicly engaged academic work	No or little evidence of public engagement in academic work (e.g. invited public or industry presentations or performances, media engagement with original or expert knowledge, consultation for industry or community or national communities, community-based knowledge dissemination).	Evidence of public or industry engagement in academic work.	Evidence of leadership and significantly impactful public or industry engagement in academic work.	Evidence of significant impact on social discourse, industry or community practice, on an industry-wide, national, or international basis.
ii. Leadership contributions to national disciplinary academic associations or to the disciplinary community.	No contributions to national disciplinary or academic associations or to the disciplinary community, professional organizations, or academic community groups. .	Evidence of contributions such as peer review or other engagement with national disciplinary or academic associations and intermittent or regional service to the disciplinary community.	Evidence of significant contributions to committees of national or international disciplinary academic associations, as well as the disciplinary community.	Assumption of formal leadership roles on national or international disciplinary or academic associations, particularly with evidence of specific initiatives undertaken.

3.0 Evaluation of Teaching

3.1 Sources of Evidence:

The assessment of successful teaching performance when considering a faculty member for tenure and promotion will take into account the following sources of evidence:

1. A teaching portfolio prepared by the candidate;
2. Student evaluations of courses taught by the faculty member;
3. Syllabi of the candidate's courses (the candidate is encouraged to include electronic information, such as reading lists or exam information);
4. The candidate's CV;
5. Peer reviews of the candidate's teaching by the head of the department, by other members of his or her department, or by the candidate's dean or representative of the dean;
6. Other relevant documents submitted by the candidate. At the full professor level, this should include evidence of the candidate's role in curriculum development or other educational leadership activities.

The use of a teaching dossier allows 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. Candidates are referred to the UCAPT-approved [teaching dossier template](#), and may also wish to contact the Centre for Teaching and Learning for assistance. A teaching dossier may include the following non-exhaustive list of useful forms of evidence of effective practice and contributions to teaching: self evaluation; Peer evaluations (by AAU Director and/or colleagues); student evaluation procedures in addition to the SET (e.g., course and/or degree exit surveys); evidence of direction of student work (e.g., senior assignment projects, special topics courses); evidence of high level of student achievement (e.g., student work recognized, accepted to conferences, published); records of PhD Supervision/chair and PhD committee member; evidence of good departmental citizenship (such as teaching introductory or service courses); participation in co-curricular academic activities (e.g., advisement of student organizations, participation in conversation hours and electronic bulletin boards); documentation of relevant awards and recognition received; evidence of innovations and their impact (e.g., new teaching methods, the design of new courses, addition of topical readings); record of participation in academic conferences geared towards pedagogical enhancement and innovation; and any other appropriate evidence of teaching excellence.

The Committee will also consider the AAU heads' evaluation of candidates' teaching effectiveness as well as the head's comments on investigated student's complaints, unusual patterns of withdrawal from the candidate's classes; or other which the AAU Head deems relevant.

3.2 Criteria for Evaluation

The Committee, utilizing the rating scale outlined above, will judge teaching on six criteria. For tenure, candidates must reach a level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) on all criteria. For full professorships, candidates must reach a level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7)

Criterion 1. Design and planning of learning activities

Criterion 2. Instructional Methods

Criterion 3. Assessment and giving feedback to students

Criterion 4. Developing effective environments, student support and guidance

Criterion 5. Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and in support of learning

Criterion 6. Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development

A rubric for the assessment of these criteria has been provided on pp. 15-20

3.3 General Considerations for Decision Making:

In assessing teaching, the Committee will be cognizant of and value various teaching methodologies. It is assumed that the "best practices" will be those that work for the candidate and enable students to acquire the intended course learning outcomes. Innovation in teaching is assessed through an examination of information on the development of new courses in new areas for the School and on the development of new pedagogical tools and teaching techniques. The School of Social Work values teaching that results in substantive knowledge acquisition and the development of strong study, research and critical analysis skills, with an emphasis on the latter.

The University of Windsor does not have a minimum standard for teaching. However, notwithstanding a consideration of diversity issues described above, a rating of Competence in teaching would normally require SET ratings consistently at or above 4 on the 7-point scale and contributions to student development. The committee will strongly consider other sources of variation, such as whether the course is undergraduate or graduate, class size, experimental and new in developing curriculum, as opposed to established within a curriculum that provides broad support for the course in question.

Therefore, the Committee will take into account 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 and, with respect to student perceptions of teaching effectiveness, social context (this may include social markers of race, gender, indigeneity, disability and sexuality). The use of multiple forms of evidence to support a case for teaching effectiveness is important in ensuring equitable and fair decision making.

Undergraduate and graduate research supervision is an important component of faculty teaching responsibilities. Evaluation of this role requires examination of both the quantity and quality of research supervision, based on quantitative data such as the number of collaborative student-faculty research presentations and publications with undergraduate and graduate supervisees. As with classroom teaching, some faculty may attract and excel in undergraduate research supervision, while other faculty may be engaged in research supervision primarily with graduate students. Some faculty may supervise student research within a relatively narrow area, while others may supervise students exploring a wide range of topic areas.

Additionally, faculty members are often engaged as instructors of graduate students who are in field placements or internships. The capacity to effectively teach and liaise with students who are applying the knowledge and skills of social work is considered an important contribution to the academic preparation of graduate level students and will form one aspect of the teaching assessment for candidates.

A rubric for the assessment of these criteria has been provided on p. 17-22.

Please refer to [Appendix B, *Teaching and Advising Activities*](#), which provides a sample set of comparative indicators of teaching and advising contrasting competence with excellence.

Table 2: School of Social Work Teaching Evaluation Rubric

Each page of the rubric provides descriptors for the indicators associated with one criterion.

Criterion 1 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 4 out of 5 criteria at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full

Criterion 1: Design and planning of learning activities	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Preparation of teaching and learning materials	Teaching and learning materials and activities show little evidence of thoughtful or systematic design in candidate's assigned courses.	Some evidence of capacity to design effective and well-aligned teaching and learning materials and activities in assigned courses.	In assigned courses teaching and learning materials are consistently well aligned, effective, and stimulating. Activities reflect informed approach to pedagogy.	Teaching and learning materials and activities are exceptionally well designed and often innovative, possibly reflecting leadership in curriculum development and pedagogical innovation
ii. Course outline clearly details learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment	Course outlines are inconsistent with bylaw and policy, and do not clearly outline intended learning outcomes, learning activities and assessment	Course outlines are generally consistent with bylaw and policy, and outline intended learning outcomes, activities and assessments with a degree of clarity	Consistently in compliance with bylaw and policy, outlines show the alignment of materials, activities and assessments with intended course learning outcomes.	Consistently in compliance with bylaw and policy, course outlines are highly readable, and clearly explain how materials, activities, and assessment align with the intended learning outcomes.
iii. Planned learning activities designed to develop the students' learning	Planned learning activities do not or rarely appear to be designed to support student acquisition of the course's intended learning outcomes, including an appropriate difficulty level	Planned learning activities appear to be intended to foster student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes, but may not do so consistently	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 consistently and systematically support student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes and may also provide flexibility to further support or challenge diverse learners
iv. Sound knowledge of the course content and material ²	Limited knowledge of the course content and material	Reasonable knowledge of the course content and material, some areas of weakness	Sound knowledge of the course content and material, with evidence of practices to remain current	Deep knowledge of the course content and material, with evidence of serious efforts to acquire depth of knowledge and remain current
v. Preparation for class	Evidence of lack of preparation for class or frequent disorganization	Generally well-prepared for class and well-organized.	Consistently well-prepared for class and well-organized	Consistently very well-prepared and organized in regard to all aspects of course development

² The committee is entitled to take into account evidence from the candidate's teaching context statement indicating the degree to which the faculty member has taken on teaching outside of their area of expertise in service to departmental needs.

Criterion 2 Standard for (level): At the level of *Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure*; 5 out of 6 at the level of *Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full*

Criterion 2: Instructional Methods	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Learning-centered approach: Demonstrates understanding and application of specific aspects of effective teaching and learning support methods.	Very little evidence of efforts to support and enhance student learning	Some awareness of effective methods to support student learning, with uneven application of those methods	Consistent awareness and application of effective approaches to supporting and enhance learning	Highly effective and often innovative support and enhancement of learning
ii. Clarity of communication and explanation	Lack of clarity identified	Adequate or uneven clarity	Consistent clarity	Exceptional clarity
iii. Stimulation of interest SET A.6.	Students report disinterest or general decrease of interest over courses	Students' interest was generally maintained over courses, or trends were uneven	Students generally indicated interest or increased interest in the courses taught.	Student interest nearly always increased, or course feedback indicated high level of interest in the course
iv. Encouragement of appropriate student-faculty interaction	Little or no evidence of efforts to encourage student-faculty interaction ³ or interactions that inhibit learning	Some evidence of efforts to encourage student-faculty interaction ²	Consistent effort to encourage appropriate student-faculty interaction ²	Consistent evidence of highly effective and innovative efforts to encourage student-faculty interaction ²
v. Encouragement of appropriate student-student interaction	Little or no evidence efforts to encourage appropriate student-student interaction ²	Some evidence efforts to encourage appropriate student-student interaction ²	Consistent evidence of efforts to encourage appropriate student-faculty interaction ²	Consistent evidence of highly effective and innovative efforts to encourage appropriate student-faculty interaction ²
vi. Supports students to develop and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes	Little or no evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning	Some evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning	Consistent evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning	Consistent evidence of highly effective and innovative efforts to support student development of intended learning

² Appropriate to the courses involved the committee will also consider Peer evaluations (by AAU Director and/or colleagues); student evaluation procedures in addition to the SET (e.g., course and/or degree exit surveys); evidence of direction of student work (e.g., senior assignment projects, special topics courses); evidence of high level of student achievement (e.g., student work recognized, accepted to conferences, published); records of PhD Supervision/chair and PhD committee member; evidence of good departmental citizenship (such as teaching introductory or service courses); participation in co-curricular academic activities (e.g., advisement of student organizations, participation in conversation hours and electronic bulletin boards); documentation of relevant awards and recognition received; evidence of innovations and their impact (e.g., new teaching methods, the design of new courses, addition of topical readings); record of participation in academic conferences geared towards pedagogical enhancement and innovation; and any other appropriate evidence of teaching excellence.

Criterion 3 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 3 out of 3 criteria at the level of Good/ (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.

Criterion 3: Assessment and giving feedback to students	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Quality of assessment tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity • Alignment with learning outcomes • Appropriate level of difficulty 	Assessment activities were hard to follow, poorly aligned with intended learning outcomes, or of an inappropriate level of difficulty	Assessment activities were inconsistent in terms of clarity, alignment, or appropriateness of difficulty, but generally appeared to be reasonable for the course level.	Assessment activities were generally clear, well-aligned with learning outcomes, and appropriately challenging for the course level.	Assessment activities were clear, well aligned, appropriately challenging, and provided innovative opportunities for student learning,
ii. Timely feedback is provided to students	Feedback is not timely – late and infrequent.	Assignment feedback is generally timely.	Assignment feedback is timely and occurs several times through the course.	Feedback is proactive, ongoing, and timely.
iii. Constructive feedback is provided to students ⁴	Constructive feedback appropriate to the nature of the course was rarely or never provided to students, or was not constructive for future improvement	Assignment feedback was appropriate to the nature of the course and generally provided useful guidance to help students to know how to improve, including some strengths and weaknesses.	Student feedback or other evidence suggests that assignment feedback was consistently appropriate to the nature of the course and provided useful guidance regarding how to improve for future work.	Assignment feedback was appropriate to the nature of the course, detailed, balanced appropriately with strengths and weaknesses and provided systematic and highly effective guidance regarding how to improve

⁴ Format and delivery appropriate to the courses involved

Criterion 4 Standard for (level): At the level of *Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 3 out of 3 criteria at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.*

Criterion 4: Developing effective environments, student support and guidance	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Availability for consultation (e.g. email, online, face-to-face or telephone) in a timely manner	Rarely available for consultation outside of class time (face-to-face, online, or by telephone)	Somewhat available outside of class time: response patterns may be uneven.	Available to students outside of class time with evidence of systematic approaches to ensuring availability to students	Makes exceptional and systematic efforts to be available to students
ii. Effective advisor/counsellor/supervisor	Ineffective as an advisor, student counsellor, or supervisor	Somewhat effective as an advisor, student counsellor, or supervisor	Generally perceived by students and peers to be effective, supportive, and knowledgeable as an advisory, student counsellor, or supervisor	Recognized by students and peers as a key advisor, student counsellor, and supervisor
iii. Demonstration of respect for students and systematic attention to ensuring students demonstrate respect for others	Evidence of habitual insensitivity to student concerns or to students	Demonstrates a satisfactory degree of respect for students and some attempts to ensure students demonstrate respect for their peers	Actively and explicitly works to establish respectful practices and interactions with students and among students	Highly effective leader and mentor in the establishment of respectful learning and responsive learning environments with students and among students.

Criterion 5 Standard for (level): At the level of *Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure*; 3 out of 4 criteria at the level of *Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full*.

Criterion 5: Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and in support of learning	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Teaching and learning research incorporated into teaching practice	Teaching and planning shows no awareness of research on teaching	Occasional incorporation of ideas or practices based on teaching and learning research into practice	Research on teaching and learning forms a regular source for planning and decision making in teaching and course design, and informal inquiry forms an element of teaching improvement practice.	Teaching and learning practices is consistently driven by knowledge of the research, and by an inquiry-based approach to teaching and learning which may also have resulted in publications or presentations of teaching research.
ii. Inclusion of discipline-based research in the curriculum and engagement of students in pedagogically sound discipline-based research	Discipline-based research or creative practice is absent from the course curriculum or is not current	Discipline-based research or creative practice is somewhat evident in the course curriculum, and is somewhat current	Current, discipline-based research or creative practice forms a regular and integrated part of the curriculum	Cutting-edge discipline-based research is frequently and effectively incorporated in the course
iii. Evidence of supervising students in doing research or other related scholarly activities	No evidence of efforts to inspire student interest or engagement with disciplinary research, creative practice, or inquiry culture	Some evidence that course activities are intended to engage students with disciplinary research, creative practice, or inquiry culture. Where applicable, this may include effectiveness in undergraduate/ graduate student research supervision	Evidence of consistent and effective efforts to engage students with disciplinary research, creative practice, or inquiry culture. Where applicable, this may include effectiveness in undergraduate/ graduate student research supervision	Evidence of highly effective, systematic efforts to engage students in disciplinary research, creative practice, or inquiry culture. Where applicable, this may include effectiveness in undergraduate/ graduate student research supervision, as well as support and mentorship of students presenting or publishing their work.
iv. Incorporation of professional experiences into teaching practice and the curriculum	Professional experiences are not incorporated into the curriculum but were intended to be.	Professional experiences are somewhat incorporated into the curriculum but may not be well-aligned with intended learning outcomes or well supported.	Professional experiences are well incorporated in the curriculum, well-aligned with intended learning outcomes, and well supported.	Professional experiences are very effectively incorporated in the curriculum offering a highly integrated, well-supported, and exceptional learning opportunity for students.

Criterion 6 Standard for (level): *At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 2 out of 2 criteria at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.*

Criterion 6: Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Participation in teaching related professional development	No evidence of 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 systematically over time, e.g., self-directed reading, workshops, forums, conferences, or peer-led activities intended to enhance teaching and learning	High degree of engagement and initiative with regard to teaching-related professional development, which may include leadership and facilitation of workshops and other events, as well as peer-reviewed conference presentations or publications on teaching and learning, and potentially grants related to teaching and learning initiatives
iii. Self-evaluation leading to changes in teaching practice. Available in the teaching dossier under 3. Teaching Development item #2.	Very little evidence of efforts to enhance teaching skills or of self-reflection regarding teaching.	Able to provide several examples of changes to teaching practice based on reflection 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.	Evidence of an ongoing commitment to improvement-oriented and evidence-based practices based in a scholarly approach to teaching and teaching inquiry.

4.0 Evaluation of Service

This category includes all forms of professional service performed for the benefit of the School of Social Work, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the University of Windsor, the profession, and the public. The faculty members of the School of Social Work recognize a continuous obligation to provide service through its professional knowledge and skills, as well as growing demand for this service.

4.1 Sources of Evidence:

Service (for tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Full Professor)

The assessment of successful service performance when considering a faculty member for tenure and promotion will take into account several sources of evidence:

1. The candidate's CV
2. A report from the Department Head
3. Other relevant documents submitted by the candidate: a statement of service goals, activities, and impact written by the candidate is strongly recommended.

As a guide to candidates for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion, a partial list of activities that may be recognized in the area of service follows:

- Efforts to promote partnerships and engagement with public and/or community organizations
- Consultative or other service to any level of public or private institutions or professional organizations
- Participation in School of Social Work committees
- Advising Social Work students
- Service as Director or Coordinator of the School
- Member of Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Coordinating Council (FCC) or Faculty of Graduate Studies Graduate Council
- Advising students in School and University recognized student groups
- Service on FAHSS or University task forces
- Service as Dean, Associate Dean
- Participation in University governance
- Participation in University-wide committees
- Participation as a member of Faculty Senate or Graduate Council
- Activities in professional organizations
- Advising or assisting civic organizations in support of the School and/or University Missions
- Public outreach and community activities in support of the School and/or University Mission
- Activities in support of the advancement of the profession and/or professional education
- Activities in support of recruitment

As a professional discipline it is highly recommended that at a minimum, Social Work faculty members become members of the Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE). As well, faculty members are highly encouraged to become members of the Ontario Association of Social Workers (OASW) and seek registration with the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers

(OCSWSSW). In addition to the aforementioned, faculty members may also consider becoming members in other highly prestigious professional discipline specific associations such as the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Directors (BPD), the Society for Social Work Research (SSWR), the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) and the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW). As well, faculty members are encouraged to consider memberships in other credible professional associations relevant to their specific areas of scholarship and/or research.

Evidence of a developing reputation for excellence in professional service beyond the local level should be presented. As mentioned earlier, a distinction should be drawn between routine service, or citizenship, and service projects that relate to scholarship. Examples might include shaping public policy, serving clients in some exceptional way, working with public organizations to bring about substantial and significant change. In all of these instances, scholarly service should be shown to contribute to knowledge creation, transfer, and dissemination.

As pointed out earlier, the School of Social Work does not recommend that candidates take positions of heavy service responsibility prior to establishing substantial competencies in scholarship and teaching. However, there may be circumstances due to under resourcing in which the School of Social Work has no choice but to call upon the candidate to assume significant service responsibilities. In such circumstances, the Social Work RTP Committee will acknowledge the candidate's service contributions and evaluate scholarship and teaching competencies within this exceptional context.

Please refer to [Appendix C, Service Activity](#), which provides a sample set of comparative indicators of service contrasting competence with excellence.

4.2 Criteria for Evaluation

The Committee, utilizing the rating scale outlined above, will judge teaching on one criterion. For tenure, candidates must reach a level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) on all criteria. For full professorships, candidates must reach a level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7)

Criterion 1: Service to the operation of the department, the faculty, university, professional academic community, and professional practice community

A rubric for the assessment of these criteria has been provided on p. 25.

Table 3: School of Social Work Service Evaluation Rubric

As a professional program, the Social Work RTP Committee will recognize some variation in terms of service emphasis to the AAU, university, community, and/or profession. The rubric provides descriptors for the indicators associated with each criterion.

Criterion 1 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.

Criterion 1: Service to the operation of the department, the faculty, university, professional academic community, professional practice community	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Service to the operation of the department, FAHSS, university, professional academic community, professional practice community	There is little evidence of active participation and/or attendance in service to the department, FAHSS, university, professional academic community or professional practice community	Evidence of a spirit of co-operation to participate and meaningfully contribute in a normal number of School of Social Work committee assignments. (e.g. 2 (as required in the SSW) or more)	In addition to the previous criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of having done an exceptional job in significant positions; • Other roles e.g., Student recruitment/ retention activities/Accreditation/ IQAP Committee/ Chair. • Service to the academic professional community (university, local, national, and international) • Service to the professional practice community (local, national, and international) 	In addition to the previous criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong evidence of having done an exceptional job in significant positions. In the School of Social Work these positions may include BSW Program Coordinator, Disabilities Studies Coordinator, MSW and MSW/JD Program Coordinator, On-Campus, MSW Program Coordinator, Off-Campus, or PhD Program Coordinator. • Evidence of an outstanding job in chairing/participating in University level committee(s) (FAHSS committee, REB, WUFA committee, Senate Student Caucus, or Senate Governance Committee). • Evidence of assuming a leadership role or being very active and supportive in developing and modifying curriculum and/or academic programs. • Evidence of a developing reputation for excellence in professional service beyond the local level should be presented. • Evidence of more than a routine amount, range, or depth of involvement in service and an assessment of the outstanding quality or effectiveness of that involvement.

Appendix A: Research and Scholarship Activities⁵

Indicators of Competence Examples	Indicators of Good/Excellence Examples
Publication of book (less prestigious publishing house; not a vanity press)	Publication of book (nationally recognized publishing house; not a vanity press)
Monograph (regional or state organization)	Published monograph (major professional organization or publishing house)
Articles (regional or professional refereed periodicals)	Articles (internationally, nationally, prestigious refereed/peer-reviewed journals)
Proceedings in refereed regional publications	Proceedings/papers presented in scholarly forums and printed in refereed/peer-reviewed international or national publications
Editor, book or readings (published by professional organization of high prestige or nationally recognized publishing house)	Chapters, articles in internationally or nationally distributed publication of high prestige or recognized publishing house
Grants (approved not funded); Tri-Council, Government, Foundation, Agency/Social Service Organization	Funded research/program grants with consideration to the grant amount and competitive selection; Tri-Council, Government, Foundation, Agency/Social Service Organization
Refereed/peer-reviewed presentation at a regional, provincial, or state professional event, symposia, or conference	Refereed/peer-reviewed presentation at an internationally or nationally recognized symposia or conference
Invited presentation at a regional, provincial, or state professional event, symposia, or conference	Invited presentation at an internationally or nationally recognized symposia or conference
Reviewer of scholarly works in national refereed journal or for a recognized publishing house	Editor-in-Chief, international/national journal
Nomination for honour/award for scholarship	Honours/awards for scholarship
Presentations (refereed; international/national)	
Grant reviewer for local or provincial organization (e.g., philanthropic foundation, provincial government ministry, etc.)	Grant reviewer for national research organization (e.g., SSHRC, CIHR, etc.)
Workbooks/Study guides (published by a major publishing house)	Significant citations of work in professional literature
Achieve graduate faculty status	
Classroom based research projects	
Instructor's manual	

⁵ This is a non-exhaustive list provided for illustrative purposes.

Appendix B: Teaching and Advising Activities⁶

Indicators of Competence Examples	Indicators of Good/Excellence Examples
Member, Doctoral dissertation committee	Chair, Doctoral dissertation committee
Advise undergraduate and Master's students	Advise Doctoral students
Average SET scores	Excellent SET scores
Participate in workshops to improve instruction	Deliver workshops to improve instruction
Nomination for teaching award	Receive teaching/achievement awards
Developing and sharing teaching materials	Publishing teaching materials

⁶ This is a non-exhaustive list provided for illustrative purposes.

Appendix C: Service Activity⁷

Indicators of Competence Examples	Indicators of Good/Excellence Examples
Member of standing committee(s) of School Council other than Appointments and/or AAU RTP Committee	Member of Appointments and/or AAU RTP Committee and/or Chair of a standing committee of the School, Faculty, or University
Participate in the development of a new academic program	Initiate/develop a new academic program
Participate in accreditation process	Assume leadership role in accreditation process
Serve on committee to initiate/develop new academic program	Initiate/develop new academic program
Serve as faculty liaison to students on field placement/internship	Initiate/develop new field placement opportunities/settings
Member of professional discipline association (e.g., CASWE, OCSWSSW, OASW, etc.)	Taking formal leadership role in a professional discipline association committee or board (e.g., CASWE Board of Accreditation or OASW Standing Committee or Board of Directors, etc.)
Member of a community health or social service organization's Board of Directors	Officer of a community health or social service organization's Board of Directors
	Administrative role in the School of Social Work (e.g., Director or Coordinator)
	Administrative role in the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (e.g., Dean or Associate Dean)

⁷ This is a non-exhaustive list provided for illustrative purposes.