Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion
of Departmental AAS-LS and Faculty Members

Approved by Council – *May 12, 2025*
Approved by Faculty of Science Council – *June 10, 2025*
Approved by UCAPT – *October 27, 2025*

Introduction

This document is in partial fulfillment of the Department's obligations under Bylaw 20 (Types and Terms of Appointments), Bylaw 22 (Committees and Procedures for Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion); and Bylaw 23 (Criteria for Renewal, Tenure & Promotion), to clearly articulate its criteria and standards for renewal, tenure, and promotion.

General Notes

Criteria rankings of "Good, Very Good and Outstanding" for Research and "Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Good and Excellent" for Service and Teaching are converted to numeric or descriptor scores, whichever is required to complete the UCAPT form(s). For reference, the descriptors on the UCAPT form are: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Good and Excellent.

A candidate for promotion and/or tenure must extend the boundaries of knowledge of Chemistry/Biochemistry and be committed to the transmittal of this knowledge in the broadest possible sense. A candidate will be evaluated based on:

(i)   Ongoing research in Chemistry/Biochemistry.

(ii)   Effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and effective mentoring and supervision of graduate students. The candidate's courses must be academically current and evolve with the field in an appropriate manner.

(iii)   Active participation in the management and operation of the Department. This includes the assumption of leadership responsibilities for portions of the service life of the Department, ongoing development of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum and participation in service to the Department, Faculty and University as a whole.

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 or performance of candidates during the period under consideration. This includes instances where a candidate is taken away from normal teaching, research, and/or service work for an extended period(s) of time due to health, family, administrative, or other applicable circumstances.

Letters of Reference:

Letters of peer review are given consideration in both tenure and promotion decisions. Outside evaluation provides arm's length judgement of the quality and quantity of publication and the recognition of the scientific community of the candidate's research efforts. The candidate is to submit the names, contact information, and research keywords of 5 potential referees. The names of at least 3 referees will be chosen from the lists provided by the candidate and APTR committee, with at least one chosen from each list.

Applicants are encouraged to provide a cover letter that describes how they believe they meet the criteria. It is the responsibility of the candidate to make a solid, evidence-supported case that the candidate has met criteria and standards in the position-relevant areas.

<u>**Research Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:**</u>
An Associate Professor is a matured scholar whose achievements at the University of Windsor and/or elsewhere have earned their colleagues' respect as an individual of superior qualities and achievements.

Consistent with Bylaw 23 the criteria and standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall be the same. A single application for tenure *and* promotion to Associate Professor will be required.

The criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is that the applicant must minimally meet the requirements for <u>Satisfactory</u> (5-5.5) in the area of Research, and <u>Satisfactory</u> (5-5.5) in Teaching, and Service as defined below.

<u>**Research Criteria for Professor with Tenure and Promotion to Professor:**</u>
A Professor is an eminent member of the University who, at the University of Windsor and throughout their career, has achieved substantial distinction in their field, as exemplified in teaching and scholarship, and demonstrated a willingness to accept reasonable University responsibilities.

The criteria for tenure and promotion to Professor is that the applicant must meet the requirements for <u>Good</u> (5.5-6) in Research and <u>Good</u> (5.5-6) in Teaching while maintaining <u>Good</u> (5.5-6) performance in Service, *or* <u>Excellent</u> (>6 – 7) performance in Research while maintaining <u>Satisfactory</u> (5-5.5) performance in Teaching and Service as outlined below.

Evaluation Criteria: RESEARCH

A candidate must make a significant, ongoing and independent contribution to research, which, under normal circumstances, will involve the following:

- A candidate must perform substantive research in Chemistry/Biochemistry or a related field, liberally defined for the purposes of tenure and promotion.

- A candidate must have established an ongoing, independent research program. Contributions with the candidate as sole corresponding author unequivocally indicate an independent research program. Collaborative research is encouraged, but the contribution of the candidate must be identified.

- Candidates must provide the results of their research to their research community through peer-reviewed, archival publications, of a type judged important in the candidate's area. Refereed journal articles are the premier sign of research significance. High-impact patents and provisional patent applications can also be a significant indicator of research impact, particularly in cases where the candidate's research must be kept confidential due to concerns about intellectual property (IP) disclosure when working with industrial partners. Refereed conference proceedings are also important for assessing the significance of the research. In some fields, an argument might be made that a refereed conference paper is equivalent to a good journal article or that a specific conference is the premier venue for publication in that field. Other refereed contributions, such as a monograph or chapter in a book, will also be taken into account. Non-refereed contributions will generally carry a lower weight, although invited contributions may be taken as evidence of standing in the field. Candidates are advised to publish in a variety of venues, some of which are at "arms-length" (e.g. the candidate is not on the applicable editorial board or program committee).

- A candidate's research must be of sufficient stature and merit to attract ongoing peer-reviewed external funding (e.g., tri-council, MITACS). Industry and interdisciplinary collaborations, and recognized creative activities are also valued. Candidates are expected to apply for, and to receive external peer- reviewed funding to support their research program and their graduate students. The candidate's research must be known within the field and must be work of the type which the referees judge has (or will have) positive impact on the research of others. Candidates are expected to actively present their work at conferences, workshops and seminars at academic or industrial institutions.

- Candidates must be involved in the training of highly qualified personnel.

In assessing and ranking a candidate's research as Outstanding, Very Good, or Good, what counts critically is the impact or potential impact of the candidate's research as evaluated by external referees. Impact can be demonstrated in a variety of ways including highly cited publications in high quality journals, high-impact patents/provisional applications with significant technology transfer potential for commercialization or societal benefit, and conference proceedings. Requirements for Outstanding, Very Good, or Good, are defined below. Candidates not meeting the minimum criteria for Good are deemed **Unsatisfactory** (i.e., competence not demonstrated).

A high-quality journal is a journal in the candidate's field of study which has a significant impact on the research community (as demonstrated, for example, by impact factors based on journal citations). The publication process in such journals is based on peer-review of the complete manuscripts to select and screen high-quality submissions. The members of the editorial board of such journals are recognized scholars in their fields.

A high-impact patent/provisional application demonstrates significant potential for technology transfer and commercialization activities with economic and/or societal benefits. It showcases a notable advance or

innovation, supported by evidence of its uniqueness compared to existing technology or methods. This evidence can include: citations, independent market research reports evaluated by experts in the field, commercialization activities resulting in letters of support, licensing, the direct sale of products or processes, and/or the formation of spin-off companies.

A high-quality conference is an international conference in the candidate's field of study that has a significant impact on the research community. The members of the program committee of such conferences are recognized scholars in their fields.

Refer to "Appendix A: Research Evaluation Rubric" for the evaluation of Research.

Appendix A: <u>Research Evaluation Rubric</u>

Criterion 1: **General impact of research program and level of research project funding**

	Unsatisfactory (1 – <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good (>5.5 – 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
Ongoing independent core* research program **e.g. NSERC Discovery Grant; or, when appropriate, industrial supported funding*	Partial or no establishment of an independent research program as evidenced by research output in the form of refereed publications, high-impact patent/provisional applications, and the training of HQP. This can be augmented but not replaced entirely by results of collaborative projects outside the PI's core areas of research.	Establishment of an independent research program as evidenced by research output in the form of refereed publications, high-impact patent/provisional applications, and the training of HQP. This can be augmented but not replaced entirely by results of collaborative projects outside the PI's core areas of research.	Continued growth of an independent research program as evidenced by increased research output (quality and/or quantity) in the form of refereed publications, high-impact patent/provisional applications, and the training of HQP at all levels. This can be augmented but not replaced entirely by results of collaborative projects outside the PI's core areas of research.	Establishment of a significant independent research program as evidenced by high impact research output (quality and/or quantity) in the form of refereed publications, high-impact patent/provisional applications, and the training of HQP at all levels. This can be augmented but not replaced entirely by results of collaborative projects outside the PI's core areas of research.
Peer-reviewed external funding in support of the PI's core research program	Have not received initial peer-reviewed external funding in support of their core research program.	Have received initial peer-reviewed external funding in support of their core research program.	Have maintained or increased their initial levels of funding through grant renewal and/or obtained funding from (an)other external peer reviewed source(s).	Have maintained and significantly increased their initial funding levels and/or obtained significant funding from (an)other external peer reviewed source(s).

Criterion 2: Quantity and quality of research publications

	Unsatisfactory (1 – <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good (>5.5 – 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
Peer-reviewed publications and patents	< *1* refereed publication/ high-impact patent/provisional application per year in the PI's core area of research after considering an appropriate period of time for laboratory set-up and HQP recruitment. This can be augmented, but not replaced entirely, by publications resulting from collaborative projects outside the PI's core areas of research.	A minimum (average) of *1* refereed publication/ high-impact patent/provisional application per year in the PI's core area of research after considering an appropriate period of time for laboratory set-up and HQP recruitment. This can be augmented, but not replaced entirely, by publications resulting from collaborative projects outside the PI's core areas of research.	A minimum (average) of *2* refereed publications/ high-impact patent/provisional applications per year, since initiation of their research program. There should be evidence of (at least ONE) publication in high impact journals or high-impact patents in the PI's core area of research. This can be augmented (up to 50%) by publications resulting from collaborative projects outside the PI's core areas of research.	A minimum (average) of *3* refereed publications/ high-impact patent/provisional applications per year, since initiation of their research program. There should be evidence of multiple publications in high impact journals or high-impact patents in the PI's core area of research. This can be augmented (up to 50%) by publications resulting from collaborative projects outside the PI's core areas of research.

Evidence of research dissemination at the national/international level	Little or no evidence of dissemination of research to academic and/or non-academic (traditional media) audiences at the regional level. Note: Other bibliometric data, such as h-index values, can be considered by the committee.	Evidence of dissemination of research to academic and/or non-academic (traditional media) audiences at the regional level. Note: Other bibliometric data, such as h-index values, can be considered by the committee.	Evidence of dissemination of research to academic and/or non-academic (traditional media) audiences at the regional and national levels. Note: Other bibliometric data, such as h-index values, can be considered by the committee.	Multiple evidences of dissemination of research to academic and non-academic (traditional media) audiences at the regional, national, and international levels. Note: Other bibliometric data, such as h-index values, can be considered by the committee.

Criterion 3: Evidence of independent and original contributions to research

	Unsatisfactory (1 – <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good (>5.5 – 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
External reviews	Negative or mixed external reviews indicating high quality of research contributions.	Positive external reviews indicating high quality of research contributions.	Positive external reviews indicating exceptional originality and quality of research contributions.	Positive external reviews identifying the candidate as defining and influencing research directions.
Impact and recognition* ** Evidence may also include awards*	<1 invitation as speaker at another institution. <1 one invitation as speaker at a regional conference. Not a member of a scientific organization.	At least one invitation as speaker at another institution. At least one invitation as speaker at a regional conference. Member of a scientific organization.	Multiple invitations as speaker at other institutions. At least one invitation as speaker at regional and national conferences. Member of advisory board for scientific journal or executive position within a professional society.	Multiple invitations as speaker in highly recognized academic institutions and/or national and international conferences. Demonstrated leadership within advisory board or professional society executive positions.

Criterion 4: Demonstrated ability to attract and successfully mentor and train HQP in research

	Unsatisfactory (1 – <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good (>5.5 – 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
Record of graduate* HQP supervision ** May include Masters, Doctoral, and/or Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate*	Not a member or interrupted member of Graduate Studies.	Continuous member of Graduate studies	Supervision of at least 1 graduate HQP per year since their appointment at UWindsor.	Supervision of typically more than 1 graduate HQP per year since their appointment at UWindsor.
Record of undergraduate HQP supervision	An average of < 1 undergraduate HQP supervision per year since appointment at UWindsor.	An average of 1 undergraduate HQP supervision per year since their appointment at UWindsor.	At least 1 undergraduate HQP supervision per year since their appointment at UWindsor.	Typically more than 1 undergraduate HQP supervision per year since their appointment at UWindsor.
Evidence of student success* ** Examples may include HQP having received an external fund or award; published a first-authored peer- reviewed paper; training-related careers; completion of degree program*	< 1 HQP has demonstrated evidence of student success since their appointment.	At least one HQP has demonstrated evidence of student success since their appointment at UWindsor.	A quarter to a half HQP have demonstrated evidence of student success since their appointment at UWindsor.	The majority of HQP have demonstrated evidence of student success since their appointment at UWindsor.

Criterion 5: Influence on and contribution to the academic and broader national/international community

	Unsatisfactory (1 – <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good (>5.5 – 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
Leadership academic contributions	Participation in a single or no peer review processes (conferences or journals).	Participation in multiple peer review processes (conferences or journals).	Participation in multiple peer review processes (conferences or journals). Conference/symposia organization or member of an advisory board.	Participation in multiple peer review processes (conferences or journals). Conference/symposia organization and member of an advisory board.
Graduate committees	Internal or external reader of a graduate committee or less.	Internal or external reader of multiple graduate committees.	Chair of at least one graduate committee. Internal or external reader of multiple graduate committees, including as an examiner on a graduate student committee in Canada.	Chair of multiple graduate committees. Internal or external reader of multiple graduate committees, including as an examiner on graduate student committees in Canada and/or internationally.

External reviews	No external review (grant agency, government documents, assessment of academic colleagues, etc.).	At least one external review (grant agency, government documents, assessment of academic colleagues, etc.).	At least, on average, once every other year, an external review (grant agency, government documents, assessment of academic colleagues, etc.).	At least, on average once per year, an external review (grant agency, government documents, assessment of academic colleagues, etc.).
			An external examiner on at least one graduate committee.	An external examiner on more than one graduate committee.
Other evidence* *** Examples may include expert opinion, coverage in mass media, invited publication, interview in any medium, public presentation, panel discussions etc.*	On average, less than one participation per year	At least, on average, one participation every year.	One to two participations every year.	More than two, on average, participations per year.

Evaluation Criteria: SERVICE

Typically, approximately 20% of a faculty member's workload is devoted to service. This would generally involve approximately seven hours a week. The assessment of service considers more than time served; **the nature, quality, and impact of the individual's contributions are also considered**. Individuals make contributions at the institutional, community, and disciplinary levels in diverse ways that may be considered in the service evaluation. In addition to evidence of a spirit of willing cooperation to participate in a normal number of committee assignments; the committee will assess the quality and depth of an individual's contributions to service, considering dimensions such as:

- Degree of agency, consistency, and flexibility in assuming service roles where the candidate's knowledge and good judgment could benefit the AAU;
- The individual's effectiveness in forwarding projects and objectives of service;
- Effectiveness in building teams and networks to further the institutional mission through service;
- Evidence of the impact of an individual's service and of tangible contributions to the life of the institution, the community, or disciplinary or professional societies;
- 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.

Possible sources of evidence for a candidate's service contributions and impact should be detailed in a statement of service contributions from the candidate, supported by:

- The candidate's CV;
- A report from the Department Head;
- Media reports;
- External reviews;
- Community engagement;
- Feedback from participants in programs, services, or other initiatives;
- Letters of recognition, appreciation and awards;
- Letters and e-mails related to funded grants which are related to service initiatives;
- Letters of outreach to communities for partnerships;
- A list of committee members from official sources;
- Formal products of committee work showing duties, duration, accomplishments, completed tasks, reports and percentage responsibility for their completion with support from the chair of the committee;
- Training attended related to service;
- Notes or e-mails describing accomplishments;
- Peer review of service contributions;
- Letters and documentation from agencies, organizations, or other units;
- Leadership statement or leadership plan;
- Other relevant documents submitted by the candidate.

It is recommended that pre-tenure/pre-promotion tenure-track candidates be cautious about taking on major service responsibility before they establish their excellence in scholarship and teaching. If circumstances arise in which a candidate is asked to do so, the RTP Committee will acknowledge the candidate's service contributions and evaluate scholarship and teaching competencies within this exceptional context.

In the case of LS-AAS candidates (Learning Specialist, Ancillary Academic Staff), whose work is focused on teaching and pedagogical service, the expectations consider the relative proportion of time intended to be spent on teaching and service. The responsibilities of LS-AAS candidates may include project management, organization of pedagogical events, curriculum coordination and development, educational/academic development, and academic leadership.

Service Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor:

During the period of qualifying service, candidates must demonstrate continuing commitment to impactful contributions to the institutional, community, and disciplinary mission. The candidate must express a willingness in assuming service roles and participate as a team member. The candidate must obtain a 5–5.5 score (SATISFACTORY) for all criteria.

Service Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

During the period of qualifying service, candidates must demonstrate leadership in formal and informal roles with a long-term commitment to improvement. There is evidence of a reputation for excellence and integrity in service, with demonstrated initiative, leadership, and creativity. The candidate expresses strong willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming service roles. The candidate demonstrates effectiveness in team-building and networking. The candidate must submit evidence of outstanding achievement in their service to the institution, community, or their discipline. The candidate must obtain (i) a 5–5.5 score (SATISFACTORY) for all criteria, and (ii) a ≥5.5-6 score (GOOD) in any criterion.

Service Criteria for Permanent Track and Promotion to AAS III

During the period of qualifying service, candidates must demonstrate continuing commitment to impactful contributions to the institutional, community, and disciplinary mission. The candidate must express a willingness in assuming service roles and participate as a team member. The candidate must obtain a 5–5.5 score (SATISFACTORY) for all criteria.

Service Criteria for Promotion to AAS IV

During the period of qualifying service, candidates must demonstrate leadership in formal and informal roles with a long-term commitment to improvement. There is evidence of a reputation for excellence and integrity in service, with demonstrated initiative, leadership, and creativity. The candidate expresses strong willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming service roles. The candidate demonstrates effectiveness in team building and networking. The candidate must submit evidence of outstanding achievement in their service to the institution, community, or their discipline. The candidate must obtain (i) a 5–5.5 score (SATISFACTORY) for all criteria, and (ii) a ≥5.5-6 score(GOOD) in any criterion.

Committee membership will be assessed considering the individual's participation and the degree of activity of that committee. Memberships 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. Similarly, candidates are strongly encouraged to briefly describe the nature of service work undertaken rather than simply providing titles or committee names.

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, new laboratories, streams, or academic programs have clearly defined and interconnected teaching and service components. Original contributions to policy, institutional practice, or industrial innovation 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 committees reserve the right to consider the degree to which contributions are being attributed to multiple elements of their case. The AAU RTP Committee will review and assess these contributions as necessary.

Service to the community is to be encouraged. In all cases, however, for service to a community or other non-university organization to be considered within a tenure or promotion application, the service must reflect the candidate's university position and/or scholarship.

SEE ALSO ARTICLE 13 OF THE WUFA COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT.

Criterion 1: **Service and leadership contributions to and engagement with the institution, its mission, and its evolution**

Examples and Indicators of Contributions:

a) **Scope of service - Extent to which service contributions were undertaken; whether they extend beyond the departmental level: faculty, institutional, Faculty Association, Research, Graduate Studies.** *Examples include:*
- Alumni Outreach or alumni fund-raising activities
- Presents or organizes faculty seminars or other formal events or programs intended to foster knowledge exchange, network building, collegiality, and inclusion
- Participation in student recruitment initiatives and events
- Student engagement activities
- Delivery of large introductory courses that include a lab/tutorial component; taking on last-minute courses or large enrolment courses outside of what would typically be expected at the request of the department head
- Effectively serving as advisor to an active club or student organization, as determined by the members of that club or student organization
- Contributing to accountability or accreditation analysis and reporting teams judged as significant by the AAU head and the APTR committee e.g. curriculum mapping, IQAP, accreditation reports, research impact statements
- Participates in department tasks that support faculty (e.g., serves on faculty evaluation committees; peer collaboration network)
- Department, college, and/or university mission-related and/or strategic plan work
- Active role in faculty association governance and responsibilities
- Mentors faculty and/or students in significant ways (e.g. Killam, Rhodes, national competitions etc.)

b) **Degree of willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming service roles where the candidate's knowledge and good judgment could benefit the AAU.** *Examples include:*
- Amount of service undertaken (see above preamble)
- Documented evidence of regular attendance at departmental and formally constituted standing committee meetings
- Evidence of active participation in the regular and necessary service commitments of the department. No documented evidence of consistent refusal to take on reasonable share of departmental service responsibilities without cause.
- Diversity of service profile
- Willingness to undertake roles/tasks that are necessary but unpopular as judged by the department Head

c) **Effectiveness in team building and networking to further the institutional mission, and evidence of the individual's service and contributions to the life of the institution, the community, or disciplinary/professional societies.** *Examples include:*
- Involvement in or leadership of successful team projects
- Involvement in faculty learning communities
- Systematic efforts to foster development of institutional networks, collaborations, and knowledge exchange
- Documented, systematic efforts to enhance faculty, staff, and student sense of belonging

- Development of academic curriculum elements:
  - Significant revision of existing course structure (how multiple courses are integrated)
  - Development of new courses
  - Development of course infrastructure
  - Development of new pan-course instructional laboratories, the introduction of a newstream
  - Developing practicum and internship practice settings
  - Development of new program
- Obtains grants to improve programs and curriculum or student experience
- Responsibility for the establishment of new and successful institutional initiatives
- Provision of expertise with bylaws, collective agreements, policies and their navigation

Unsatisfactory (1 – <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good (>5.5 – 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
The candidate does not regularly participate in active AAU committees, or the candidate does not provide impactful contributions to the departmental or institutional mission. There is not sufficient evidence to support a commitment to institutional service reflected by factors including, but not limited to, a lack of willingness to assume service roles; lack of ability to network or build teams to further the institutional mission; a lack of initiative or impactful contributions to institutional service; or there is documented evidence of refusal to take on reasonable share of service responsibility without cause.	The candidate participates in AAU committees and provides impactful contributions to the departmental mission with long-term commitment to improvement. The candidate expresses a willingness in assuming service roles and participates as a team member in group efforts to further the institutional mission. The candidate is involved in service at the departmental level.	The candidate participates in AAU committees and demonstrates impactful contributions in formal and informal roles. There is evidence of ongoing commitment and integrity in service. The candidate expresses strong willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming service roles. The candidate demonstrates effectiveness in team-building and networking to further the institutional mission. The scope of service extends beyond the departmental level and includes efforts to collaborate with other groups at the institution (faculty, students, alumni, etc).	The candidate participates in AAU committees and demonstrates impactful contributions and leadership in formal and informal roles. There is evidence of a reputation for excellence and integrity in service. The candidate performs significantly above the normal expectations of service. They are active on multiple committees that contribute to the critical operations of the program, departmental, faculty, or university activities. The candidate undertakes significant activities that benefit their program, department, faculty, and/or university (e.g. chairing university wide initiatives or committees).

.

Criterion 2: **Contributions to and 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**

Examples and Indicators of Contributions:

a) **Scope of service - Extent to which service contributions were undertaken; whether they extend beyond the local level – regional, provincial, national, international.** *Examples include:*
- Advocacy
- Consultation
- Student learning opportunity development
- Mentorship
- Board membership
- Impact studies, evaluation, assessment
- Policy contributions
- Industry/organizational partnerships
- Campus/Community Events
- Media contributions
- Support for grant development and funding opportunity development in support of community organizations
- Youth outreach
- Outreach to groups who may be less likely to attend post-secondary

b) **Degree of willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming service roles where the candidate's knowledge and good judgment could benefit the AAU.** *Examples include:*
- Amount of community service undertaken
- Support of existing community engagement programs and imperatives
- Willingness to undertake necessary departmental community service responsibilities, particularly those that are sometimes less popular

c) **Effectiveness in team building and networking to further the institutional commitment to community engagement, and evidence of the individual's service/contributions to the community.** *Examples include:*
- Engagement in activism or advocacy in support of community matters
- Evidence of involvement of students in community project teams
- Building of knowledge networks
- Community mentorship programs

- Involvement in community learning partnerships
- Systematic efforts to foster development of university/community networks, collaborations, and knowledge exchange
- Documented, systematic efforts to enhance inclusive practice in all aspects of institutional practice and community engagement
- Documented history of successful and sustained community partnerships
- Evidence that community partners value the candidate's contributions
- Development and implementation of community learning opportunities or of programs that enhance community participation in the life of the University (or vice-versa) (e.g., Community directed publications, resources, or events)
- Evidence that community partners value the candidate's contributions
- Implementation of new technologies or infrastructure that further community well-being, prosperity, or opportunity
- Evidence of contributions to the development of policies, procedures and mechanisms to support university-community collaboration
- Contributions to fairness, equity, justice, and individual agency for community members
- Organization of community events related to the discipline

Unsatisfactory (1 – <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good (>5.5 – 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
The candidate does not regularly participate in community engagement activity planning, or their service contributions are undistinguished. There is not sufficient evidence to support a commitment to service to the community, reflected by factors including but not limited to a lack of willingness to assume service roles; lack of ability to network or build teams to build community engagement; a lack of initiative or impactful contributions to community service; or there is documented evidence of refusal to take on reasonable share of service responsibility without cause.	The candidate makes impactful contributions to community engagement with a long-term commitment to improvement. The candidate expresses a willingness in assuming service roles and participates as a team member in group efforts to engage the community. The candidate supports existing engagement activities. The scope of service includes the local level.	The candidate makes impactful contributions to community engagement. There is evidence of ongoing commitment and integrity in service. The candidate expresses willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming engagement roles. The candidate demonstrates effectiveness in team-building and networking to engage or service the community. The scope of service extends beyond the local level.	The candidate makes impactful contributions and takes on leadership roles in community engagement. There is evidence of a reputation for excellence and integrity in service. The candidate expresses strong willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming engagement roles and takes on leadership roles to engage or service the community. The candidate undertakes notable engagement activities that benefit their program, department, faculty, and university beyond the local level (e.g., promoting their program or discipline to the public or school students considering university at OUF).

Criterion 3: **Service to and engagement with one's professional or disciplinary societies and/or to recognized practitioners in the field.**

Examples and Indicators of Contributions:

a) **Scope of service - Extent to which service contributions were undertaken; whether they extend beyond the local level – regional, provincial, national, international.** *Examples include:*
   - Board membership
   - Peer review
   - Editorial Board membership
   - Disciplinary conference organization
   - Policy contributions
   - Research ethics
   - Support for grant development and funding opportunity development

b) **Degree of willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming roles in service of the discipline or profession.** *Examples include:*
   - Amount of disciplinary service undertaken
   - Willingness to undertake necessary departmental disciplinary service responsibilities

c) **Effectiveness in team building and networking, as well as evidence of the individual's service and contributions to further the discipline.** *Examples include:*
   - Evidence of efforts to involve students in disciplinary societies
   - Hosting disciplinary resources on campus (e.g. journals, data sets)
   - Involvement in successful team projects to support the advancement of the discipline or the work of practitioners in the field
   - Documented, systematic efforts to enhance inclusive practice within the discipline
   - Development and implementation of disciplinary programs that enhance student and early-career faculty opportunities
   - Evidence of contributions to the development of policies, procedures and mechanisms to support disciplinary practice
   - Evidence of contributions to or development of programs, services, and resources for practitioners in the field.
   - Organization of disciplinary events in the community
   - Organization of researcher/practitioner events and programs

Unsatisfactory (1 – <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good (>5.5 – 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
The candidate does not regularly participate in service and engagement with their disciplinary field, or their service contributions are undistinguished. There is not sufficient evidence to support a commitment to service to the disciplinary field, reflected by factors including but not limited to a lack of willingness to assume service roles; lack of ability to network or build teams to further the discipline; a lack of initiative or impactful contributions to disciplinary service; or there is documented evidence of refusal to take on reasonable share of service responsibility without cause.	The candidate makes impactful contributions to their professional or disciplinary society with a long-term commitment to improvement. The candidate expresses a willingness in assuming service roles and participates as a team member in group efforts. The scope of service includes the local level.	The candidate makes significant contributions to their professional or disciplinary society. There is evidence of ongoing commitment and integrity in service. The candidate expresses strong willingness, consistency, and flexibility in assuming service roles. The candidate demonstrates effectiveness in team-building and networking. The scope of service extends beyond the local level.	The candidate makes significant contributions to their professional or disciplinary society. There is evidence of a reputation for excellence and integrity in service. The candidate has engaged significantly with the outside community to benefit their cause, and relevant societies in a manner that demonstrably advances their discipline (e.g., leading their professional society; contributing to how the discipline develops). The scope of service extends beyond the local level.

Evaluation Criteria: TEACHING
(SEE ALSO ARTICLE 13 OF THE WUFA COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT)

Teaching Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:
During the period of qualifying service, candidates must demonstrate their ability and effectiveness in planning, development, preparation and delivery of learning materials and activities. The candidate must obtain (i) the scores of criteria 1, 2, and 3 are ≥5, and (ii) an overall average rubric score greater than 5-5.5 (SATISFACTORY).

Teaching Criteria for Promotion to Professor:
During the period of qualifying service, candidates must demonstrate a long-term commitment to improving their teaching, and/or their involvement in leadership activities intended to foster and enhance teaching and learning activities. In addition, they must also demonstrate their ability and effectiveness in planning, development, preparation and delivery of learning materials and activities. The candidate must provide supporting evidence of these commitments. The candidate must obtain (i) the scores of criteria 1, 2, and 3 are ≥5, and (ii) an overall average rubric score greater than 5-5.5 (SATISFACTORY).

Teaching Criteria for Promotion Academic Ancillary Staff – Learning Staff (AAS-LS) Promotion to AAS-LS III
During the period of qualifying service, candidates must demonstrate their ability and effectiveness in planning, development, preparation and delivery of learning materials and activities. The candidate must obtain a ≥5 score for all criteria.

Teaching Criteria for Promotion to AAS-LS IV
During the period of qualifying service, candidates must demonstrate a long-term commitment to improving their teaching, and/or their involvement in leadership activities intended to foster and enhance teaching and learning activities. In addition, they must also demonstrate their ability and effectiveness in planning, development, preparation and delivery of learning materials and activities. The candidate must obtain a ≥5 score for all criteria, with a score of ≥5.5 in at least 4 of criteria 2 to 13.

AN OVERALL AVERAGE RUBRIC SCORE

UNSATISFACTORY: Candidate fails to meet the listed criteria of Competent: An overall average rubric score (see end of Rubric Table) less than 5.0.
SATISFACTORY: An overall average rubric score (see end of Rubric Table) is in the lower range: 5.0-5.5.
GOOD: An overall average rubric score (see end of Rubric Table) mid-range of the department: 5.5-6.0.
EXCELLENT: An overall average rubric score (see end of Rubric Table) high range: greater than 6.0.

Note: *Interpretation of SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching) and/or SPT (Students' Perception of Teaching) scores may take into consideration class sizes, class levels, and other factors giving rise to known trends in scores.*

Sources of Data on Teaching Criteria:
All faculty applying for tenure or promotion are required to provide a **teaching dossier** and/or a **statement of teaching excellence**.
1. Teaching Dossier
The teaching dossier should provide information on teaching philosophy, courses taught, course outlines, intended learning outcomes, SET and/or SPT scores and student comments. Applicants may also include examples of

course material and exam papers or other forms of assessment to illustrate how the assessment processes align with the intended learning outcomes. Evidence for the support of students and provision of appropriate and timely feedback is encouraged. Inclusion of information on discipline-based research in the curriculum and engagement of students in pedagogically sound discipline-based research is desirable. In addition, incorporation of professional career paths and experiences into teaching practice and the curriculum is desirable.

Faculty are strongly encouraged to submit information on undergraduate and graduate teaching and may include training of research HQP at undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral levels. This may include examination of MSc and PhD students and should incorporate a list of graduate committee memberships and roles as external examiner/reader.

The dossier may also include information on courses attended to enhance teaching skills, e.g. those organized by the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) or other provincial, national or professional bodies. Contributions to pedagogy and pedagogical research are encouraged e.g. through participation in CTL summer schools, publication of articles in journals such as J. Chem. Ed. or another education-based research.

Information on contributions to leadership through course and/or program development should be included as well as contributions to service in teaching such as undergraduate and graduate committee.

Recognition of teaching excellence through Faculty, University, Provincial and/or National Awards should be included.

Applicants are encouraged to include feedback through peer review of teaching, e.g. through statements from other faculty who have team-taught or observed the applicant's teaching practices e.g. through the University's Peer Collaboration Network or who have otherwise been invited to observe the candidate's teaching.

A guide and template for the teaching dossier can be obtained by contacting the Centre for Teaching and Learning.

2. Statement of Teaching Excellence

The statement of teaching excellence should not exceed 2 pages (12 pt font, 1 cm margins all around). The statement of teaching excellence should be considered as an executive summary of the teaching dossier and should address the criteria for assessment of teaching outlined below. The statement must include information on quality of teaching, including: lecturing, classroom, laboratory, workshop, undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, and supervision of student research. This must also include information on planning, development and preparation of learning activities, course or program development, learning resources and materials for a course, course or degree program: including coordination, involvement or leadership in curriculum design and development. The statement can include graphical data or cross-reference tables or other data. It is up to the applicant to make clear and justified statements as to how they meet each of the criteria and, where appropriate, include context.

A copy of the teaching criteria is presented below. Examples of date which might be used as metrics or for justification for each criterion are suggested in the left hand column. However, these are not exhaustive, and the applicant may select whatever data from their teaching dossier they feel best supports their arguments.

Design and planning of learning activities	Unsatisfactory (1 - <5)	Satisfactory (5 – 5.5)	Good(>5.5 - 6)	Excellent (>6 – 7)
1. Course outlines *Evidence might include*: • course outlines • SET score columns B1, B2, B3, B4 • SPT Questions 7, 8, 9, 11	Course outlines are inconsistent with bylaw and policy. Course outlines do not clearly outline intended learning outcomes (ILOs) and learning activities. Are ILOs and learning activities inappropriate to the level? Course outlines do not clearly outline assessment processes.	Course outlines are generally consistent with bylaw and policy. Course outlines ILOs and learning activities with a degree of clarity. ILOs and learning activities are broadly in keeping with course level. Course outlines broadly outline assessment processes but maybe lack some detail.	Course outlines are consistently in compliance with bylaw and policy. Course outlines show the alignment of materials, activities and assessments with course ILOs. ILOs and learning activities are well aligned to the course level. Course outlines clearly describe the assessment processes.	Course outlines are consistently in compliance with bylaw and policy. Course outlines are highly readable and clearly explain the course material, activities and assessment processes and are well-aligned with the ILO. ILO and learning activities show exemplary alignment to the course level. Course outlines provide detailed explanation of the assessment process and methods.
2. Sound knowledge of the course content and material* *Evidence might include:* • course outlines and course materials to reflect course structure • SET score columns A1, A3, A7 • SPT Questions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 13 • Examples of exam questions or assignments • Feedback from independent observers such as letters from other faculty or through the PCN	Limited knowledge of the course content and material. *Each category takes into account the degree to which faculty are teaching outside their core expertise.	Sound knowledge of the course content and material, some areas of weakness.	Deep knowledge of the course content and material, with some evidence of practices to update course material to keep the course contemporary.	Expert knowledge of the course content and material, with evidence of serious efforts to acquire depth of knowledge, to remain current/topical and to engage student learning through real- world examples.

3. Clarity of communication and explanation *Evidence might include:* • SET score columns A1, A3, A4, A7, B7, B8 • SPT Questions 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 13, 12, 21, 23 • Course material for written communication/ Explanation • Feedback from independent observers of lectures or classes such as letters from other faculty or through the PCN.	Lack of clarity identified. *Clarity can be in the form of written communication (course materials or feedback to students on assignments, worked answers to problem sets) or oral communication (explanations in class etc)*	Evidence of effort to explain content clearly with appropriate use of examples.	Evidence of consistent clarity in explaining content clearly, with effective use of examples.	Evidence of consistent exceptional clarity in explaining content clearly, with effective use of examples.
4. Stimulation of interest *Evidence might include:* • SET score columns A5, A6, B13, B14, B15 • SPT Questions 16, 26, 27, 32 • Other feedback from students • Increasing enrolment numbers	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.
5. Supports students to develop and demonstrate the ILOs. *Evidence might include:* • Attendance at CTL or related teaching development courses. • SET score columns A7, A9, A10, A11, B8, B9 • SPT Questions 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 • course material highlighting additional support for students. • changes to course delivery	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.

leading to improved achievement of ILOs.				

6. Quality of assessment tools (including clarity, alignment with ILOs and appropriate level of difficulty) *Evidence might include:* • examples of assessment methods (exam and/or test papers, rubrics for assessment of presentations or written assignments) • SET score columns B4, B5, B6, B7, B11 • SPT Questions 8, 9, 12, 21 • evidence for investigating and implementing new assessment tools (such as attendance at CTL courses etc)*****	Assessment activities were hard to follow, poorly aligned with ILOs, or of an inappropriate level of difficulty (high or low). ******Providing and corroborating or mitigating evidence to address relevant issues.*	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 ILOs and appropriately challenging for the course level.	Assessment activities were clear, well aligned, appropriately challenging, and provided innovative opportunities for student learning.
7. Timely feedback is provided to students *Evidence might include:* • SET score columns A7, A8, A11, B6 • SPT Questions 12, 13, 18, 21, 22 • General information made available to students through Blackboard or other e-media. Personalized feedback for assessments.	Feedback is not timely – entirely absent and/or late and infrequent.	Assessment feedback is generally timely.	Assessment feedback is timely and occurs several times through the course.	Assessment feedback is proactive, ongoing, and timely.

8. Creation of effective learning environments *Evidence might include:* • SET score columns A12, B1, B3, B7, B8, B9, B12 • SPT Questions 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 30, 31, 35 • Feedback from independent observers of lectures or classes such as letters from other faculty, GA/TA or through the PCN. • Attendance at, or participation in, CTL programs or related opportunities to enhance the learning environment or teaching methods.	Little evidence of awareness of the need to create positive, respectful, supportive and energizing learning environments, potentially with examples to the contrary.	Few systematic initiatives intended to create positive, respectful, supportive and energizing learning, but evidence that these values are generally followed at the level of individual interactions with students.	Evidence of a number of specific and evolving efforts to create and maintain positive, respectful, and energizing learning environments.	Consistent, systematic and successful efforts to create positive, respectful, supportive and energizing learning environments, potentially including leadership activities intended to foster and enhance these values across the department or institution.
9. Availability for consultation (e.g. email, online, face-to-face or telephone *Evidence might include:* • SET score columns A10, A11 • SPT Questions 23, 24 • Feedback from students.	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.

10. Demonstration of respect for students and systematic attention to ensuring students demonstrate respect for others *Evidence might include:* • SET score columns A9, A10 • SPT Questions 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22 • Feedback from students. • Attendance at (and evidence for implementation of) CTL or University- based courses on respect in the workplace.	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.

11. Inclusion of discipline-based research in the curriculum *Evidence might include:* examples of teaching materials used, such as use of contemporary papers and literature reviews.	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.
12. Engagement of students in pedagogically sound discipline-based research *Evidence might include:* • examples of assessment based on use of search engines or databases in problem solving, data or knowledge retrieval. • examples of research publications or conference contributions (oral/poster) where students have contributed significantly to research.	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.
13. Incorporation of professional, industry or work-based practice and experiences into teaching practice and the curriculum *Evidence might include:* • examples of academic or industrial research best practices in HQP training. Could be exemplified by completed training of HQP.	Professional, industry, and work-based practice and experiences are not incorporated into the curriculum but were intended to be.	Professional, industry and work-based practice and experiences are somewhat incorporated into the curriculum, but may not be well-aligned with intended learning outcomes or well supported.	Professional, industry, and work-based practice and experiences are well incorporated in the curriculum, well-aligned with intended learning outcomes, and well supported.	Professional, industry, and work-based practice and experiences are very effectively incorporated in the curriculum offering a highly integrated, well-supported, and exceptional learning opportunity for students.