

Standards: Example of multiple minimum thresholds in one document.

This hypothetical department used the existing research rubric to identify standards at the Association and Full Professor Levels, then created this summary chart of the threshold requirements at each level. Departments can identify both specific, mandatory standards (**bolded** here), other factors that might be additive or mitigating, and also more flexible lists from which proponents can choose, to demonstrate a specific number.

	Associate Professor (Level A)	Professor (Level B)
<p>Criterion 1: Expertise in research or creative area, relevant methodologies and effective and ethical project management</p> <p>Conformity with all relevant institutional, disciplinary and funding agency ethical and research guidelines</p>	<p>The candidate demonstrates an ongoing, clearly focused, and highly active research program, with a continued pattern of quality articles under review.</p> <p>Clearly focused research plan articulated in a research statement</p> <p>There is no evidence of lack of conformity with relevant institutional, disciplinary, and funding agency ethical research guidelines</p>	<p>Well-articulated and successful research agenda. History of research goals 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. pending publications, under review, grants submitted).</p> <p>There is no evidence of lack of conformity with relevant institutional, disciplinary, and funding agency ethical research guidelines</p>
<p>Criterion 2: A record of high quality refereed publications, juried creative activity or other demonstrated scholarly outputs</p>	<p>Publications have been peer reviewed, and are generally published in well-respected journals or through publishing houses with high quality academic reputations.</p> <p>Research dissemination is often at the national or international level.</p> <p>Has consistently met and in some areas exceeded the departmental productivity standard¹</p> <p>Peer review indicates that publications are of good quality.</p>	<p>Many publications are published in journals or with publishing houses of elite national or international reputations.</p> <p>Research dissemination is consistently widely recognized at national and/or international levels.</p> <p>Consistently exceeds the departmental productivity standard¹</p> <p>Peer review indicates that publications are of excellent quality.</p>

¹ Departmental criteria will need to provide a clearer definition of the productivity standard: some departments include an appendix outlining equivalencies among different kinds of publications, which is also an option. The original rubric also contains footnotes that may be of use in more clearly defining how terms like “well-respected journals.”

	Associate Professor (Level A)	Professor (Level B)
Criterion 3: Evidence of independent and original contributions to research or creative activity, which have an impact on the field of expertise.	Evidence of original contributions that are influencing the evolution of the field, practice, or thinking within the discipline or as practical applications. ² Strong evidence of recognition within the area of research, including invitation to give keynote addresses, offer master classes, fellowships, major residencies or exchanges.	Evidence of major original contributions with significant impact within the discipline or through practical applications. Strong evidence of international recognition in the area of research including keynotes, guest residencies, major and highly competitive research fellowship, residencies or exchanges.
Criterion 4: Capacity building through income generation, collaboration development and infrastructure development strategies <i>(b) and (c) may be considered as additional evidence in cases where (a) has not met the departmental standard.</i>	a) Funding of external research grants judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors. ³ b) Strong degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually. c) Strong evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.	a) 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. b) Exceptional degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually. c) Exceptional evidence of grant or contract research resulting in publishable material that advances the field.
	Associate Professor (Level A)	Professor (Level B)
Criterion 5: Demonstrated ability to attract and successfully mentor	Evidence that graduate students were recruited based on the candidate's reputation or actions, or that students supervised or mentored regularly met	Clear and sustained evidence that the candidate attracts graduate students, and successfully supervises and mentors them to high achievement. Collaborative

² Some departments may wish to provide more specific quantifiers based on factors including impact factors of journals, citation counts, and elements of the candidate's research statement supported by evidence, or alternatively to include examples such as patents, policy contributions, etc. Some departments also combine impact and publication record, depending on the nature of the discipline.

³ Disciplines vary in their reliance on external funding for research success, the typical size of grants, and the frequency with which funding is typically received. This may result in significant variations in how grant success is treated in tenure and promotion decisions across departments. Departments should provide quantifiers for this criterion that are consistent with their disciplinary standards. This sample includes factors that would tend to indicate that the candidate is engaged in building opportunity for the expansion of research capital, socially, intellectually and/or materially, in ways that can benefit the research, the researcher, the research team, the discipline, and the various communities the research might impact. Departments may judge these as more, or less, relevant to their context, and create more, or less flexibility with regard to how this criterion might be met.

and train students in research ⁴	with solid success. Collaborative publications, presentations, and funding for graduate students will be considered further positive evidence.	publications, presentations, and funding for graduate students will be considered as further positive evidence.
Criterion 6: Influence on and contributions to the academic and broader national/international community.	X of: a) Evidence of involvement in research collaborations b) Evidence of public or industry engagement in academic work c) 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.	X of: a) Evidence of leadership roles or strong demand for involvement in research collaborations, at a national or international level b) Evidence of leadership and significantly impactful public or industry engagement in academic work. c) Evidence of significant contributions to committees of national or international disciplinary academic associations, as well as the disciplinary community, particularly with evidence of specific initiatives undertaken.

Notes:

It is possible to include statements that make Level A the base level even for professorship in cases of exceptional achievement in teaching.

It is possible to indicate that to reach the professor level, a proponent must meet the threshold in x out of 6 criteria or in, for example, (1) and (2) and 3 of the other 4 or some other pattern that provides more flexibility.

One department has created an “eminent” category that is beyond “professor” – faculty can then make a case for professorship with level A in research or teaching if they reach the “eminent” level in the other.

Bolding can be used to identify minimum required standards for a given criterion.

A similar example using the teaching evaluation rubric as a foundational planning document has been attached separately.

<http://www1.uwindsor.ca/provost/sites/uwindsor.ca.provost/files/Sample%20teaching%20standards%20summary%20multiple%20levels.pdf>

⁴ This criterion may be more suitable to some departments than to others, in particular with regard to the existence, size, and nature of graduate programs within departments. Some departments include specific numbers of graduate students who have been successfully supervised. Some departments consider student mentorship as a teaching criteria.