

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
2024-2025 Criteria for the Renewal, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty Members
Document Last Updated on June 16, 2025

This document is in partial fulfillment of the department's obligations under Bylaw 23, Section 4 to clearly articulate its criteria and standards for renewal, tenure, and promotion. Once approved by Council, these standards must be forwarded to the Faculty of Science (Coordinating) Council and, if approved, from there to the University Committee on Academic Promotion and Tenure (UCAPT). As candidates may follow the approved AAU criteria and standards in place at the time of their initial appointment or any AAU criteria and standards approved thereafter, it is important that careful records be kept of any changes and the dates of those changes.

Document History	Date
Approved by the Mathematics and Statistics RTP Committee	June 10, 2025
Approved by Mathematics and Statistics Council	June 16, 2025
Approved by Faculty of Science Coordinating Council	July 18, 2025
Approved by UCAPT	October 27, 2025

Preamble

General

The following general remarks on research, teaching and service are pertinent to renewal of contract, granting of tenure and promotion. By "Committee" we mean the Department of Mathematics and Statistics Renewal, Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Criteria:

A review of the following aspects of teaching will be used to evaluate teaching performance of a faculty member:

1. Minimum Experience
2. Teaching Development
3. Instructional Delivery, Facilitation of Learning and Overall Student Satisfaction
4. Grading Expectations and Feedback
5. Positive Learning Atmosphere and Student Motivation
6. Workload/Difficulty and Perceived Learning
7. Overall Teaching Evaluation by Committee

Material:

The material used to complete the *teaching, research and service* evaluation will include any or all of the following:

1. CV
2. Teaching dossier to include.
 - (i) A teaching philosophy
 - (ii) A statement of teaching practices, e.g., goals, strategies, and evaluation methods.
 - (iii) A list of activities undertaken to improve teaching and learning.
 - (iv) Copies of two or more course outline for different courses taught since first/previous appointment/promotion.
 - (v) Copies two or more of final examinations for-different courses taught since the first/previous appointment/promotion.

- (vi) Samples of student comments, if any.
- 3. Candidate Self-Assessment statement (optional)
- 4. Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPT, formerly SET) Scores.
- 5. Performance reviews
- 6. Letters of recommendation or commendation (optional)
- 7. Feedback (e.g., student, peer)
- 8. Teaching awards, if available
- 9. AAU Head comments
- 10. UWinsite Student

Evaluation process:

The Renewal, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee will use the following scale in determining their recommendations for Contract Renewal, and Promotion:

- Excellent (6 to 7 on 7-point scale)
- Good (5 to 5.9 on 7-point scale)
- Satisfactory: (4 to 4.9 on 7-point scale)
- Unsatisfactory: (1 to 3.9 on 7-point scale)

It is acknowledged that the four categories of assessment above cannot be determined by merely quantifiable or mechanical means. Peer discretion, respect, and support are essential. Nevertheless, evidence of various kinds of contributions is germane to each of the criteria and it is recognized that the responsibility for accumulating and presenting the appropriate evidence rests with the individual faculty member. The material submitted with an application for renewal and/or promotion should, therefore, contain the necessary documentary grounds upon which the applicant expects their case to be considered. It shall also be understood that responsibility for presenting evidence in relation to each criterion rests with the individual faculty member. In accounting for one's teaching performance, faculty members are particularly encouraged to refer to the University Committee on Academic Promotion and Tenure (UCAPT) Optional Self Assessment Statement and the UCAPT Optional Teaching Dossier. Additionally, the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic makes available a "UCAPT RTP Guide for Faculty", which identifies relevant Senate bylaws and WUFA Collective Agreement articles and outlines key process, procedures, and timelines in the renewal, tenure, and promotion process

The material, in addition to the ten materials listed previously, used to complete the *research* evaluation will include the following:

- Peer reviewed journal articles.
- Peer reviewed monographs.
- Peer reviewed conference proceedings.
- Book chapters.
- Technical reports.
- Talks delivered at academic conferences.
- Supervision of student research theses and projects.
- Supervision of Post-Doctoral Fellows.
- Successful grant applications.
- Work performed as a referee, associate editor, or editor.
- Involvement on student thesis committees.

It is the publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals, the contribution and impact, or potential impact, of the publication to the discipline, and the quality of the selected journals, that are the primary factors in the evaluation of research. Work performed as a referee, associate editor, or editor; as well as involvement on thesis committees may also be considered a contribution to service, as does involvement in the preparation of team research / equipment grants. Supervision of student research projects may also be considered a contribution to teaching.

In the research criteria for promotion to Associate Professor we refer to good quality journals and in the criteria for promotion to Professor we refer to high quality (excellent) journals. The classification of journals by quality is a challenge. While active researchers can normally identify a handful of journals that are almost universally accepted as being high quality or good quality, there are hundreds of journals that are at the classification margins; and the margins fluctuate with time. In the evaluation of the quality of journals, we will consider, for example, indicators such as the SCImago rank of Q1 for high-quality journals and Q2 for good-quality journals.

The SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) indicator is a measure of the scientific influence of scholarly journals that accounts for both the number of citations received by a journal and the importance or prestige of the journals where the citations come from. A journal's SJR is a numeric value indicating the average number of weighted citations received during a selected year per document published in that journal during the previous three years. Higher SJR values are meant to indicate greater journal prestige. - [Wikipedia Accessed February 10, 2021](#)

Caveats:

1. SCImago is just one of many journal ranking services. We encourage the candidate to make the case for the quality of the journal selected by the candidate for publication.
2. There are many journals that are high quality within a subspecialty that will not appear high on ranking lists. We encourage the applicant to address the reputation of the chosen journal within the discipline.
3. When evaluating a candidate's research record agencies such as NSERC ask evaluators to consider the quality of the research independent from the quality of the journal. We encourage the candidate to provide information such as the number of citations and the h-index of published papers.
4. In the years leading up to tenure and promotion, authors will consider "time to publication" as well as journal quality when submitting their work. We encourage the candidate to make statements about the journals chosen.
5. There is a tradition of giving author order in alphabetical order. We encourage the candidate to make statements about the contribution of each co-author to the publication.

We encourage the candidate for renewal, tenure, and promotion to (1) include statements about, and provide evidence for, the quality of journals; (2) provide information about the impact, or potential impact, of the research (this might include, for example, citations, h-index, number of reads on ResearchGate or Google Scholar, etc.); (3) to provide a rationale for the choice of journals; and (4) to provide information on the contribution of co-authors. Also, we recommend that candidates consult with the AAU Head throughout the years leading to tenure and promotion, especially during performance reviews to ensure that research standards are being met.

Commitment to EDI (Equity, Diversity and Inclusion) and Indigenous Peoples

The Committee will take an equity-informed approach in its assessments and deliberations. 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 (eg. indigenous peoples) will be considered equitably. Additionally, the Committee will take into consideration both career interruptions and special circumstances that may have affected the productivity of candidates during the period under consideration. Career interruptions and special circumstances occur when, for health, administrative, family or other reasons, a researcher is taken away from normal teaching, research or service work for an extended period of time.

A. Criteria for Renewal of Contract

For renewal, the candidate must have demonstrated satisfactory performance in teaching, research, and service. Recognizing that the need of the candidate to develop a research program that will position them for tenure and promotion, and recognizing the time required for developing and teaching new courses, less emphasis is placed on the need for service contributions.

The candidate must demonstrate in each of the criteria evaluated (see Tables, 1,2,3) satisfactory to good performance

B. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The basis for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall be demonstrated academic excellence as exemplified in research and teaching, and a demonstrated willingness to accept reasonable University responsibilities.

The candidate must demonstrate in each of the criteria evaluated (see Tables, 1,2,3) at least good performance

C. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor will normally be granted if the candidate has, in the opinion of the candidate's peers within the academic community, achieved substantial distinction in the candidate's field, as exemplified in research and teaching, and demonstrated a willingness to accept reasonable University responsibilities. Though distinction in all areas will not be considered requisite, candidates will be expected to have achieved the standards of performance described below. Research and teaching will be accorded the most weight. There may be individual cases when the candidate's service activity is deemed sufficiently significant so that this component is accorded more weight. Although promotion to the rank of Professor will rarely if ever be granted based on teaching alone, a candidate with a long-standing record of outstanding teaching, including distinguished performance in the classroom and a dedication to the welfare of students, constitutes a special case. Even in such cases, it will normally be considered a minimum requirement that some level of peer-reviewed research has been accomplished.

Table 1: Teaching Standards and Evidence

The teaching evaluation shall include a review of the following aspects and evidence of teaching:

Criteria			
	Renewal of Contract	Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	Promotion to Professor
Minimum Experience	Adequate (no less than satisfactory) performance through demonstration of teaching of four courses in an academic year, a PhD in Mathematics or Statistics, as evidenced by any or all of the provided material.	Minimum experience of successful (good) performance as an Assistant Professor through demonstration of teaching four credit courses in an academic year, a PhD in Mathematics or Statistics, and as evidenced by any or all of the provided material.	Typically, minimum experience of distinguished and outstanding (good to excellent) performance as an Associate Professor through demonstration of teaching four credit courses in an academic year, a PhD in Mathematics or Statistics, and as evidenced by any or all of the provided material.
Teaching Development	Satisfactory involvement, to be determined by the committee, in either teaching development or in activities intended to improve the teaching environment as demonstrated by involvement of professional and related academic achievement and activities, additional formal professional degrees, programs of continuing education, and relevant initiatives, leadership and creativity and as evidenced by any or all of the provided material.	Good involvement in either teaching development or in activities intended to consistently improve the teaching environment in the department, during the candidate's tenure as an Assistant Professor as demonstrated by involvement of professional and related academic achievement and activities, additional formal professional degrees, programs of continuing education, and relevant initiatives, leadership and creativity and as evidenced	Distinguished and outstanding (good to excellent) involvement in both teaching development and in activities intended to continually improve the teaching environment in the department, during the candidate's tenure as a Associate Professor as demonstrated by involvement of professional and related academic achievement and activities, additional formal professional degrees, programs of continuing education, and relevant initiatives, leadership

		by any or all of the provided material.	and creativity and as evidenced by any or all of the provided material.
Instructional Delivery/Facilitation of Learning/Overall Student Satisfaction	Adequate (satisfactory) class preparation, satisfactory quality presentation of material, ability to communicate complex ideas, ability to elaborate on concepts in ways that aid understanding, instructor knowledge of course content, adequate commitment and interest in students and their learning as demonstrated by awareness of an satisfactory course outline that clearly details satisfactory quality learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessments, satisfactory quality level of instruction in a course, satisfactory recommendation levels of this course to other students, a minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) satisfactory threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.	Good class preparation, good quality presentation of material and assignments, ability to clearly communicate complex ideas, ability to elaborate on concepts in ways that aid understanding, instructor thorough knowledge of course content, instructor good interest in students' learning, instructor feedback on assignments and instructor care for student success as demonstrated by consistent awareness of a course outline that clearly details consistently good quality learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessments, good quality level of instruction in a course, good level of recommendations of this course to other students, a minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.	Consistently good to excellent class preparation, high quality presentation of material, ability to communicate complex ideas clearly, ability to elaborate on concepts in ways that aid understanding, instructor thorough superior knowledge of course content, instructor high interest in students' learning, instructor feedback on assignments and instructor care for student success demonstrated by consistent awareness and development of a course outline that clearly details high quality learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment, high quality level of instruction in a course, high level of recommendations of this course to other students, a minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good to excellent threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.
Grading Expectations & Feedback	Adequate (satisfactory) quality assignment instructions,	Good quality assignment instructions, assignments fairly	High (good to excellent) quality assignment instructions,

	assignments fairly marked, rationale for marking, assignments consistently graded, expectations for acceptable performance and assignment feedback returned in a useful time as demonstrated by an adequate awareness that clearly details good quality assessments and feedback, a minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) satisfactory threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.	marked, rationale for marking, assignments consistently graded, expectations for acceptable performance, consistent assignment feedback returned in a useful time as demonstrated by good awareness that clearly details consistently good quality assessments and feedback, a minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.	assignments fairly marked, rationale for marking, assignments consistently graded, expectations for acceptable performance, consistent assignment feedback returned in a useful time as demonstrated by good to excellent awareness that clearly details high quality assignments and feedback, a consistently minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good to excellent threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.
Positive Learning Atmosphere and Student Motivation	Adequate (satisfactory) comfort level of students asking questions in class, demonstrates instructor sensitivity to students' difficulties, instructor respect in treating students, instructor enthusiasm about course content, promotes classroom environment respect level with regard to student participation, instructor eagerness/availability to help students, adequate student interest level when enrolling in course, adequate student interest level near completion of course, student effort level into course, and student attendance as	Good comfort level of students asking questions in class, instructor sensitivity to students' difficulties, instructor respect level in treating students, instructor enthusiasm about course content, classroom environment respect level with regard to student participation, instructor eagerness to help students, good student interest level when enrolling in course, student interest level near completion of course, student effort level into course, student attendance as demonstrated by	High (good to excellent) comfort level of students asking questions in class, instructor sensitivity to students' difficulties, instructor respect level in treating students, instructor enthusiasm about course content, classroom environment respect level with regard to student participation, instructor eagerness to help students, high student interest level when enrolling in course, high student interest level near completion of course, high student effort level into course, student attendance as

	demonstrated by adequate availability to students (by email, phone, online, in-office hours, after class, open door, etc.), satisfactory student feedback, low documented and investigated student complaints and withdrawals from the course, a minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) satisfactory threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.	good availability to students (by email, phone, online, in-office hours, after class, open door, etc.), as demonstrated by good student feedback, consistently low documented and investigated student complaints, consistently low withdrawals from the course, a consistently minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.	demonstrated by consistently good to excellent availability to students (by email, phone, online, in-office hours, after class, open door, etc.), good to excellent student feedback, minimal documented and investigated student complaints, minimal withdrawals from the course, a consistently minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good to excellent threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.
Workload/Difficulty/Perceived Learning	Adequate (satisfactory) quality course material level of ease, course volume level of work, past course level compared to other courses at this level, adequate quality level of student value of learning, ability of instructor to help students see the knowledge and skills gained by students that relate to their program, extent level of skills acquired in this course that will transfer to future courses or activities, student confidence level of communicating learned knowledge and skills in this course to other courses as demonstrated by adequate awareness that details	Good quality course material level of ease, course volume level of work, past course level compared to other courses at this level, good student value of learning, ability of instructor to help students see the knowledge and skills gained by students that relate to their program, good extent level of skills acquired in this course that will transfer to future courses or activities, student confidence level of communicating learned knowledge and skills in this course to other courses, as demonstrated by consistent	High (good to excellent) quality course material level of ease, course volume level of work, past course level compared to other courses at this level, high student value of learning, ability of instructor to help students see the knowledge and skills gained by students that relate to their program, high extent level of skills acquired in this course that will transfer to future courses or activities, high student confidence level of communicating learned knowledge and skills in this course to other courses as

	satisfactory quality learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessments, satisfactory student feedback, consistently minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) satisfactory threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.	awareness that clearly details good quality learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessments, good student feedback, consistently minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.	demonstrated by consistent awareness that clearly details high quality learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, assessments, good to excellent student feedback, consistently minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good to excellent threshold score, and any or all of the provided material.
Overall Teaching Evaluation	Adequate (satisfactory) teaching evaluation to be determined by the committee and to be based on a careful overall teaching evaluation of the complete application as demonstrated by a consideration of a satisfactory simple average, over all courses taught, if available, a minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) satisfactory threshold score for each of the criteria listed above, if available, satisfactory quality AAU Head feedback, and any or all of the provided material.	Consistently good teaching evaluation, to be determined by the committee and to be based on a careful evaluation of the complete application as demonstrated by a consideration of a good simple average, over all courses taught as an Assistant Professor, a minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good threshold score for each of the criteria listed above, consistently good quality AAU Head feedback, and any or all of the provided material.	Consistently good to excellent teaching evaluation, to be determined by the committee and to be based on a careful evaluation of the complete application as demonstrated by a consideration of a good to excellent simple average over all courses taught as an Associate Professor a consistently minimum student perceptions of teaching (SPT) good to excellent threshold score for each of the criteria listed above, high (good to excellent) quality AAU Head feedback, and any or all of the provided material.
Evaluation Level			
Unsatisfactory		The candidate has performed well below normal expectations as outlined in the teaching criteria. The teaching methods and approaches employed may be inappropriate or inadequate for the intend learning outcomes. The relationship	

	the candidate has established with students is poor and is detracting from effectively teaching the expected content. The candidate has demonstrated little or no initiative to improve teaching through additional training and/or mentorship opportunities, nor have they acted on meaningful feedback.
Satisfactory	The candidate has performed within the bounds of normal expectations as outlined in the teaching criteria. The teaching methods and approaches employed generally fulfil the intended learning outcomes. The candidate has a productive but not remarkable rapport with students. Lesser performance in one aspect (e.g., in class instruction) may be balanced by greater performance in another aspect related to teaching (e.g., student supervision). The candidate is aware of opportunities to improve teaching (e.g., workshops, etc.) but may have only participated in limited opportunities.
Good	The candidate has performed above normal expectations as outlined in the teaching criteria. The teaching methods and approaches employed fulfil the intended learning outcomes and has stimulated the interest or enthusiasm of students and others. The candidate has a productive rapport with students. Lesser performance in one aspect (e.g., in class instruction) may be balanced by significantly greater performance in another aspect related to teaching (e.g., student supervision).
Excellent	The candidate has performed significantly above normal expectations as outlined in the teaching criteria. The teaching methods and approaches employed fulfil the intended learning outcomes and has stimulated high levels of interest or enthusiasm by students and others. The candidate has a strong, productive rapport with students. The candidate may provide superior mentorship or assistance to students within the context of teaching.

Table 2: Research Standards and Evidence

The research evaluation shall include a review of the following aspects and evidence of research:

Criteria			
	Renewal of Contract	Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	Promotion to Professor
Research/Publications	Competent (satisfactory) research over and above that presented at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for contract renewal as demonstrated by a publication record that shows improvement in quantity (at least one more peer reviewed publication) and quality, and a clear, positive indication that the candidate is likely to continue to maintain or to exceed the current level of research, and any or all of the provided material.	Achieved good quality and significant research activity completed beyond the initial appointment with a likelihood to continue to maintain or to exceed the level of research as demonstrated by, normally, at least three peer reviewed articles in good journals beyond their appointment as Assistant Professor published in good quality journals, developed an independent research program and a good record of external research grants and any or all of the provided material.	Ability to carry out a good to excellent high quality and significant independent research program beyond their appointment as Associate Professor as demonstrated by publications in high quality journals so that the candidates research contributions are widely recognized by academic authorities in the field, by, normally, at least three peer reviewed articles with one in a high-quality journal, achieved some measure of national or international recognition (for example, by invited presentations at conferences important to the research area, etc.)
Supervision of student research theses and projects, and involvement on student thesis committees inside and outside the Department.	Candidates are normally engaged in the direct supervision or co-supervision of at least one graduate student (MSc or equivalent). Failure to supervise any students is normally interpreted as evidence of not meeting this requirement.	Candidates are normally engaged in the direct supervision or co-supervision of several graduate students (typically ≥ 2 MSc or 1 MSc + a PhD in progress). At least one graduate student must have completed a degree. Supervision of one or more	Candidates are expected to show a sustained, uninterrupted record of supervising multiple graduate students (MSc and PhD). Normally more than one MSc and at least one PhD student will have completed under their supervision. Failure to have supervised several graduate students to completion is normally interpreted as evidence of not meeting this requirement. Undergraduate supervision provides additional evidence.

	<p>Candidates are also expected to have served on at least one thesis committee.</p> <p>Undergraduate supervision also provides additional evidence.</p>	<p>PhD students at the time of promotion provides additional evidence.</p> <p>Undergraduate supervision also provides additional evidence. Candidates should have served on several thesis committees inside and outside Mathematics & Statistics.</p>	<p>Candidates must have served on numerous thesis committees across departments.</p>
<p>Participation in professional research activities (conference, workshop, or seminar talks/posters; organisation or chairing of sessions, workshops, or special meetings).</p>	<p>Candidates normally will have attended several scholarly meetings and delivered at least one contributed talk or poster prior to renewal.</p>	<p>Candidates normally will show regular participation at national or international meetings with multiple contributed and invited talks. They will have gained initial experience organising or chairing a conference session, mini-symposium, or departmental workshop, and may have sponsored an undergraduate or graduate students to present their work.</p>	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate a sustained, active presence at conferences, including invited / plenary presentations, organisation or leadership of conferences, workshops, or special sessions, and possible sponsorship of students to present joint results.</p>
<p>Work performed as an invited referee or expert reviewer, associate editor or editor for external publications (journals), or participation on grant</p>	<p>Candidates typically may not have participated in such activities but participation typically will be interpreted as evidence of meeting this requirement and more broadly</p>	<p>Candidates typically have performed at least one or several such duties and failure to participate in any such duties will be interpreted as evidence of</p>	<p>Candidates typically have performed such duties several times and failure to participate in any such duties will be interpreted as evidence of failure to meet this requirement.</p>

review committees (where such invitations serve to demonstrate research competence or expertise.)	as evidence of research success.	failure to meet this requirement.	
Successful research grant support obtained from sources outside of the University. Of particular importance is funding from a recognized federal agency such as a tri-council agency or CFI, or from a significant peer-reviewed national research body or foundation, or from a government agency that enables an independent research program to be established, including student training and support.	Candidates typically have applied for one or more such grants. Successful receipt of an NSERC Discovery Grant is typically considered evidence that this requirement has been met. Failure to obtain any external support is not necessarily evidence of failure to meet this requirement if evidence of continual re-application, application to multiple sources, and continual engagement in activities (i.e. peer-mentoring) intended to maximize the chance of a successful application are present.	Candidates typically have applied for one or more such grants. Successful receipt of an NSERC Discovery Grant capable of supporting the candidate's independent research program is typically considered evidence that this requirement has been met. Failure to obtain any external support is typically evidence of failure to meet this requirement unless evidence of extreme circumstances are presented.	Candidates typically are holding grants from a tri-council or other agency. External support is typically continually held with few or no breaks in support and such support has allowed the continual operation of an active research program including student training and support. Failure to hold at least one external grant is typically evidence of failure to meet this requirement unless evidence of extreme circumstances is presented.

Evaluation Level	
Unsatisfactory	The candidate has performed well below normal expectations as outlined in the RSCA criteria. The output from the candidate is substantively low, or of unacceptable or poor quality. The candidate has not demonstrated the ability to attract significant funding or external commitment to their RSCA field of expertise or practice. The candidate has not been able to capably supervise or cultivate scholarship or creativity in students (as

	applicable). The candidate has demonstrated little or no initiative to improve their RSCA through additional training and/or mentorship opportunities, nor have they acted on meaningful feedback.
Satisfactory	The candidate has performed within the normal expectations as outlined in the RSCA criteria. The output from the candidate is reasonable, and of nominal quality. The candidate has been able to attract funding or external commitment to their RSCA field of expertise or practice. The candidate has been able to supervise or cultivate scholarship or creativity in students (as applicable). Lesser performance in one aspect (e.g., funding) may be balanced by greater performance in another aspect related to RSCA (e.g., invited presentations). The candidate has attempted to improve their RSCA through additional training and/or mentorship opportunities, and they have acted on meaningful feedback.
Good	The candidate has performed above the normal expectations as outlined in the RSCA criteria. The output from the candidate is of high quality. The candidate has been able to attract a high level of funding or external commitment to their RSCA field of expertise or practice. The candidate has supervised or cultivated scholarship or creativity in students, and they have in turn achieved notable successes (as applicable). Lesser performance in one aspect (e.g., number of supervised students) may be balanced by significantly greater performance in another aspect related to RSCA (e.g., critically praised performances). The candidate has improved their RSCA through additional training and/or mentorship opportunities, and they have acted on meaningful feedback. The candidate may be a recognized expert in their field at a regional or discipline specific level.
Excellent	The candidate has performed significantly above the normal expectations as outlined in the RSCA criteria. The output from the candidate is of consistently high quality. The candidate has been able to attract noteworthy levels of funding or external commitment to their RSCA field of expertise or practice. The candidate has supervised or cultivated scholarship or creativity in students, and they have in turn achieved significant successes (as applicable). The candidate may be recognized as an expert or pioneer nationally or internationally within their discipline, and may also be asked to critically adjudicate others within their discipline. The candidate may have established a noteworthy RSCA group/program/institute of emerging prominence.

Table 3: Service Standards and Evidence

The service evaluation shall include a review of the following aspects and evidence of service:

Criteria			
-----------------	--	--	--

	Renewal of Contract	Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure	Promotion to Professor
Service to the University	Capability to demonstrate a willing and effective (satisfactory) positive level of membership (active or passive) or leadership on committees, to be determined by the committee, as demonstrated by contributions to Faculty, University and Windsor University Faculty Association (WUFA) committees for example Equity Officer, Chair of Thesis Defense Committees) and any or all of the provided material.	Demonstrated, in addition to meeting the criteria and standards for service for renewal of contract and to be determined by the committee, a good level of active, positive membership in, participation in or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for an Assistant Professor contract renewal, as demonstrated by maintained or increased contributions to Departmental Faculty, Faculty, University and Windsor University Faculty Association (WUFA) committees and any or all of the provided material.	Demonstrated, in addition to the standards for service for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and to be determined by the committee, a good to excellent level of active, positive membership in, participation in or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for an Associate Professor contract renewal, as demonstrated by consistent good to excellent contributions to Departmental Faculty, Faculty, University and Windsor University Faculty Association (WUFA) committees. For example, a good to excellent leadership service record by serving as committee chair, serving as undergraduate advisor, etc., and any or all of the provided material.
Service to the AAU	Capability to demonstrate a willing and effective (satisfactory) positive level of membership (active or passive) or leadership on committees, to be determined by the committee, as demonstrated by	Demonstrated, in addition to meeting the criteria and standards for service for renewal of contract and to be determined by the committee, a good level of active, positive membership in,	Demonstrated, in addition to the standards for service for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and to be determined by the committee, a good to excellent level of active, positive membership in,

	engagement within the life of the AAU and involvement on student thesis committees and any or all of the provided material.	participation in or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for an Assistant Professor contract renewal, as demonstrated by maintained or increased engagement within the life of the AAU and any or all of the provided material.	participation in or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for an Associate Professor contract renewal, as demonstrated by consistent good to excellent engagement within the life of the AAU and any or all of the provided material.
Service to professional/academic societies and/or broader University community	Capability to demonstrate a willing and effective (satisfactory) positive level of membership (active or passive) or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for contract renewal, to be determined by the committee, as demonstrated by contributions to professional/academic societies, government and community agencies and services that utilize the candidate's professional expertise and the potential for service to the broader University community and/or academic profession and any or all of the provided material.	Demonstrated, in addition to meeting the criteria and standards for service for renewal of contract and to be determined by the committee, a good level of active, positive membership in, participation in or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for an Assistant Professor contract renewal, as demonstrated by maintained or increased contributions to professional/academic societies, government and community agencies and services that utilize the candidate's professional expertise and the potential for service to the	Demonstrated, in addition to the standards for service for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and to be determined by the committee, a good to excellent level of active, positive membership in, participation in or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for an Associate Professor contract renewal, as demonstrated by consistent good to excellent contributions to professional/academic societies, government and community agencies and services that utilize the candidate's professional expertise and the potential for service to the

		broader University community and/or academic profession and any or all of the provided material.	broader University community and/or academic profession and any or all of the provided material.
Service to academic publishers	Capability to demonstrate a willing and effective (satisfactory) positive level of membership (active or passive) or leadership on committees, to be determined by the committee, as demonstrated by contributions to academic publishers such as work performed as a referee, associate editor or editor and any or all of the provided material.	Demonstrated, in addition to meeting the criteria and standards for service for renewal of contract and to be determined by the committee, a good level of active, positive membership in, participation in or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for an Assistant Professor contract renewal, as demonstrated by maintained or increased contributions to academic publishers such as work performed as a referee, associate editor, or editor and any or all of the provided material.	Demonstrated, in addition to the standards for service for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and to be determined by the committee, a good to excellent level of active, positive membership in, participation in or leadership on committees with the level of engagement increasing beyond that demonstrated at the time of appointment or at earlier reviews for an Associate Professor contract renewal, as demonstrated by consistent good to excellent contributions to academic publishers such as work performed as a referee, associate editor, or editor and any or all of the provided material.

Evaluation Level	
Unsatisfactory	The candidate has performed well below normal expectations as outlined in the service criteria. The contributions from the candidate are minimal compared to what could be reasonably expected. Alternatively, they may have performed poorly to the point of being ineffective even with dedicated guidance or mentorship. The candidate has not engaged significantly in program, departmental, faculty, or university activities (as appropriate to their level): for example, the candidate has not served on AAU committees necessary to the running of the program. The candidate has not engaged meaningfully with the outside community or relevant societies to enhance the community or the profession.
Satisfactory	The candidate has performed within the normal expectations as outlined in the service criteria. The participation of the candidate is reasonable and effective. For example, the candidate serves on

	committees that contribute to the necessary operations of the program, departmental, faculty, or university activities (as appropriate to their level). Lesser performance in one aspect (e.g., revising program options) may be balanced by greater performance in another aspect related to service (e.g., serving as liaison with other programs or initiatives). The candidate has engaged with the outside community or relevant societies, and helps to further their discipline (e.g., serving as an outside reviewer).
Good	The candidate has performed above the normal expectations as outlined in the service criteria. The participation of the candidate is effective and their contributions are usually deemed significant. For example, the candidate may chair select committees that contribute to the operations of the program, departmental, faculty, or university activities (as appropriate to their level). The candidate undertakes notable activities that benefit their program, department, faculty, or university (e.g., promoting their program or discipline to the public or school students considering university). Lesser performance in one aspect (e.g., recruiting students) may be balanced by significantly greater performance in another aspect related to service (e.g., leading accreditation efforts). The candidate has engaged with the outside community or relevant societies, and helps to further their discipline (e.g., serving as an outside reviewer).
Excellent	The candidate has performed significantly above the normal expectations as outlined in the service criteria. For example, the candidate may chair multiple committees that contribute to the critical operations of the program, departmental, faculty, or university activities (as appropriate to their level). The candidate undertakes significant activities that benefit their program, department, faculty, or university (e.g., organizing a conference; chairing university wide initiatives or committees). 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).