



MOUNT ROYAL
UNIVERSITY
1910

Faculty of Arts

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING, SERVICE
AND SCHOLARSHIP FOR TENURE

Approved by GFC on May 12, 2011

Table of Contents

	Page
Criteria for Evaluating Teaching For Tenure	5
I. First Principles	7
A. The Primacy of Teaching to Tenure and Promotion at Mount Royal University	7
B. Adherence to the <i>APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria</i>	7
2. Criteria for Teaching	8
A. “Competent Teaching” and “Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”	8
B. Midterm Evaluation—“Competent Teaching”	8
C. Promotion to Associate Professor—“Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”	9
3. Evidence for “Competent Teaching” and “Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”	9
A. The Tenure Dossier and Its Relationship to Evidence of “Competent” and “Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”	9
B. The Reflective Assessment of Teaching Document	10
C. Sources for Evidence of Successful Teaching	10
4. How to Use the Following Chart	10
Criteria and Evidence for Successful Teaching - CHART	11 - 13
Appendix A - A Note on SEIs, KEYS, and Peer Evaluations of Teaching	14
Appendix B - CAUT Guidelines on Teaching Dossiers	15
Criteria for Evaluating Service for Tenure	17
1. Preamble	19
A. Service is an essential part of faculty responsibilities	19
B. There are types of service which are mandatory for all full-time and limited-term faculty	19
C. There should be a mechanism to acknowledge service for which faculty receive reassigned time	19
D. A faculty member’s service obligations should go beyond the basic level of service mentioned above	19
E. There will be variations in levels of service from year to year	19
F. Tenure track faculty should aspire to reach an acceptable level of service by the time they apply for tenure	19
G. Academic departments are best equipped to measure and assess the levels of service attained by faculty	19
H. Faculty shall use their annual reports to document yearly service	19
I. Service should be part of the criteria for promotion to full professor	19
Rationale	20
A. Service is an essential part of faculty responsibilities	20
B. There are types of service which are mandatory for all full-time and limited-term faculty	20
C. There should be a mechanism to acknowledge service for which faculty receive reassigned time	20
D. A faculty member service obligations should go beyond the basic level of service mentioned above	21
E. There will be variations in levels of service from year to year	21
F. Tenure track faculty should aspire to reach an acceptable level of service by the time they apply for tenure	21
G. Academic departments are best equipped to measure and assess the levels of service attained by faculty	21
H. Faculty Shall use their annual reports to document yearly service	22
I. Service should be part of the criteria for promotion to full professor	22
Examples of service for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Faculty of Arts and SACL - CHART	23-27
Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure	29
1. Preamble	31

2. APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria	31
3. Principles of Scholarship Tenure Criteria in the Faculty of Arts	32
Detailed Criteria 1: The Program of Scholarship and the Systematic Reflection on Scholarly Practices	32
Detailed Criteria 2: The Production of Significant Results and Dissemination in Appropriate Peer-Reviewed Venues	35
	35-37
Scholarly Results – CHART	

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING FOR TENURE

Prepared by the Arts Faculty Council Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Service

- Sabrina Reed (Chair)
- Karen Manarin (APTC Representative, winter 2010)
- Scott Murray (APTC Representative, fall 2010-winter 2011)
- Miriam Knapik, (Counselling)
- Bill Bunn (English)
- Jennifer Pettit (Humanities)
- Janice Smith (Interior Design and Art History)
- Maria Jesus Plaza (Languages and Cultures)
- Maureen McGregor (Policy Studies, winter 2010)
- Ambrose Leung (Policy Studies, fall 2010-winter 2011)
- Mardy Roberts (Psychology)
- Isha Sharma (Sociology and Anthropology, winter 2010)
- Chris O'Connor (Sociology and Anthropology, fall 2010-winter 2011)

Approved by Arts Faculty Council, January 28, 2011

Final version, February 2, 2011

Approved by General Faculties Council on May 12, 2011

Teaching Criteria in the Faculty of Arts and SACL

I. First Principles

A. The Primacy of Teaching to Tenure and Promotion at Mount Royal University

The *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria* speak of “the primacy of teaching, informed by scholarship” (4 of 14). Teaching (or, in the case of the Counselling faculty in SACL, the equivalent) represents the majority of faculty workload at Mount Royal on both the TS and TSS work patterns; and successful teaching or counselling is therefore central to achieving tenure and promotion to the rank of associate or full professor in the Faculty of Arts and SACL. The *Collective Agreement*¹ defines the teaching load for Full-Time Faculty, Counsellors, Educational Developers and Librarians in Article 14.

B. Adherence to the APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Arts Faculty Council bases its criteria for teaching on the *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria* (May 3, 2010), and endorses its description of three levels of teaching competence. The document states:

Teaching involves not only what takes place in the class but also activities such as curriculum design, mentorship and student supervision. Please see the Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship and Service in the *Mount Royal Collective Agreement*, for a detailed, but not comprehensive list of examples. Scholarly literature on teaching often describes growth in teaching effectiveness in three phases:

- 1) Good or competent teaching—the criteria developed for Mount Royal build on criteria developed by Chickering and Gamson (1987): encourages contact between students and faculty; develops reciprocity and cooperation among students; encourages active learning; gives prompt feedback; emphasizes time on task; communicates high expectations; respects diverse talents and ways of learning.
- 2) Scholarly teaching—scholarly teachers are reflective practitioners, conduct systemic observations of teaching and learning and refine their practices, engage in teaching and learning professional development, remain current in their disciplines and utilize pedagogical best practices for the discipline. Unlike the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, scholarly teaching is not necessarily disseminated beyond the immediate context.
- 3) Leadership in teaching and learning—this refers to teachers who have a sustained impact beyond the local level, influencing professional dialogue about teaching at a national or international level, and providing leadership for major educational initiatives. (6-7 of 14)

In line with APTC guidelines, departments will articulate their expectations for the criteria.

¹ References to the *Collective Agreement* refer to the July 1, 2010/June 30, 2012 version. Article numbers and content may change in subsequent versions of the document.

2. Criteria for Teaching

A. “Competent Teaching” and “Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”

The *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria* divide teaching criteria into two sections: “competent teaching” and “proficient and scholarly teaching” (page 8 of 14). To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must reach the level of “proficient and scholarly teaching.” For purposes of annual and midterm evaluation, a faculty member must exhibit “competent teaching,” as defined by the *APTC Recommendations* and printed below.

B. Midterm Evaluation—“Competent Teaching”

In accordance with the *2010-2012 Collective Agreement*, tenure track faculty will report on their teaching in their annual reports (see Articles 10.4.2 and 12.1.1). In addition, Article 10.5.1 states that

The TPC and the Dean shall conduct a comprehensive mid-term evaluation of the tenurable employee’s progress towards fulfilling the criteria for the granting of tenure after the completion of the winter semester of the third probationary year. The evaluation shall be based on the materials in the employee’s tenure dossiers, with a focus on the documents produced in the third probationary year and on the annual evaluation reports for the first and second probationary years (Article 10.5.1).

It is expected that by the time tenurable employees reach the mid-term tenure evaluation, they will demonstrate the teaching standards defined as “competent teaching” in the APTC document:

- the candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the relevant subject area(s)
- the candidate organizes and presents course content clearly
- the candidate communicates high expectations
- the candidate fosters interaction between students and faculty
- the candidate encourages active learning
- the candidate develops collaboration and cooperation among students
- the candidate emphasizes time on task
- the candidate gives prompt and meaningful feedback
- the candidate respects diverse talents and ways of learning
- the candidate performs course-related administrative tasks efficiently (8 of 14)

As part of the evidence of “competent teaching,” tenure track faculty members must present a reflective assessment (no more than three pages) of their strengths as instructors, and how they have improved teaching practice and/or areas in which the faculty member needs to grow. This document should include a one page plan which outlines how the faculty member will achieve, or, in some cases, will continue to exhibit, “proficient and scholarly teaching” as outlined below.

C. Promotion to Associate Professor—“Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member must exhibit, as stated in the APTC document, “proficient and scholarly teaching” (8 of 14) or, in the case of the Counselling faculty in SACL, the equivalent proficiency and currency in their duties as Counsellors. The APTC document states that the criteria for “proficient and scholarly teaching” “include all of the criteria for ‘competent teaching,’ plus the following”:

- the candidate demonstrates currency in his or her discipline(s)
- the candidate engages in teaching and learning professional development
- the candidate utilizes pedagogical best practices for the discipline
- the candidate aligns teaching philosophy, intended outcomes, learning activities and assessment strategies
- the candidate engages in systematic reflection on teaching practices (8-9 of 14)

As part of the evidence of “proficient and scholarly teaching,” tenure track faculty members must present a reflective assessment (no more than four pages in length) on their strengths as an instructor, and how they have improved teaching practice and/or areas in which the faculty member needs to grow. This document should include a one page summary which outlines how the faculty member has achieved, and will continue to exhibit, “proficient and scholarly teaching,” as outlined below.

3. Evidence for “Competent Teaching” and “Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”

A. The Tenure Dossier and Its Relationship to Evidence of “Competent” and “Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”

Some of the items mentioned as “evidence” below will be part of a “cumulative tenure dossier” (10.4.2) prepared annually by all tenure-track faculty members. The Midterm tenure dossier completed “after the winter semester of the third probationary year” (10.5.1) and the final tenure dossier submitted by 1 February of the final probationary year (10.6) are particularly significant. The exact nature and contents of the tenure dossier will be determined by UPTC, but Article 10.4.2 of the *July 1, 2010-June 30, 2012 Collective Agreement* says that “The tenure dossier shall include, but not be limited to:

- the letter of appointment;
- current curriculum vitae;
- a scholarship plan, where applicable;
- teaching assessments, including student and peer evaluations;
- the employee’s Annual Reports as stipulated in Article 12.1.1;
- previous years’ annual tenure evaluation reports;
- the mid-term tenure evaluation report, when completed;
- the employee’s responses, if any, to teaching assessments and/or annual and mid-term tenure evaluation reports, and any letters giving reasons why assessments were not conducted;
- any material, including record of disciplinary action against the employee, which is placed in the dossier because it bears on his or her progress towards fulfilling the criteria for the granting of tenure.

B. The Reflective Assessment of Teaching Document

For purposes of midterm evaluation and again for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, all candidates in the Faculty of Arts or in SACL will create a “reflective assessment of teaching.” This document will be no more than three pages for the midterm evaluation and no more than four pages for promotion to Associate Professor. In this document, candidates will evaluate and assess their growth as teachers and/or counsellors. The reflective assessment provides a chance for practitioners to reflect on their teaching and assessment strategies: what worked, what didn’t work, and what needs to be developed or changed. In the case of the midterm evaluation, candidates may present a series of strategies for how they will reach the level of “scholarly and proficient teaching.” The reflective assessments of teaching may include such things as

- a list of teaching methods and why they worked or did not work
- a summary of the candidate’s contribution to the development of new courses and/or revision of existing courses
- a description of any professional development which the candidate feels was particularly useful in promoting growth as a teacher
- a description of the candidate’s contribution to the overall teaching of your department
- reflection on the candidate’s supervision of students in practica, honours, or directed readings.

C. Sources for Evidence of Successful Teaching

Candidates will provide evidence of successful teaching through comments in their annual reports, teaching philosophies, and reflective assessments on teaching. Departments, colleagues, and departmental TPCs will provide evidence through comments in peer evaluations and annual, midterm, and summative evaluations of the candidate. SEIs will also be used to assess a candidate’s teaching.

Arts Faculty Council recognizes that there are not always clear boundaries between what is considered teaching, scholarship, and service. The APTC recommendations state, “It is very important to note that these three types of activity are overlapping and interconnected, not discrete, rigidly defined categories. When a candidate brings forward evidence in support of a promotion or tenure application, he or she may categorize the contributions with some degree of flexibility” (page 6 of 14). Departmental TPCs can best assess whether the evidence brought forward by the candidate is relevant.

4. **How to Use the Following Chart**

The following chart is based on the APTC Recommendations on Institutional Promotion and Tenure Criteria. As stated there, individuals at the rank of Assistant Professor must exhibit, or work toward exhibiting, the requirements for “competent teaching,” as listed in the “criteria” column, below. Candidates for the rank of Associate Professor must exhibit the requirements for “proficient and scholarly teaching.” The evidence for these criteria will vary by candidate. The following chart provides examples of evidence, and is not meant to be either prescriptive or comprehensive. It is understood that there may be some variation between disciplines, and therefore departmental TPCs will determine the relative weighting of evidence.

Criteria and Evidence for Successful Teaching

Faculty of Arts and SACL

Assistant Professor Rank—“Competent Teaching”	
Criteria	Examples of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the relevant subject area(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student comments and scores on SEIs (see below)</i> • <i>Peer and chair evaluations of teaching</i> • <i>Attendance at conferences related to candidate’s area(s) of expertise</i> • <i>Informed discussions with colleagues</i> • <i>Conference papers and publications in the candidate’s area(s) of expertise</i> • <i>New course development or course redesign</i> • <i>Teaching a course not taught previously</i> • <i>Subscriptions to journals, membership in societies and professional organizations, etc.</i> • <i>Participation in professional practice outside the institution</i> • <i>New media such as podcasts, blogs, etc.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate organizes and presents course content clearly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student comments and scores on SEIs</i> • <i>Peer and chair evaluations of teaching</i> • <i>Course outlines and week by week syllabi</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate communicates high expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student comments and scores on SEIs (see below)</i> • <i>Peer and chair evaluations of teaching</i> • <i>Course outlines and week by week syllabi</i> • <i>Representative assignments</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate fosters interaction between students and faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where appropriate, formal teaching of students outside the classroom setting, including such things as involving students in research projects, supervising directed readings, supervising honours theses or projects, and supervising practicum students, experiential learning, field schools</i> • <i>Mentorship of students outside the classroom, which can take the form of tasks such as talking to students about career goals or graduate school, writing reference letters when the faculty member feels comfortable doing so, informal referral of students to resources such as Student Learning Services, Accessibility Services, Career Services, Counselling, etc. and meeting with students regarding issues related to the Student Code of Conduct</i> • <i>Organization and participation in extra-curricular events focused on students</i> • <i>Attendance and participation at student events and/or leadership of a student society</i> • <i>Student comments and scores on SEIs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate encourages active learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student comments and scores on SEIs (see below)</i> • <i>Peer and chair evaluations of teaching</i> • <i>Specific assignments designed to encourage active learning</i> • <i>Participation in experiential learning, field schools, etc.</i>

Assistant Professor Criteria, continued	Assistant Professor Examples of Evidence, continued
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate develops collaboration and cooperation among students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lesson plans, rubrics, and course outlines</i> • <i>Teaching philosophy</i> • <i>Use of group or team projects, discussions, etc., where applicable</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate emphasizes time on task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lesson plans, rubrics, and course outlines</i> • <i>Student comments and scores on SEIs</i> • <i>Peer Evaluations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate gives prompt and meaningful feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Prompt return of student work (usually within two weeks) and final grades (usually within three business days of the final examination)</i> • <i>Student comments and scores on SEIs</i> • <i>Chair's Evaluations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate respects diverse talents and ways of learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Assignments which speak to diverse student talents</i> • <i>Chair's evaluations, Peer evaluations, and student comments and scores on SEIs</i> • <i>Demonstrated respect for students' varied learning styles and a willingness to provide reasonable support to students with learning difficulties, when such students are identified by Accessibility Services or other student service areas at Mount Royal.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate performs course-related administrative tasks efficiently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Posted office hours and/or notes in course outlines regarding availability</i> • <i>Course outlines ready according to semester and department timelines</i> • <i>Book orders submitted in a timely fashion</i> • <i>Assignments and examinations graded in a timely fashion</i> • <i>Well maintained Blackboard (or equivalent) site as referenced in Peer evaluations, student comments and scores on SEIs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of good and competent teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teaching awards or commendations</i> • <i>Nomination for teaching awards</i> • <i>Attends courses and workshops at MRU and elsewhere aimed at improving delivery and good practices in the classroom, and shows evidence of implementing them, where applicable</i> • <i>Attends courses aimed at maintaining currency in the discipline or enhancing knowledge.</i>
Assistant Professor Rank—Midterm Evaluation	
Criteria	Examples of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate demonstrates most or all of the above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria as above, with the addition of a self assessment of teaching practices (no more than three pages) and a one page timeline/statement of goals related to reaching and/or maintaining the achievement of "proficient and scholarly teaching"

Associate Professor Rank—“Proficient and Scholarly Teaching”

Criteria	Examples of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate exhibits all the criteria for “competent teaching” as listed above 	<p><i>See above</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate demonstrates currency in his or her discipline(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ability to discuss current trends in the discipline with students and colleagues</i> • <i>Regular updating of teaching materials</i> • <i>Attendance at conferences related to the discipline/profession</i> • <i>Conference papers and published research</i> • <i>Willingness to teach new courses, when and if the academic unit or discipline requires this</i> • <i>Feedback from colleagues on peer evaluation forms</i> • <i>Assessments by the department during tenure evaluations</i> • <i>Department/faculty wide talks on candidate’s discipline</i> • <i>Evidence of new course development (where applicable),</i> • <i>Evidence of variety in courses taught</i> • <i>Teaching beyond the 1000 or 2000 level (if possible in the discipline)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate engages in teaching and learning professional development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Participation in SoTL project/working groups, faculty learning communities</i> • <i>Attendance at ADC and MRFA professional events and workshops</i> • <i>Attendance at conferences related to teaching and pedagogy</i> • <i>Participation in the ISP program</i> • <i>Publication related to teaching, learning, and pedagogy</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate utilizes pedagogical best practices for the discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teaching awards or commendations</i> • <i>Nomination for teaching awards</i> • <i>Peer and Chair evaluations from faculty in the candidate’s discipline</i> • <i>Student comments and scores on SEIs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate aligns teaching philosophy, intended outcomes, learning activities and assessment strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Course outlines and rubrics</i> • <i>Reflection on teaching practices</i> • <i>Statement of teaching philosophy</i> • <i>Sample assignments</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate engages in systematic reflection on teaching practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Articulation of a teaching philosophy in annual report</i> • <i>Reflection in the annual report and in a “reflective assessment of teaching” regarding the success of the candidate’s strategies</i>

Revised January 25, 2011

Appendix A

A Note on SEIs, KEYS, and Peer Evaluations of Teaching

SEIs, KEYS, and Peer evaluations of teaching are valuable tools for evaluating teaching and counselling, but they should be considered in context.

a) SEIs (Student Evaluation of Instruction)

- Some departments/disciplines have higher average scores than others, so departments/disciplines need to discuss the norms for their own areas.
- SEIs should primarily be read for patterns, both positive and negative, in faculty teaching. For example, evidence that a faculty member gives superior feedback on assignments becomes more relevant as the comment is repeated over several terms worth of evaluations. A one-time low score around an instructor's inability to foster "an environment of respect" is of less concern than consistent low scores in this area.
- Student comments on SEIs should be read in a similar way to numerical scores—that is, a comment made only once is of less significance than a comment repeated by several students.
- Departments may also look at the student response rate for a particular evaluation. A response rate of 50% or higher should be the norm, and SEI data from fewer than ten students should be treated with caution.
- Evaluations from different courses and levels should be included in the tenure dossier.
- The "Faculty Class Notes" form may include relevant explanations for lower than average SEIs, and this form should be taken into account.

b) KEY evaluations for Counsellors

- KEYS should reflect a range of the Counsellor's professional experience at Mount Royal. Over the course of the tenure process, the faculty member should have been evaluated by a range of clients.
- KEYS should primarily be read for patterns, both positive and negative, in faculty work.
- Client comments on KEYS should be read in a similar way to numerical scores—that is, a comment made only once is of less significance than a comment repeated by several clients.

c) Peer evaluations

- Peer evaluations should be formative
- Peer evaluations should reflect the range of a faculty member's teaching or counselling experience. That is, a faculty member should, wherever possible, have peers evaluate courses at different levels of difficulty (1000, 2000, 3000, 4000) and content area.
- Tenure track faculty should try to spread their peer and chair evaluations out over the course of the academic year.
- With the exception of chair evaluations, tenure track faculty should not have the same person evaluate them more than once.
- As with SEIs, trends in peer evaluations should be given more weight than individual evaluations.

Appendix B

CAUT Guidelines on Teaching Dossiers

The following is quoted with permission from a CAUT online publication on preparing a teaching dossier. This excerpt suggests possible items for inclusion in a teaching dossier. Please note that this is for information only; candidates for tenure are not required to adhere to the suggestions made below.

For the complete publication, "CAUT Teaching Dossier," go to http://www.caut.ca/uploads/teaching_dossier_en.pdf

3.2 Possible items for a teaching dossier

Academic staff members should recognize which of the following items would most effectively enhance a favourable impression of teaching competence and which might better be used for self-evaluation and improvement. The dossier should be compiled to make the best possible case for teaching effectiveness.

3.2.1 Teaching responsibilities and practices

1. List of course titles and numbers, unit values or credits, enrolments with brief elaboration.
2. List of course materials prepared for students.
3. Information on academic's availability to students and evidence of prompt and effective correspondence via e-mail.
4. Report on identification of student difficulties and encouragement of student participation in courses or programs.
5. Steps taken to emphasize the interrelatedness and relevance of different kinds of learning.
6. Statement about quizzes and examination items being keyed to instructional objectives.

3.2.2 Products of good teaching

7. Student scores on teacher-made or standardized tests, possibly before and after a course has been taken as evidence of learning.
8. Student laboratory workbooks and other kinds of workbooks or logs.
9. Student essays, creative work, projects and field-work reports.
10. A record of students who select and succeed in advanced courses of study in the field.
11. A record of students who elect another course with the same academic.
12. Evidence of effective supervision of Honour's, Master's or Ph.D. theses.
13. Setting up or running a successful internship program.
14. Evidence of help given to colleagues on teaching improvement.

3.2.3 Evaluating and improving one's teaching

15. Maintaining a record of the changes resulting from self-evaluation.
16. Instructional innovations attempted and evaluation of their effectiveness.
17. Reading journals on improving teaching and attempting to implement acquired ideas.
18. Reviewing new teaching materials for possible application including exchanging course materials with a colleague from another institution.
19. Conducting research on one's own teaching or course.
20. Becoming involved in an association or society concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning.
21. Participating in seminars, workshops and professional meetings intended to improve teaching.

22. Using general support services such as the Education Resources Information Centre in improving one's teaching.
23. Participating in course or curriculum development.

3.2.4 Contributions outside of the classroom

24. Preparing a textbook or other instructional materials such as on-line 'courseware'.
25. Editing or contributing to a professional journal on teaching one's subject.

3.2.5 Information from students

26. Student course and teaching evaluation data which suggests improvements or demonstrate effectiveness or satisfaction.
27. Evidence of student satisfaction including written comments received during the term or after a course has been completed.
28. Interview data collected from students.

3.2.6 Information from colleagues

29. Statements from colleagues who have observed teaching either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course.
30. Written comments from those who teach courses for which a particular course is a prerequisite.
31. Evidence of contributions to course development and improvement.
32. Statements from colleagues from other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
33. Requests for advice or acknowledgment of advice received by a committee on teaching or similar body.

3.2.7 Information from others

34. Honours received such as being nominated or named "teacher of the year."
35. Statement about teaching achievements from administrators at one's own institution or another institution.
36. Alumni ratings or other graduate feedback.
37. Comments from parents of students.
38. Reports from employers of students (e.g., in a work-study or cooperative program).
39. Invitations to teach from outside agencies.
40. Invitations to contribute to the teaching literature.
41. Other kinds of invitations based on one's reputation as a teacher such as a media interview on a successful teaching innovation.

Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). "Possible Items for a Teaching Dossier." *CAUT Teaching Dossier*. Ottawa: The Canadian Association of University Teachers. 2007. Web. January 20, 2011. <http://www.caut.ca/uploads/teaching_dossier_en.pdf>

Included with permission from CAUT, January 20, 2011

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SERVICE FOR TENURE

Prepared by the Arts Faculty Council Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Service

- Sabrina Reed (Chair)
- Karen Manarin (APTC Representative, winter 2010)
- Scott Murray (APTC Representative, fall 2010-winter 2011)
- Miriam Knapik, (Counselling)
- Bill Bunn (English)
- Jennifer Pettit (Humanities)
- Janice Smith (Interior Design and Art History)
- Maria Jesus Plaza (Languages and Cultures)
- Maureen McGregor (Policy Studies, winter 2010)
- Ambrose Leung (Policy Studies, fall 2010-winter 2011)
- Mardy Roberts (Psychology)
- Isha Sharma (Sociology and Anthropology, winter 2010)
- Chris O'Connor (Sociology and Anthropology, fall 2010-winter 2011)

Approved by Arts Faculty Council on October 22, 2010

Revised in response to APTC feedback and approved by Arts Faculty Council on April 29, 2011

Approved by General Faculties Council on May 12, 2011

Criteria for Service

Preamble

The Faculty of Arts and the Counseling faculty in Student Affairs and Campus Life base their guidelines on service on the *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria*, passed by GFC in May 2010. The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee is to clarify “Faculty and academic unit level development of faculty/discipline-specific evidence and standards, in cooperation with APTC” (*APTC Recommendations 2*).

In the APTC document, service is defined as follows:

Service is essential to the effective functioning of the University. Service not only demonstrates commitment to the Institution, but supports Mount Royal's commitment to engage with the communities outside its walls. Service may include service to the academic unit and faculty, service to the university, service to academic fields of study, and service to the broader community where these activities are related to the individual's academic discipline or responsibilities as a member of the Mount Royal University community. The level of involvement in service activity is categorized by “participation” versus “contribution”, where the latter requires a greater degree of involvement. Specifically, participation in the governance and activities of the academic unit, faculty and/or university engages faculty members in active discussion and collegial decision making processes. Contribution necessitates a greater level of involvement as measured by specific responsibilities and investment of time. Please see the Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship and Service in the Mount Royal Collective Agreement, for a detailed, but not comprehensive list of examples. (*APTC Recommendations, 7*)

Further, Article 14.7 of the *July 1, 2010-June 30, 2012 Collective Agreement*, “Service Activities for Full-time and Limited-term Instructors,” states that “Full-time and limited-term instructors shall engage in service which will include, but not be restricted to, the examples described in the Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship and Service.” The *Collective Agreement* gives the following examples of service, stating that examples of service “may include but [are] not restricted to the following activities” (*Agreement 89*)

- Participation in department, faculty and institutional governance
- Selection, support, development and evaluation of colleagues
- Appropriate student support including advising
- Development and application of academic policies
- Creation, development, evaluation and revision of academic programs
- Liaison, partnership and leadership work with disciplines, organizations and communities relevant to academic or professional expertise
- Participation in the Mount Royal Faculty Association, its processes and committees

In keeping with the above, the Faculty of Arts agrees that,

- A. Service is an essential part of faculty responsibilities
- B. There are types of service which are mandatory for all full-time and limited-term faculty
- C. There should be a mechanism to acknowledge service for which faculty receive reassigned time
- D. A faculty member's service obligations should go beyond the basic level of service mentioned in point B
- E. There will be variations in levels of service from year to year
- F. Tenure track faculty should aspire to reach an acceptable level of service by the time they apply for tenure
- G. Academic departments are best equipped to measure and assess the levels of service attained by faculty
- H. Faculty shall use their annual reports to document yearly service
- I. Service should be part of the criteria for promotion to full professor

Rationale

A. Service is an essential part of faculty responsibilities

The *July 1, 2010-June 30, 2012 Collective Agreement* states that “Full-time and limited-term instructors shall engage in service which will include, but not be restricted to, the examples described in the Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.” (14.7). Service is thus an essential part of faculty work. As specified in Appendix B of the *July 1, 2010-June 30, 2012 Collective Agreement*, full-time and limited-term faculty should report service as part of their annual reports (*Agreement* 92).

B. There are types of service which are mandatory for all full-time and limited-term faculty

The Faculty of Arts and the Counseling faculty in SACL support the position of the *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria* that all faculty should “clearly demonstrat[e] collegial participation” (page 8 of 14) around service. The APTC document states that the criteria for collegial participation are

- The candidate participates in the governance and activities of the academic unit
- The candidate participates in academic governance at the faculty council level

For faculty in Arts and Counseling, the above criteria imply that all full-time and limited-term faculty should take part in the following as a job requirement:

- Regular attendance at department meetings
- Regular attendance at Arts Faculty Council meetings
- Attendance at department planning, tenure, and evaluation meetings

While the Faculty of Arts and SACL acknowledge and support the right of faculty to have flexibility in scheduling and workload, and the necessity for faculty to attend conferences in their areas of expertise, they also believe that faculty should normally be available for meetings scheduled during regular working hours and for the duration of the academic year (August 15 to June 14).

As mentioned in the *APTC Recommendations*, “the level of involvement in service activity is categorized by ‘participation’ versus ‘contribution.’ . . . **Participation** in the governance and activities of the academic unit, faculty and/or university engages faculty members in active discussion and collegial decision making processes. **Contribution** necessitates a greater level of involvement as measured by specific responsibilities and investment of time” (page 7 of 14).

C. There should be a mechanism to acknowledge service for which faculty receive reassigned time

The Faculty of Arts and the Counseling faculty in SACL define “service” to be activities over and above the basic instructional and/or counseling duties as specified in the Collective Agreement for faculty on TS and TSS (see Article 14.9: *Activities Eligible for Reassigned Time for Faculty*). When faculty receive reassigned time—that is, “an adjustment to their instructional load or equivalent” (Article 14.9.1)—such work is not, in this sense, “service.” However, the Faculty of Arts and the Counseling faculty in SACL also believe that faculty should receive credit for taking on such work, as many of the activities which receive reassigned time are essential to the workings of the department, the faculty, and the university. Individual departments are the best judge of whether reassigned time is adequate for the amount of work done. In all cases, a faculty member’s willingness to take on the work of the chair, advising, coordination, assistant to the chair and other duties should be considered in a candidate’s tenure, annual evaluation, and promotion, regardless of the amount of reassigned time allocated. Over the course of their careers, it is expected that most faculty will take part in this essential part of faculty work.

D. A faculty member's service obligations should go beyond the basic level of service mentioned above

The 2010-2012 *Collective Agreement* states that "Full-time and limited-term instructors shall engage in service which will include, but not be restricted to, the examples described in the Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship, and Service." (14.7).

The Faculty of Arts and the Counseling faculty in SACL believe that the items mentioned in section B, above, are a basic level of service expected of all tenured and tenure track faculty. For the purposes of promotion, tenure, and annual evaluation, there is an expectation that faculty will perform service above and beyond this basic level.

E. There will be variations in levels of service from year to year

Notwithstanding the above, the Faculty of Arts and the Counseling faculty in SACL recognize that levels of service may vary from year to year, based on a faculty member's other commitments and the nature of the committee(s) on which a faculty member serves. A "service heavy" year may be followed by a year that is not so high in service, though the activities outlined in section B, above, are expected of all full time faculty in each year of employment at Mount Royal, with the exception of those on approved leaves from Mount Royal University.

F. Tenure track faculty should aspire to reach an acceptable level of service by the time they apply for tenure

Especially in the first year of tenure-track employment, opportunities for service are often limited. By the time an individual applies for tenure, however, the candidate should have reached the level of "contribution" in one or more of service to the department, the faculty, the institution (MRFA or university-wide committees), or the larger discipline-specific community. In accordance with the timelines laid out in the *2010-2012 Collective Agreement*, tenure track faculty will report their yearly service in their annual reports. In addition, Article 10.5.1 states that

The TPC and the Dean shall conduct a comprehensive mid-term evaluation of the tenurable employee's progress towards fulfilling the criteria for the granting of tenure after the completion of the winter semester of the third probationary year. The evaluation shall be based on the materials in the employee's tenure dossiers, with a focus on the documents produced in the third probationary year and on the annual evaluation reports for the first and second probationary years.

It is expected that by the time a tenurable employee reaches the mid-term tenure evaluation, he or she will have accrued a significant amount of service. The TPC and the Dean will inform the tenurable employee of his or her progress in this area and, if necessary, suggest ways for the employee to improve his or her performance.

G. Academic departments are best equipped to measure and assess the levels of service attained by faculty

While this report offers general guidelines for how intensive a particular kind of service is, academic departments, and especially Chairs, are best equipped to assess whether or not a faculty member has performed to the level of service expected and/or if there are any extenuating circumstances (illness, family crisis, for example) that would account for a faculty member's not carrying out his or her service task(s). A faculty member's department and Chair are also best able to evaluate when an individual significantly exceeds the expectations for a particular service task.

H. Faculty shall use their annual reports to document yearly service

As mentioned in the 2010-2012 Collective Agreement, it is the responsibility of each full-time and limited term faculty member to report on service performed as part of the annual report. (See *Appendix B: Faculty Annual Report*).

I. Service should be part of the criteria for promotion to full professor

The *APTC Recommendations* state that for promotion to the rank of Full Professor, a candidate should present

1. One of:
 - a) Excellence and leadership in teaching
 - b) Excellence in scholarship and continued proficient and scholarly teaching
2. Substantial contribution in service.
Exceptional performance in any of the above categories does not lower the performance expectations in the remaining categories. (page 9 of 14)

In addition, the *APTC Recommendations* discuss “Requirements for Substantial Contribution in Service”:

The candidate clearly demonstrates substantial contribution in service. The criteria include all the criteria for “collegial participation,” plus the following:

The candidate demonstrates leadership in at least one, or significant contributions in at least two, of the following:

- Service to the academic unit and faculty
- Service to the university
- Service to academic fields of study
- Service to the broader community, in a faculty member- or discipline-related capacity (page 10 of 14)

With these recommendations in mind, the Faculty of Arts and the Counseling faculty in SACL recommend that faculty who wish promotion to full professor must have maintained a consistent service profile within their departments and the university, and, in some cases, in the broader community. In terms of the attached chart, “Examples of Service in the Faculty of Arts and SACL,” a faculty member requesting promotion to full professor should be able to present several examples of service at levels three and four, in at least one of the above four categories.

Examples of service for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Faculty of Arts and SACL

Please note:

- This is a **guideline only**, intended to help tenure-track and tenured faculty understand what types of service are available to them and how they might count towards tenure and/or annual evaluation.
- This chart is meant to be interpreted in the light of the evaluating department's and dean's understanding of a faculty member's work and commitment.
- Categories are not always clean cut. Organizing a conference can, for instance, be considered service; but others might prefer to count such work under "scholarship." Much depends on the actual tasks performed. In this example, for instance, the organization of a conference panel might be reported under "scholarship," while organizing food, transportation, etc. could be reported as "service."
- Participation and Contribution are defined in the APTC document
 - "Participation in the governance and activities of the academic unit, faculty and/or university engages faculty members in active discussion and collegial decision making processes" (page 7 of 14).
 - "Contribution necessitates a greater level of involvement as measured by specific responsibilities and investment of time" (page 7 of 14).

How to use this chart

This chart is divided into activities which indicate "participation" and activities which indicate "contribution." Keeping in mind that the chart is a **guide rather than a rubric**, all tenured, tenure-track, and limited term faculty should show a continuing commitment to service, with yearly examples of activities at level one, and, over a three year period, two or more activities at levels two to four. By the time tenure-track colleagues apply for tenure, they should have four or more activities at level two or higher and at least one activity at level three or four. The APTC Recommendations state that with regard to service, criteria for tenure and promotion to the Associate Professor rank, the candidate should have exhibited "all of the criteria for 'collegial participation,' plus the following":

The candidate has contributed significantly in at least one of:

- Service to the academic unit and faculty
- Service to the university
- Service to academic fields of study
- Service to the broader community, in a faculty member- or discipline-related capacity

Level 1	Collegial participation which does not require significant preparation. Faculty member attends an event, has read or prepared materials that make him or her able to participate in the discussion at hand. Example: reading materials sent out in advance of a department meeting and contributing to discussion.
Level 2	Contribution. Faculty member may have been part of a committee that prepared materials for an event, meeting, etc., or have helped organize a conference, forum, or presentation. Example: being an active member of a department committee, serving as a member of an AFC, MRFA, or university-wide committee, evaluating tenure-track or part-time colleagues, mentoring one's colleagues as required.
Level 3	Contribution, usually in a leadership capacity. Requires significant preparation and time commitment and takes a leadership role. May include preparing agendas, calling meetings, taking minutes, preparing information materials. Example: member of GFC, Chair of MRFA committee, Chair of Department Committee.
Level 4	Contribution, usually in a University-level leadership role. Requires significant preparation and time commitment and takes a leadership role in the institution or beyond. Will include major time commitment and responsibilities. Example: Chair of APPC, Chair of GFC, Lead negotiator for the MRFA. NOTE: Many of the activities at level four are only available to faculty with tenure, or, because of their level of difficulty, are usually only chosen from within the ranks of tenured faculty. While tenure-track and limited-term faculty may achieve a position at level 4, this level of service is not expected of non-tenured faculty. Level 4 service may, however, be a consideration in promotion to full professor.

Examples of Service in the Faculty of Arts and SACL

Note: This is a **guide** to the types of service a faculty member may perform in the course of his or her employment at MRU. While the chart suggests levels for service activities, there will be some variation in how these levels apply.

Type of Service	Collegial Participation	Contribution		
A. Service to the Academic Unit and Faculty	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
1. Commitments to colleagues and to department and faculty governance				
• Attend department and discipline meetings	Expected			
• Attend meetings of Arts Faculty Council	Expected			
• Attend events that promote and celebrate the academic unit or faculty (i.e. student welcome events, Faculty of Arts welcome reception, department colloquia), as time permits.	Expected	Faculty member organizes event	Faculty member gives a research/professional presentation at a dept. colloquium or speaker series	Faculty member organizes a series of colloquia/speakers for the Faculty of Arts or University community
• Mentoring of tenure track (and tenured) colleagues. Faculty member shares knowledge with others on an informal basis	Expected	Faculty member is assigned specific faculty to mentor	Faculty member gives a major workshop (half day or more)	
• Participating in department full-time hiring by attending candidates' presentations and, if possible, helping with hiring-related activities such as tours of MRU, airport pick up, etc.	Expected			
• Serving as a member of a full-time hiring committee (usually a responsibility for <i>tenured</i> faculty)			Faculty member serves on hiring committee	Chair of hiring committee
• Peer evaluations of tenure-track (and, should policy change), tenured faculty. NOTE: Numbers of tenure-track faculty vary	Expected	Multiple evaluations (3-4 per year)	Multiple evaluations (more than 4 per yr)	
• For tenured faculty: attending department meetings associated with tenure, promotion, and the granting of leaves	Expected	Writing peer evaluation of a colleague's leave application	Serving on department TPC	Chairing department TPC
• Member of part time hiring committee (usually a responsibility for <i>tenured</i> faculty)		Member	Chair of committee	
• Serving on departmental committees	Member	Chair		
• Serving on major departmental committees		Member	Chair	

Type of Service	Collegial Participation	Contribution		
Service to the Academic Unit and Faculty (con't)	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
2. Curriculum Support				
• Course coordination (i.e., Psychology 1103 & 1104; English 1101)	Depends on complexity and reassigned time	Depends on complexity and reassigned time	Depends on complexity and reassigned time	
• Discipline coordination in multi-disciplinary departments	Depends on complexity and reassigned time	Depends on complexity and reassigned time	Depends on complexity and reassigned time	
• Arts Curriculum Committee			Membership	Chair
• Arts Coop Committee		Membership	Arts Coop point person	Chair
• Class substitutions/guest lectures	Occasional trading of class time/ substituting for colleagues attending conferences, etc.	Substituting for two weeks or more (i.e. in the case of colleague's extended absence)	Taking over a course at the last minute , especially for the first time	
• Degree development and degree assessment (i.e. reporting to Campus Alberta Quality Council)	Faculty member engages with such development in dept. meetings	Faculty member serves on committee related to development/ assessment	Faculty member takes a leadership role	
• Member of Program Advisory Committee	Member (once /yr)	Member (twice/yr)	Member (multiple meetings)	
3. Student support				
• Provides occasional advice about courses and programs	Expected—provides <i>unofficial</i> advice		B.A. majors advisor (appointed position)	
• Writing letters of reference for students (if comfortable with the request)	Writes letters as requested	Writes letters as requested		
• Faculty advisor for student society		Faculty advisor		
• Regularly attending student events related to discipline/dept.	Regular attendance, as schedule permits	Taking a major role in organizing such events		
• Attending Open House	Attendance			
• Helping with faculty/university wide activities such as Majors and Minors Fair, Degree Information Evening	Attendance	Taking a major role in organizing such events		
• Faculty of Arts Diversity Committee		Member	Chair	
• Ad Hoc Committees		Member	Chair	
• FDC		Member		

Type of Service	Collegial Participation	Contribution		
• Arts Scholarly Events		Member		
• Other Faculty of Arts Committees	As workload dictates	As workload dictates	Chair	
B. Service to the University	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
1. Service to the MRFA				
• Attending MRFA meetings	Regular attendance			
• Serving on an MRFA Committee (see MRFA website for a list of MRFA committees)—Service commitment may vary according to number of meetings and tasks performed	Member	Member	Chairing an MRFA Committee	
• Serving on MRFA executive			Executive position	Executive position
• Board of Governor's Representative				BOG Representative
• Negotiations Committee			Member	Lead negotiator
2. Service on University Committees				
• Member of GFC			Member	Speaker for GFC
• APTC (Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee)			Member	Chair
• UPTC (University Tenure and Promotion Committee)				Member
• APPC (Policy and Program Committee)			Member	Chair
• Leave Granting Committee		Member		
• Tenure Granting Committee			Member	
• Bylaws and Striking Committee			Member	Chair
• Member of a GFC Committee not mentioned above			Member	Chair
• Human Research Ethics Board			Member	Chair
• Research Committee (University-wide)			Member	Chair
• Other University committees	Varies depending on task	Varies depending on task	Varies depending on task	Varies depending on task (Chair's position, for ex.)

Type of Service	Collegial Participation	Contribution		
C. Service to Academic Fields of Study (items listed in this category, while not required for tenure, will be considered as service if presented by the candidate)	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
• Sitting on M.A./PhD supervisory committee		Member		
• External Examiner for M.A./PhD thesis		Examiner		
• Organizing a conference		Helping organize	Major organizer	Lead organizer of a major conference
• Evaluating grant proposals	Variable	Variable	Variable	
• Reviewing articles for academic journals, conferences, etc.—without attribution	Variable	Variable	Variable	
• Participation in professional organizations related to disciplinary expertise (i.e., Interior Design , Counseling)	Variable depending on time and responsibility	Variable depending on time and responsibility	Variable depending on time and responsibility	
• Board of directors/member of a professional society	Member	Member	Board Chair	
• Member of Program Advisory Committee	Member (once/year)	Member (twice/year)	Member (multiple meetings)	
D. Service to the Broader Community—faculty member or discipline-related context (items listed in this category, while not required for tenure, will be considered as service if presented by the candidate)	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
• Participation in MRU-sanctioned activities that foster community involvement (i.e., Calgary Corporate Challenge, United Way)	Variable depending on time and responsibility	Variable depending on time and responsibility	Variable depending on time and responsibility	Chairing an MRU-sanctioned initiative such as the United Way
• Commenting for the media in one's primary area of expertise	One to three per year	Four to five per year	Six to ten per year	Over ten per year
• Presenting to non-academic community organizations in an area related to one's discipline	Variable depending on time and responsibility	Variable depending on time and responsibility		
• Activities related to recruiting students from high schools	One to five	Six to ten	Eleven to fifteen	Over fifteen
• Judging contests related to one's area	One to five	Six to ten	Eleven to fifteen	Over fifteen
• Participation in community events or organizations that have a potential to benefit Mount Royal and are closely related to the faculty member's discipline	Variable	Variable		

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SCHOLARSHIP FOR TENURE



Submitted by Faculty of Faculty Arts Scholarship Tenure Criteria Committee:

- Shane Gannon, Sociology and Anthropology
- Peter Howie, Policy Studies
- Mark Humphries, Humanities
- Manuel Mertin, Dean
- Alain Morin, Psychology
- Scott Murray, APTC Representative
- Kathy Offet-Gartner, Counselling
- Yuhuan Wang, Languages and Cultures
- Helen Evans Warren, Interior Design
- Clifford Werier, English

Approved by Arts Faculty Council on December 10, 2010

Revised in response to APTC feedback and approved by Arts Faculty Council on April 29, 2011

Approved by General Faculties Council on May 12, 2011

Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure in the Faculty of Arts

1. Preamble

Article 10—Tenure—of the current Collective Agreement (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2012) lists “evidence of scholarship where applicable, congruent with the teaching loads and resources available at an undergraduate university” as a general criterion for tenure at Mount Royal University, based on “a clear promise of continuing intellectual and professional development” (10.2.1). The Tenure Article also states that “Tenure recommendations and decisions shall be based solely on the general criteria in this Article, the Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship and Service, and the detailed criteria recommended by General Faculties Council and approved by the Board of Governors.”

2. APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria

The *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria* give explicit direction to Faculties to develop a “faculty-and discipline-specific interpretation that includes: development of guidelines with respect to acceptable evidence and determination of standards associated with that evidence.” According to the GFC bylaws, this work will result in recommendations from faculty councils to the APTC, and eventual recommendations to the GFC.

The institutional scholarship criteria for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor specify that (where applicable) the candidate must clearly demonstrate “significant results from scholarship.” The criteria are as follows:

- the candidate has established the foundation of an appropriate program of scholarship, feasible with respect to time and resources in a Mount Royal context;
- the candidate has produced significant results within that program of scholarship;
- the candidate has communicated those results as scholarly contributions to one or more relevant fields, through dissemination in appropriate, peer-reviewed venues;
- the candidate engages in systematic reflection on scholarly practice. (14)

The definitions of scholarship in the APTC document are general and inclusive (research, creative and artistic work) and explicitly identify the categories of discovery, integration, application and the scholarship of teaching and learning. The Collective Agreement’s “Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship and Service” is also referenced in the APTC document.

The Collective Agreement also specifies that the “responsibility for maintaining a cumulative tenure dossier rests with the employee” and that the employee “shall assemble annually an updated tenure dossier containing evidence of achievements in teaching, service, and, where applicable, scholarship.” Among other things, the tenure dossier shall include a “current curriculum vitae,” “a scholarship plan, where applicable,” and “the employee’s Annual Reports” (10.4.2).

3. Principles of Scholarship Tenure Criteria in the Faculty of Arts

In accordance with the institutional criteria outlined above, candidates in the Faculty of Arts are asked to provide the TPC with evidence that they have established a program of scholarship, engaged in systematic reflection, produced significant results, and disseminated those results in appropriate peer-reviewed venues. The candidate's program of scholarship must produce significant results from scholarship during the five-year tenurable period.

Each year, the candidate's dossier and scholarship plan should present evidence that scholarly or creative work has been taking place. TPCs in the Faculty of Arts will look at the candidate's dossier holistically and evaluate the extent to which the evidence demonstrates that the candidate is fulfilling the institutional criteria outlined above. Such evidence can manifest in diverse ways, but the most important consideration for tenure-track faculty and TPCs is that the program of scholarship must include or culminate in peer-reviewed results that are disseminated in appropriate venues during the five year tenure-track process.

TPCs need to acknowledge the diversity of resources available and required to conduct scholarship across different disciplines in the Faculty of Arts.

The detailed criteria for scholarship in the Faculty of Arts must recognize the diversity of disciplines and cultures across academic units. The system for evaluating the significance of scholarship must be flexible, simple, and allow enough latitude for departmental TPCs to make adjustments that recognize disciplinary differences while ensuring that expectations across departments are equitable. The Scholarly Results Chart below provides examples of general evidence of scholarship over the tenure-track period (Levels 1 and 2) and specific peer-reviewed results (Level 3) that should ensure relative consistency across academic disciplines.

Detailed Criteria 1: The Program of Scholarship and the Systematic Reflection on Scholarly Practices

A tenure-track faculty member's Scholarship Plan is an essential part of the tenure dossier for those in the TSS stream. In the first year's dossier, the Scholarship Plan must describe the expected projects and anticipated peer-reviewed and other results over the next four years. In formulating the scholarship plan in year one, the candidate should refer to the Scholarly Results Chart at the end of this document which provides the examples of the types of scholarship that must be demonstrated over the course of the five-year probationary period at levels 1, 2, and 3.

In each subsequent year, it is expected that the candidate's Scholarship Plan will be updated, revised, and self-assessed, as "systematic reflection" is an explicit criterion. The TPC will consider whether the reflection, revision, and self-assessment demonstrate that a "foundation of an appropriate program of scholarship" is being established systematically by the candidate in each year. At the end of the five-year period, the scholarship plan as a whole must provide evidence to the TPC that the candidate has produced significant results from scholarship.

The TPC assesses results and provides constructive feedback to candidates; it also responds to the scholarship plan and self-assessment in the annual and mid-term evaluations, giving the tenure-track candidate feedback about his or her progress towards achieving the scholarly results described below.

Detailed Criteria 2: The Production of Significant Results and Dissemination in Appropriate Peer-Reviewed Venues

It is the TPC's task to evaluate the significance of the candidate's results in the context of a scholarship plan. In assessing whether the candidate's program of scholarship has produced significant results, the TPC must evaluate the peer-reviewed venues in which the candidate has chosen to disseminate findings and consider whether those venues are appropriate to the candidate's discipline. Given the diversity of the Faculty of Arts, it is impossible and indeed undesirable to lay down fixed standards for assessing the appropriateness of peer-reviewed venues that would apply to all disciplines. Such judgements must be made by the TPC in the context of the standards and best-practices which are accepted in the candidate's field or discipline.

The Scholarly Results Chart will guide the candidate and TPC in determining whether scholarship is progressing from year to year, as the candidate establishes foundational work leading to the peer-reviewed results described in Level 3.

Each discipline/academic unit is required to develop standards that will be used to determine the appropriateness of the peer-reviewed venues. These standards must be made available to the candidate and should be consulted by both the candidate and the TPC during the formulation, updating, and self-assessment of the scholarship plan, as well as in the TPC's annual evaluation, mid-term review, and final evaluation of the candidate's dossier.

Scholarly Results Chart

This chart lists the various *types* (or categories) of scholarship in which candidates in the Faculty of Arts may engage during the five-year probationary period. It is intended to be flexible, but it also provides candidates and TPCs with clear guidelines as to the types of activity that will constitute sufficient evidence of scholarship at the midterm review and at the end of the probationary period. TPCs must assess the *significance* of a candidate's scholarship holistically in accordance with the detailed criteria outlined above and on the basis of the TPC members' professional competence.

Not all types of scholarship are appropriate to every discipline. Therefore, each discipline/academic unit must consider which are applicable and which are not. Expectations must be clearly understood by candidates and TPCs while also ensuring equitability across disciplines/academic units.

Throughout the five-year probationary period, it is expected that a candidate will complete a number of examples within the various types of scholarship at all levels. The general evidence of scholarship described in Levels 1 and 2 will provide the TPC and the candidate with an indication that scholarly work is being achieved at various levels of complexity and completion over time. The appropriateness of the types of scholarship

listed in Levels 1 and 2 will vary by academic unit, but the candidate's activities in these areas should typically lead towards achieving the peer-reviewed results described in Level 3.

Where a type of scholarship straddles one or more levels on the attached chart, it is assumed that in most instances, examples of that type of scholarship would usually be evaluated at the lowest level, but that in some circumstances and for some disciplines/academic units, it might be appropriate to evaluate them at a higher level. Here the standards of the discipline/academic unit should allow candidates and TPCs to determine where a specific example of scholarship best fits.

The mid-term evaluation is particularly important, as a tenure-track faculty member needs to know at the half-way point whether or not their activities are likely to lead to significant results. Typically, by the mid-term review in year three, the candidate should be able to demonstrate the completion of:

- One or two examples from the types of scholarship at level 1, and;
- One or two examples from the types of scholarship at level 2.

In combination, these activities should demonstrate that the candidate is working towards achieving at least one of the peer-reviewed types of scholarship listed at level 3.

Normally, by the fifth year of the probationary period it will be expected that the candidate will be able to demonstrate the completion of:

- Five examples from the types of scholarship at levels 1 and 2 (no more than two of which can be from level 1), and;
- At least one example from the types of scholarship at level 3.

Tenure-track faculty members in the Faculty of Arts are hired with widely divergent experiences. In the case of an already established scholar, the results will normally build on previous work, but it is still expected that such a candidate will produce evidence of scholarship at levels 1, 2, and 3 during the tenure-track period in accordance with a defined scholarship plan as approved by the TPC.

Faculty of Arts Scholarly Results Chart				
A. Editing / Organizing	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	
	Organizing a conference panel	Editing a journal issue		
	Reviewing an article for a peer-reviewed journal or book	Editing a journal (ongoing appointment)		
	Organizing a workshop			
	Organizing official or public collections			
	Applying expertise to communities (where applicable)			
	Engagement and training of students and/or R.A. in research activities	Editing a book-length collection		
		Editing a reference work		
		Editing a peer-reviewed critical edition of a primary source		
		Service on an editorial board for a peer-reviewed journal		
Editing a peer-reviewed book/reader				
Organizing a conference				
B. Presentation	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	
	Chairing a conference panel			
	Conference poster session			
	Campus and local presentations in the candidate's discipline(s)	Keynote lecture or an invited lecture		
	Discussant in conferences	Giving a conference paper		
	A public presentation to a non-academic audience	Presenting original research at a symposium or seminar		
	Media consultant/researcher			

Faculty of Arts Scholarly Results Chart		
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Multi-media project, public exhibit, or other significant public/official application of scholarly knowledge as deemed to be relevant to the candidate's discipline		Peer-reviewed multi-media project, public exhibit, or other significant public/official application of scholarly knowledge as deemed to be relevant to the candidate's discipline
Book review in an academic journal	Published non-peer-refereed book chapter	Two (2) peer-refereed book chapters and/or works in peer-reviewed journals *
Completion of a non-published and non-presented working paper	Production of a website, related to the candidate's discipline	Primary authorship of a new peer-reviewed academic textbook
Published commentary/editorial in a peer-refereed journal		Peer-reviewed monograph or book published through a reputable literary or scholarly publisher
Published papers in non-peer-refereed journals	Production of government reports	
Reference article	Adapting an existing academic textbook for a new audience or secondary authorship of an academic textbook or monograph	
	Publishing a non-peer reviewed, academic book or monograph	
Application of scholarly knowledge (where appropriate to the discipline)		
	Creative or professional works which draw on the candidate's academic or professional expertise, as defined by the TPC	
Published translation of an article, book chapter or short literary work.		Peer-reviewed published translation of a literary or scholarly monograph or book relevant to the candidate's discipline.
* a single peer-refereed book chapter and/or work in a peer-reviewed journal may be used to satisfy a level 2 requirement		

D. Recognition / Distinction			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
	Fellowship or Award (local/regional)	Fellowship or Award (national/international)	
	Successful Internal research grant		
	Application for major external funding, award, or grant	Successful major external grant or fellowship	



Faculty of Arts

CRITERIA AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Jointly prepared by the members of the Arts
Faculty Council Ad Hoc Committee on
Scholarship and the Arts Faculty Council Ad Hoc
Committee on Teaching and Service

Approved by Arts Faculty Council:
March 25, 2011

Revised in accordance with Appointments
Promotion Tenure Committee feedback and
approved by Arts Faculty Council:
April 29, 2011

Approved by General Faculties Council:
May 12, 2011

Table of Contents

Page

Preamble	1
Application of the Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor	1
Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor: TS and TSS Work Patterns	2
Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor: Years Served as Chair of a Department	2
Categories for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor	2
1. Promotion Based on Excellence and Leadership in Teaching	4
1.1 Evidence of excellence and leadership in teaching	5
1.2 Recognition by peers at the national and international level	5
2. Promotion Based on Excellence in Scholarship	5
3. Requirements for Substantial Contribution in Service for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor	6
3.1 Evidence of substantial contribution in service	7
3.2 Consistency of service over the course of a career	7

Criteria and Recommendations for Promotion to Full Professor

Preamble

Arts Faculty Council believes that attainment of the rank of Full Professor should be based on sustained achievement of excellence over the course of a career. Faculty members who wish to achieve the rank of Full Professor are responsible for collecting, maintaining, and presenting evidence to support their applications. “Candidates for promotion to Full Professor must satisfy all of the Associate Professor criteria for teaching, service and, where applicable, scholarship, plus the Full Professor criteria in teaching or scholarship, with substantial contribution to service.”¹

The Collective Agreement² states that “At Mount Royal University, promotion to the rank of Professor is a formal recognition of sustained excellence as a faculty member in an instructionally-focused undergraduate university” (Article 11.3.1). As described in Article 11.3.2, such sustained excellence will include four types of evidence:

- i. evidence of proficient and scholarly teaching;
- ii. evidence of scholarship, congruent with teaching loads and resources available for scholarship at an undergraduate university, where applicable;
- iii. evidence of significant contributions in service; and
- iv. evidence that the duties have been carried out in a responsible and professional manner.

Whether applying for promotion to the rank of Full Professor on the basis of “excellence and leadership in teaching” (11.3.2.1) or on the basis of “excellence in scholarship” (11.3.2.2), candidates must maintain “proficient and scholarly teaching,” carry out their duties in “a responsible and professional manner,” and, as discussed in Article 11.3.2.3, maintain a “substantial contribution to service.” Guidelines on service, scholarship, and “proficient and scholarly teaching” for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Faculty of Arts and in SACL were approved by Arts Faculty Council on October 22, 2010; December 10, 2010; and January 28, 2011 respectively.

Application of the Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

Arts Faculty Council agrees with the “APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria” that “Tenure and promotion committees are expected to exercise their judgement in the evaluation of a candidate’s application, based on [the] criteria and the evidence presented” by the candidate” (page 5 of 14); and that, as stated in Appendix A of the July 1, 2010 to July 1, 2012 Collective Agreement, “The implementation of a ranking system will address the fact that faculty tenured prior to July 1, 2009 worked under different terms and conditions of

¹ Faculty of Health and Community Studies Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Evidence, January 21, 2011. page 2.

² References to the Collective Agreement refer to the July 1, 2010/June 30,2012 (2010 Version). Article numbers and content may change in subsequent versions of the document.

employment” (91). In addition, Arts Faculty Council agrees that the criteria are designed to be applied holistically. Specifically,

- They are flexible with respect to a potential shifting of focus over time (e.g. they permit service-heavy versus scholarship-heavy years);
- They are not based solely on the candidate’s most recent contribution(s), but on performance and contributions over a career. (page 5 of 14)

Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor: TS and TSS Work Patterns

Arts Faculty Council recognizes that work patterns may vary over the course of a career, and such variation will need to be taken into account when individuals apply for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. A faculty member may apply for the rank of Full Professor from either the TS or the TSS work pattern, and a faculty member’s chosen work pattern does not necessarily determine the basis for promotion to Full Professor. A faculty member on TS, for example, could, if applicable, be promoted to Full Professor on the basis of scholarship; and a faculty member on TSS could be promoted to Full Professor on the basis of excellence and leadership in teaching. It is up to the faculty member to decide on the category under which he or she will apply and to present the necessary evidence to support that application.

Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor: Years Served as Chair of a Department

Arts Faculty Council recognizes the essential place of the chair in the governance of Mount Royal University. Faculty members who have successfully completed their term as chair will ordinarily have shown leadership in teaching through their responsibilities regarding curriculum development, the mentoring of faculty, curriculum review, peer evaluations, and other teaching-related duties. In addition, a chair will likely have exhibited a substantial contribution to service, and often will have shown leadership in encouraging the scholarship of those in his or her discipline. It is up to candidates to show how the duties they have performed as chair apply to any one of the categories of “substantial contribution in service,” “excellence and leadership in teaching,” or “excellence in scholarship.”

Categories for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

1. Promotion Based on Excellence and Leadership in Teaching

In accord with the “APTC Recommendations,” promotion to the rank of Full Professor will “include all the criteria for ‘proficient and scholarly teaching’” as laid out in the Arts Faculty Council guidelines on promotion to Associate Professor, plus the following:

- the candidate demonstrates a sustained and significant impact on teaching beyond the individual’s classes
- the candidate influences professional dialogue about teaching beyond the academic unit
- the candidate provides leadership for major educational initiatives in or beyond the university
- the candidate champions the ongoing enhancement of undergraduate education
- the candidate’s contribution to teaching and learning is recognized by peers at the national or international level.

1.1 Evidence of excellence and leadership in teaching

Since promotion to the rank of Full Professor is based on the work of an entire career, candidates are likely to present a wide range of evidence. It is up to the candidate to make the case for why examples of evidence are applicable, and it is up to departmental TPCs to assess the evidence presented and make recommendations to UTPC based on the applicability of the evidence to the discipline and department. Some examples of evidence include the following:

- examples of evidence already described in the AFC guidelines on promotion to the rank of Associate Professor
- leadership in curriculum development within the department or the university as a whole
- recognition as an accomplished mentor of new and continuing faculty
- major teaching awards and commendations
- leadership in program development, revision, and review
- national reputation as an expert on teaching practice
- keynote addresses and invited lectures on teaching practice

1.2 Recognition by peers at the national and international level

Applicants for the rank of Full Professor based on excellence and leadership in teaching may be on the TS work pattern. It is important to recognize, therefore, that candidates can be promoted on the basis of excellence and leadership in teaching without *published* scholarship, recognizing that “proficient and scholarly teaching” implies commitment to scholarship even if no work is published in peer reviewed venues. Although the Collective Agreement speaks of the need for candidates to present the names of “six external referees” (11.4.1), Arts Faculty Council recommends that departmental TPCs be open to non-traditional external referees such as colleagues in professional areas related to the candidate’s discipline (interior designers, psychologists in private practice, technical writers, public archivists, etc.), community leaders, and leaders of academic or professional societies.

2. Promotion Based on Excellence in Scholarship

In accord with the APTC Recommendations approved by GFC, “promotion to the rank of Full Professor will include all the criteria for ‘significant results from scholarship,’ plus the following:

- the candidate’s scholarship is recognized by peers at the national or international level;
- the candidate’s scholarship has had a demonstrable impact on the work of other scholars, professionals, or within appropriate academic or professional communities.”

The Arts Faculty Council gives the benchmarks for scholarship in its “System and Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure” from which “significant results” and excellence are

projected. Excellence is understood to mean exceeding the customary levels of proficiency required for promotion to the level of Associate Professor, as described in the “System and Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure” document.

The Collective Agreement and GFC give more direction on how promotion should be considered by TPCs and UPTC.

- Although external referees are the default commentators on an application for promotion, departmental colleagues “may provide” written feedback on the suitability of the applicant for promotion.
- Departmental colleagues may comment on the same reputational criteria as the external reviewers, plus they may assess
 - the service record;
 - the quality of teaching at least at the level required for tenure at MRU.
 - evidence that the duties have been carried out in a responsible and professional manner.

Although promotion on the basis of scholarship (and service) is not specifically on the basis of teaching, GFC stipulates that “the candidate must also demonstrate a continued high quality of teaching” which entails at least maintaining the criteria for teaching required for the granting of tenure/promotion to Associate Professor (proficient and scholarly teaching).” In those cases where tenure was granted at appointment and hence the tenure criteria of another institution were recognized, the applicant for promotion is still expected to meet and maintain the same criteria for teaching. For all candidates, promotion also “implies continued and ongoing development as a teacher.”

3. Requirements for Substantial Contribution in Service for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

Whether candidates apply for promotion to the rank of Full Professor based on excellence and leadership in teaching or based on excellence in scholarship, they are expected to have established a substantial record of sustained service. Article 11.3.2.3 of the Collective Agreement and the “APTC Recommendations” define such a contribution as follows:

The candidate demonstrates leadership in at least one, or significant contributions in at least two, or the following:

- service to the academic unit and faculty
- service to the university
- service to academic fields of study
- service to the broader community, in a faculty member- or discipline-related capacity.

3.1 Evidence of substantial contribution in service

Since promotion to the rank of Full Professor is based on the work of an entire career, candidates are likely to present a wide range of evidence. It is up to the candidate to make the case for why examples of evidence are applicable, and it is up to departmental TPCs to assess the evidence presented and make recommendations to UTPC based on the applicability of the evidence to the discipline and department. Evidence will include the following:

- examples of service already described under the AFC guidelines for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor
- several examples of service at levels three and four in the “Examples of Service in the Faculty of Arts and SACL” chart approved by Arts Faculty Council on October 22, 2010. (as amended on April 29, 2011).

3.2 Consistency of service over the course of a career

Not all years will be as service-heavy as others, but an applicant for the rank of Full Professor should be able to show a sustained commitment to service over the course of a career. This means that, except for terms in which the faculty member was on leave from the institution, the faculty member will be able to demonstrate examples of service at levels one and/or two in the “Examples of Service in the Faculty of Arts and SACL” chart approved by Arts Faculty Council on October 22, 2010 (as amended on April 29, 2011). In most years, this basic level of service will be augmented by service at levels three and four.