

Tenure and Promotion Criteria for Faculty in the Library

Preamble

Faculty in the Library are engaged in a combination of teaching, service, and scholarly activities. This document provides guidance in terms of criteria, evidence and standards related to those activities for Library faculty applying for tenure and promotion, and for those evaluating the applications.¹ This document will be reviewed every two years, or as needed, to ensure congruence with current institutional guidelines, processes and collective agreements.

The teaching, service, and scholarship work of faculty in the Library is defined institutionally through the Mount Royal Faculty *Collective Agreement*, and the *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria*² developed by the Appointments, Promotions and Tenure Committee (APTC), recommended by the General Faculties Council (GFC), and approved by the Board of Governors in 2010. Criteria, examples, and standards specific to work in the Library have been developed within those definitions. The processes for appointment, tenure, and promotion are overseen by the University Tenure and Promotion Committee (UTPC).

It is the responsibility of the candidate applying for tenure and/or promotion to provide evidence that he or she is performing at the level of the next rank prior to application for promotion, and to articulate how his or her evidence addresses the criteria for each rank and category of the relevant work pattern. It is the responsibility of the Library Tenure and Promotion Committee to ensure that faculty members at the Assistant level are regularly informed of Library expectations and of their progress in meeting these standards.

Promotions in rank and the granting of tenure are based on merit. In preparing and evaluating materials for promotion and tenure, faculty members will observe the following conditions:

- All duties and activities presented as evidence by the candidate shall be carried out in a responsible, professional, and ethical manner.
- Candidates may make a case for including evidence of service, scholarship, or teaching from their employment at other institutions. Such evidence would be evaluated using MRU criteria.
- All categories appropriate to a candidate's work pattern (teaching, service, scholarship) must be represented in his/her dossier in applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In applying for promotion to Full Professor, the candidate will provide documents to support their promotion on the basis of either

¹ This document has been prepared by the Library Roles and Responsibilities Sub-Committee of the Library Faculty Council with input from librarians. The work has been informed by documents developed in other MRU Faculty Councils.

² This document is based on the Collective Agreement between the Mount Royal Faculty Association and the Board of Governors of Mount Royal University, July 1, 2010-June 30, 2012, and the APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria, passed by the Board in 2010
<http://www.mtroyal.ca/wcm/groups/public/documents/pdf/gfc_aptc_recommandations.pdf>.

Teaching or Scholarship, and significant Service. It is recognized that the proportions of a candidate's workload in the two or three areas will naturally vary from year to year and across a career.

- 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 inter-connected, 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" (p. 6). It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence for how activities are included in particular categories.
- Examples of evidence presented below are not intended to be restrictive or limiting but are provided to guide faculty in preparing and evaluating tenure and promotion documents. Candidates may present forms of evidence specific to their roles and responsibilities that are not explicitly named in the following document but which align with the institutional criteria and assist the candidate in making the case for promotion.
- Documents presented by candidates will be reviewed according to the quality of the work produced, not according to the number of artifacts presented.
- For promotion to Full Professor, as stated in the *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria*, a degree of flexibility is provided in that a candidate's application is judged according to:
 1. one of:
 - excellence and leadership in teaching
 - 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.

It is the responsibility of the candidate applying for promotion to Full Professor to decide whether to seek promotion based on teaching or on scholarship, in addition to service requirements provide the appropriate evidence, regardless of work pattern.

Teaching

The Library 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)*

Evidence for fulfillment of the criteria will be provided through student, chair, and peer evaluations, teaching artifacts such as course outlines, assignments, and collection plans, and the faculty member's Reflective Assessment of Teaching Document. Given the varied nature of classroom teaching activities of librarians, which may include workshops, distance modules, or credit courses, the Library will not use specific standards for SEI scores. Rather they will be one form of evidence used in evaluating the development and improvement of teaching.

These criteria, evidence, and standards apply to Library faculty teaching credit courses, teaching information literacy within credit courses, and participating in other activities that fall within the Mount Royal Faculty Association definition of teaching, such as one-to-one research instruction, and collection development.

The Reflective Assessment of Teaching Document

For purposes of evaluation for tenure and promotion, all faculty members in the Library will provide a “reflective assessment of teaching.” In this document, faculty members will evaluate and assess their development as teachers and articulate 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 proficient and scholarly teaching required of Associate Professors. The expectation is that this will be a 2-7 page document. The reflective assessments of teaching activities may include such things as:

- a list of teaching methods (including those that apply to research instruction and collection development) and reflection on their effectiveness
- a summary of the faculty member’s contribution to the development or revision of new classes, courses, collections, reference, or instruction activities
- a description of any professional development which the faculty member feels was particularly useful in informing his or her development in teaching activities
- a description of the faculty member’s contribution to the overall teaching activities in the Library
- reflection on the faculty member’s teaching, teaching evaluations, support of students in one-to-one consultations

Assistant Professor (for mid-probation review):

The candidate clearly demonstrates competent teaching.

Standards

Collection funds are spent with thoughtful expertise in support of institutional and program priorities; collection projects are successfully completed.

There is evidence of consistent improvement or development of teaching practice in response to SEIs, peer and chair observations, and personal reflections.

Criteria and Examples

The following table provides examples of evidence, and is not meant to be either prescriptive or comprehensive. The evidence for these criteria will vary by faculty member, depending on her or his individual responsibilities and opportunities. The criteria are those presented in the *MRFA Collective Agreement*, based on the *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria*.

Table 1. Criteria and Examples of Evidence for Teaching - Assistant Professor

Criteria	Examples of Evidence
<p>The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of relevant subject area(s)</p> <p>(In the library context, this includes knowledge of librarianship, instruction, and liaison subject areas)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courses, classes, workshops developed and delivered • Materials selected for the collection to support learning, teaching, and scholarship • Work on Library instruction and collection initiatives • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document • Participation in the ISP program • Attendance at courses, workshops, and conferences aimed at improving instruction activities, and demonstrated evidence of implementation of what was learned • Attendance at courses, workshops, and conferences aimed at maintaining currency in the discipline or enhancing knowledge.
<p>The candidate organizes and presents course content clearly</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Course outlines / Subject area, course websites • Representative teaching materials including research guides, modules, websites, podcasts, videos, etc • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document
<p>The candidate communicates high expectations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student comments and scores on SEIs (see below) • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Course outlines and week by week syllabi • Representative assignments • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document
<p>The candidate fosters interaction between students and faculty</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of research instruction and referrals to other services as appropriate • Where appropriate, formal teaching of students outside the classroom setting, including such activities as individual consultations, group consultations, drop-in workshops and

	<p>presentations, involving students in research projects, supporting directed readings, theses, or projects, practicum students, experiential learning, or field schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization and participation in extra-curricular events focused on students • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document
The candidate encourages active learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative assignments and activities designed to encourage active learning • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document
The candidate develops collaboration and cooperation among students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative assignments and activities designed to encourage collaboration • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document
The candidate emphasizes time on task	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative assignments and activities designed to encourage time on task • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document
The candidate gives prompt and meaningful feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prompt return of student work and final grades • Provision of feedback on student research strategies in formal and informal teaching settings • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document
The candidate respects diverse talents and ways of learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignments and activities which speak to diverse student talents • Demonstrated respect for students' varied learning styles and a willingness to provide reasonable support to students with learning difficulties • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Reflective Assessment of Teaching document
The candidate performs course-related administrative tasks effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student comments and scores on SEIs • Peer and chair evaluations of teaching • Collection resources are acquired within budget guidelines • Collection analyses conducted and reported to internal and external stakeholders, government, and accrediting bodies, including Quality Council • Participation in program reviews and proposals for accreditation (e.g. Quality Council submissions)

Associate Professor

The candidate clearly demonstrates proficient and scholarly teaching.

Standards

There is evidence of consistent improvement or development of teaching practice in response to SEIs, peer and chair observations, and reflections.

The criteria include all of the criteria for “competent teaching”, plus the following:

Table 2. Criteria and Examples of Evidence for Teaching - Associate Professor

Criteria	Examples of Evidence
The candidate demonstrates currency in his or her discipline(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regular updating of teaching materials• Development of course and program integrated instruction and materials• Development of courses and curriculum• Analyses of collections for internal and external purposes• Collection development plans• Student comments and scores on SEIs• Peer and chair evaluations of teaching• Reflective Assessment of Teaching document• Professional Development activities to improve professional and/or liaison area subject knowledge
The candidate engages in teaching and learning professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participation in courses, workshops, and conferences aimed at improving instruction activities• Participation in courses, workshops, and conferences aimed at maintaining currency in the discipline or enhancing knowledge.• Reflective Assessment of Teaching document• Examples of activities, assignments, collections processes, etc, developed in response to professional development activities
The candidate utilizes pedagogical best practices for the discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporation of appropriate pedagogical practices from Information Literacy and liaison disciplines in teaching activities• Student comments and scores on SEIs• Peer and chair evaluations of teaching
The candidate aligns teaching philosophy, intended outcomes, learning activities and assessment strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reflective Assessment of Teaching document• Statement of teaching philosophy• Representative learning activities, assignments, rubrics, and documents illustrating collection activities• Student comments and scores on SEIs• Peer and chair evaluations of teaching
The candidate engages in systematic reflection on teaching practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Articulation of teaching philosophy in annual report• Reflective Assessment of Teaching document• Examples of activities, assignments, collections processes, etc, developed in response to evaluations and reflections• Participation in activities such as Triads, faculty learning communities, discussion groups, etc. to develop teaching skills and knowledge

Full Professor

The candidate is an exemplary teacher and clearly demonstrates leadership in teaching and learning.

Standards

There is evidence of consistent improvement or development of teaching practice in response to SEIs, peer and chair observations, and reflections.

There is evidence of sustained, significant leadership in teaching activities.

The criteria include all of the criteria for “proficient and scholarly teaching”, as well as the following:

Table 3. Criteria and Evidence for Teaching – Full Professor

Criteria	Examples of Evidence
The candidate demonstrates a sustained and significant impact on teaching beyond the individual’s own classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use of teaching materials by others both internal and external to the Library and Mount Royal University• Use of collections development materials by others both internal and external to the Library and Mount Royal University• Contribution to the professional development of other faculty through workshops, learning communities, mentoring, etc.
The candidate influences professional dialogue about teaching beyond the academic unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advocacy for information literacy• Participation in institutional curricular initiatives, or department/program level curriculum work and reviews outside the library
The candidate provides leadership for major educational initiatives within or beyond the university	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Leadership of institutional initiatives to improve teaching/learning activities• Leadership of local provincial or national initiatives on teaching• Leadership of local, provincial, or national collections initiatives, including consortial work, digitization projects, etc
The candidate champions the ongoing enhancement of undergraduate education	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development of new approaches to teaching activities• Development of new approaches to collection development• Participation in institutional, discipline, or regional initiatives that advocate enhancement of undergraduate education
The candidate’s contribution to teaching and learning is recognized by peers at the national or international level	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• National or international nominations and awards related to teaching activities• Invitations to participate in national or international initiatives, conferences, panels, or committees• Invitations to speak or contribute material related to teaching activities• Widespread adoption of materials developed by the faculty member in support of teaching activities• Contributions to teaching materials repositories

Service

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

Service constitutes activities that support the academic processes at the departmental, Faculty and institutional level. Service may provide opportunities to bring relevant faculty skills, disciplinary expertise, perspectives, and leadership to the community. Service demonstrates commitment to the institution and supports Mount Royal's commitment to outside communities.

The quality of the faculty member's contributions is more significant than the number of service activities undertaken. Evaluation of service activities will be based on evidence of effectiveness in service role(s), accomplishments, and where appropriate, evaluations.

Evidence for the fulfillment of criteria will be provided through the faculty member's annual reports, evaluations, and other documentation the member wishes to provide.

Assistant Professor (for mid probation review)

The faculty member clearly demonstrates collegial participation.

The criteria are:

Table 4. Categories and Examples of Evidence for Service - Assistant Professor

Categories	Examples of Evidence - Collegial participation
Participates in the governance and activities of the academic unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participates in department meetings and provides input into policy and other department decisions• Volunteers for work on subcommittees, task forces, and other aspects of governance in the Library• Participates in Library events and/or acts as a Library representative at University events
Participates in the academic governance the faculty council level	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participates in Faculty Council meetings and provides input on policy and other FC-level decisions. Serves on subcommittees as appropriate

Associate Professor

Criteria

For tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, candidates clearly demonstrate contribution in service. The criteria include all of the criteria for “collegial participation,” plus significant contribution in at least **ONE** of the four categories:

Table 5. Categories and Examples of Evidence for Service - Associate Professor

Categories	Examples of Evidence
Service to academic unit and faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Leads internal Library committees or initiatives• Serves as Coordinator of a Library service area or function for one term• Serves as Library Chair for one term• Collaborates with external stakeholders to further Library initiatives
Service to university	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides significant service on MRFA or institution-wide committees
Service to academic fields of study	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participates actively in conference planning committees, advisory boards, external reviews• Chairs MRFA or Institution-wide committees
Service to the broader community, in a faculty member -of discipline-related capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Uses Library and/or academic expertise to contribute significantly to the wider community

**Full Professor
Criteria**

For promotion to Full Professor, candidates clearly demonstrate substantial contribution in service. The criteria include all of the criteria for “collegial participation,” plus significant contributions in at least **TWO** categories **OR** leadership in at least **ONE** category.

‘Significant contribution’ and ‘leadership’ are indicative of service beyond fulfilling a role or being a member of a group. It is the candidate’s responsibility to demonstrate how her or his efforts made a significant contribution to the academic unit, faculty, institution, discipline or community. Leadership will be demonstrated by successful projects, initiatives, or other work beyond the normal expectations of the role.

Table 6. Categories and Examples of Evidence for Service - Full Professor

Categories	Examples of Evidence	
	Significant Contribution	Leadership
Service to academic unit and faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads internal Library committees or initiatives Serves as Coordinator of a Library service area or function for one term Serves as Library Chair for one term Collaborates with external stakeholders to further Library initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads a successful, sustained, significant initiative within the Library that contributes to the Library, the University, the profession/discipline, or the community
Service to university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides significant service on MRFA or institution-wide committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads significant university initiatives Undertakes a significant service role with students or student organizations
Service to academic fields of study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participates actively in conference planning committees, advisory boards, external reviews Chairs MRFA or Institution-wide committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads national or international Library or discipline-specific organizations through positions on executive boards or major committees Contribution to librarianship and/or academic disciplines is recognized at a national or international level through awards, invitations to speak, requests for secondments or extensive consultancy
Service to the broader community, in a faculty member -of discipline-related capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses Library and/or academic expertise to contribute significantly to the wider community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads successful initiatives advocating for libraries and related issues Provides extensive professional service or consultations to the broader community in librarianship or liaison areas

Scholarship

The Library Faculty Council bases its criteria for scholarship on the *APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria* (May 3, 2010), and endorses its description of scholarship.

The document states:

Scholarship encompasses research, creative and artistic work. All of these forms of scholarship are valued equally at Mount Royal. This reflects the diversity of the academic pursuits of faculty, and of their contributions to knowledge. Scholarship may be based within or across disciplines.

Scholarship includes:

- *discovery—investigative inquiry that builds a distinctive body of knowledge;*
- *integration—analytical inquiry that develops new insights and understanding as a result of bringing together and synthesizing knowledge and information from a wide variety of sources;*
- *application—inquiry that advances knowledge through engagement with the application of knowledge and expert practice;*
- *scholarship of teaching and learning—using disciplinary methods and research practices to study and improve student learning, and to disseminate the resulting knowledge through scholarly, peer-reviewed channels.*

The defining aspect of scholarship is that it is disseminated through appropriate channels and reviewed by peers, through publication or presentation in credible academic, professional or creative forums.

Scholarship in the Library reflects the diversity of expertise and interests among librarians; areas of focus may include librarianship, teaching and learning, academic disciplines, and administrative and service work. Dissemination venues will vary with the subject and purpose of the scholarship and it is incumbent upon the candidate to provide a rationale for each choice of venue including evidence of the venue's suitability and credibility.

Scholarship may be individual or collaborative; in the case of the latter, it is incumbent upon the candidate to describe the nature of the collaboration and the extent of her or his contribution.

The MRFA Collective Agreement July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2012 (p.42) states that evidence of scholarship should be congruent with teaching loads and resources available for scholarship at an undergraduate university. The requirements for significant results and dissemination of scholarship for tenure reflect the context at Mount Royal University, and focus on quality, not quantity of effort.

Scholarly works that result from graduate studies undertaken while in the employment of MRU may be used as evidence of scholarship.

Evidence for scholarship activities will be provided through examples of work, the Reflective Assessment of Scholarship Document, annual reports, and other documentation relevant to the application such as awards, correspondence, etc.

The Reflective Assessment of Scholarship Document

For purposes of evaluation for tenure and promotion, all faculty members in the Library who are in the Teaching-Service-Scholarship work pattern will provide a “Reflective Assessment of Scholarship” document as part of their application for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates applying for promotion to Full Professor on the basis of Scholarship will also provide a “Reflective Assessment of Scholarship” document. In this document, faculty members will evaluate and assess their development as scholars and articulate their strategies, methodologies and goals, what worked, what didn’t work, and what needs to be developed or changed. The reflective assessments of scholarly activities may include such things as

- a list of activities, methods and strategies, and why they worked or did not work
- a reflection on the candidate’s progress in meeting the goals of her/his scholarship plan
- a description of any professional development which the faculty member feels was particularly useful in promoting his or her development in scholarly activities
- a description of the faculty member’s contribution to the overall scholarly activities in the Library
- reflection on the faculty member’s support of the scholarly work of others
- reflection on the impact of the faculty member’s scholarship on the scholarly, creative, or professional work of others
- reflection on the faculty member’s growth as a scholar

Assistant Professor (for mid probation review)

The faculty member on the Teaching-Scholarship-Service work pattern clearly demonstrates adequate preparation for scholarship.

Standard:

The faculty member will conduct the required activities to establish the foundation of an appropriate program of scholarship.

For more detail see the [Guidelines for the Evaluation of Scholarship Dissemination for Faculty in the Library](#), below.

Table 7. Criterion and Examples of Evidence for Scholarship – Assistant Professor

Criterion	Examples of Evidence
The candidate has established, or is working to establish, the foundation of an appropriate program of scholarship, feasible with respect to time and resources in a Mount Royal context	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work towards fulfillment of a scholarship plan• Successful HREB clearance for research activities• Successful application for research funding• Determination of appropriate methodologies, populations, dissemination venues, collaborators, etc.• Data collection and analysis• Working drafts, models, etc. of creative work• Reflective Assessment of Scholarship document• Dissemination activities (See Guidelines below)

Associate Professor

The faculty member on the Teaching-Scholarship-Service work pattern clearly demonstrates significant results from scholarship.

Standards:

- It is expected that the scholarly work of faculty members on the **Teaching-Scholarship-Service work pattern** would include dissemination through peer-reviewed journal article(s), **OR** publication(s), presentation(s) or performance(s) in venues of equivalent rigorous review
- The faculty member would also be expected to disseminate the results of their scholarship within the institution and/or local academic, creative, or professional communities.

For more detail see the [Guidelines for the Evaluation of Scholarship Dissemination for Faculty in the Library](#), below.

Table 8. Criteria and Examples of Evidence for Scholarship – Associate Professor

Criteria	Examples of Evidence
The candidate has established the foundation of an appropriate program of scholarship, feasible with respect to time and resources in a Mount Royal context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline of scholarly work conducted including notes on methods used, populations studied, literature reviews conducted, etc. • In keeping with MRU’s commitment to undergraduate research, the candidate may describe the inclusion of undergraduate students in her or his scholarship projects where appropriate and feasible • Reflective Assessment of Scholarship document • Other scholarly contributions including reviews of materials for publication or presentation
The candidate has produced significant results within that program of scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline of results the progress of her/ his scholarship related to his/ her plan, including work in progress, disseminated work, and, if the candidate intends to continue on the TSS pattern, plans for future scholarly work • Results of peer reviews for HREB, funding, and dissemination purposes • Reflective Assessment of Scholarship document • Requests to provide peer reviews for the work of others for funding or dissemination purposes • Evidence of impact of work, including requests for collaboration, use of results in practice
The candidate has communicated those results as scholarly contributions to one or more relevant fields, through dissemination in appropriate, peer-reviewed venues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflective Assessment of Scholarship document, including: • List of works and their dissemination venues with rationale for why each was chosen • Narrative description of the body of work to indicate that it meets the standard required. • Indications of impact of the dissemination including evaluations of presentations, citations, use of materials elsewhere • Artifacts of disseminated work, including print or electronic publications, models of creative works, presentations, multimedia productions, programs, etc.

Full Professor

The candidate is an exemplary scholar. The criteria 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 candidate must also demonstrate a continued high quality of teaching. This entails continuing to meet the criteria for proficient and scholarly teaching. Note that satisfying these criteria implies continued and ongoing development as a teacher.

Standards:

- It is expected that the work of candidates applying for promotion on the basis of Scholarship would include significant, sustained dissemination of scholarly work through peer-reviewed journal articles, or publications, presentations or performances in venues of equivalent rigorous review
- The candidate would also be expected to disseminate the results of their scholarship within the institution and/or local academic, creative, or professional communities.
- The candidate must provide evidence that his or her scholarship has had an impact on the scholarship and/or practice of others
- For more detail see the [Guidelines for the Evaluation of Scholarship Dissemination for Faculty in the Library](#), below.

Table 9. Criteria and Examples of Evidence for Scholarship –Full Professor

Criteria	Examples of evidence
The candidate’s scholarship is recognized by peers at the national or international level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rich, sustained record of scholarship disseminated in significant peer-reviewed venues • Awards and nominations, other external recognition of scholarly work • Invitations to speak, or contribute to national or international scholarly publications and initiatives
The candidate’s scholarship has had a demonstrable impact on the work of other scholars, professionals, or within appropriate academic or professional communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflective Assessment of Scholarship document • Citations, evidence of incorporation of the work in the development of policies and procedures, evidence of contribution of the work to professional or academic discourse. • Use of scholarship to further the academic, scholarly or professional work of others, through adoption of methods, integration of results or methods in practice or scholarship, or influence of creative work • Mentoring colleagues at MRU and elsewhere • Serving on external granting or ethics boards, • Serving as an editor or curator for the work of others • Sustained, significant work in peer review of the work of others • Sustained mentoring and involvement of undergraduate students in scholarship projects where it is appropriate and feasible to do so

Guidelines for the Evaluation of Scholarship Dissemination for Faculty in the Library

Table 9 lists representative evidence of scholarship activities in which faculty members in the Library may engage. It is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive, but rather intended to illustrate the relative effort demanded by various activities and therefore their relative weighting in evaluating scholarship. Faculty members may disseminate scholarship in ways neither included nor foreseen here, but may use the table as a guide to help place forms of scholarship within a larger context. It is intended to be flexible, but it also provides faculty members and TPCs with clear guidelines as to the types of activity that will constitute sufficient evidence of scholarship for promotion and tenure. If a faculty member considers that their work on a particular type of scholarship required more effort than the table indicates, he or she should provide evidence to that effect in presenting the work for review. TPCs must assess the *significance* of a candidate's scholarship holistically in accordance with the detailed criteria outlined above.

It is expected that prior to applying for promotion to Associate Professor/Tenure, faculty members 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 faculty member with an indication that scholarly work is being achieved at various levels of complexity and completion over time. The faculty member's activities in these areas should typically lead towards achieving the peer-reviewed results described in Level 3.

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 faculty member is working towards achieving at least one of the peer-reviewed types of scholarship listed at Level 3.

When a faculty member applies for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, she or he will be able to demonstrate the completion of:

- Four examples from the types of scholarship at Levels 1 and 2 (at least two at Level 2), which may include more than one instance of an example, but should show some variety, and;
- At least one example from the types of scholarship at Level 3.

Faculty members applying for promotion to Full Professor on the basis of Scholarship would be expected to have a significant proportion of their work at Level 3.

Table 10. Involvement in the Dissemination of Scholarship by Faculty in the Library

Forms of Scholarship		
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of a non-published and non-presented working paper • Articles, editorials or reviews in news or trade publications, or newsletters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published papers in non-peer-refereed publications • Creation of resources (e.g. bibliographies, webpages, etc.) related to the candidates discipline intended to inform the national or international community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-media project, public exhibit, original creative/artistic work, computer program, or other significant public/official application of scholarly knowledge in a peer-reviewed or juried venue • Peer-reviewed article in a relevant credible journal; chapter in an edited book or reference source; monograph
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of a book, website or other information resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editing a journal issue • Reviewing an article for a peer-reviewed journal or book • Serving as a member of a jury panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edit a journal (ongoing appointment), a book-length collection, or critical edition of a primary source • Serve on editorial board for a journal, reference source or other peer reviewed information source • Invited to curate official or public collections
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenting a poster at a conference • Campus and local presentations and workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing a workshop/conference panel • Presenting a paper or participating in a panel at a conference or seminar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing a conference; selecting papers for a conference • Invited or keynote speaker at a conference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement and training of students and/or Research Assistants in research activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving students in the dissemination of scholarship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring students in the creation and/or dissemination of their own scholarship
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert commentator • Media consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applying results of scholarship to communities, organizations, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published report of scholarship conducted on behalf of a community, industry, government department or organization