



MOUNT ROYAL UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Business, Communication
Studies and Aviation

Research and Scholarship Criteria, Evidence, and Standards for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty of **Business, Communication Studies and Aviation** (BCSA)
at Mount Royal University

1. OVERVIEW

“Scholarship encompasses research, creative and artistic work. All of these forms of scholarship are valued equally at MRU” (Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria, ITP, 2024, p. 9). Scholarship occurs through “discovery, integration, teaching and learning, or application of knowledge and is disseminated through peer-reviewed processes” and encompasses “research and creative and artistic work.” (Collective Agreement, 2024, p. 8). For faculty on the Teaching, Service and Scholarship (TSS) work pattern, one criterion for tenure is “evidence of scholarship, where applicable, congruent with the teaching loads and resources available for scholarship at an undergraduate university” (Collective Agreement, 2024, Article 10.2.1.ii). The purpose of this document is to provide examples of evidence that meet the Research & Scholarship criteria within the Faculty of Business, Communication Studies and Aviation.

1.1. Related documents

All University employees involved in tenure and/or promotion processes should be familiar with:

- 1) The relevant articles in the Collective Agreement between The Mount Royal Faculty Association and The Board of Governors of Mount Royal University (hence referred to as the Collective Agreement);
- 2) The Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria (ITP); and
- 3) The Tenure, Permanency and Promotion Handbook.

1.2 Choosing a category for evidence

The Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria notes that some examples of evidence occur in more than one of Teaching, Scholarship and Service because these are overlapping and interconnected activities. It observes that there is flexibility in categorizing such forms of evidence and states that, “each piece of evidence may only be used to support one of Teaching or Scholarship or Service” (ITP Criteria, 2024, p. 8). Therefore, a candidate may have to decide how best to report an item—as Teaching or Scholarship or Service. There may be instances where a candidate produces teaching materials (teaching criterion) and later studies their impact via a research project (research criterion). In such a case, the candidate must clearly differentiate the creation of these materials from their dissemination/impact.

1.3 Assessing evidence holistically

BCSA recognizes that candidates for tenure and promotion are assessed based on their overall record of research, scholarship, and/or creative achievement. Such records are often demonstrated based on a combination of presentations, scholarly contributions/publications, grants and recognitions.

1.4 Collaborative scholarship and authorship

A criterion for tenure at MRU is that candidates have produced significant results within their program of research/scholarship. Thus, there is the expectation that the candidate will have taken a lead role on some scholarly projects. That said, sole-, co-, and multi-authored publications are recognized. For co- and multi-authored publications, the candidate should indicate the process of collaboration and/or the extent or nature of their contribution. Authorship should be clearly listed on the CV and Annual Report. Candidates may consult the CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) framework for guidance about how to share an accurate and detailed description of their contributions to a project/publication. Candidates may consider explaining their

contributions in the document “Reflective Assessment of Scholarship” (Form 105).

1.5 Disciplinary standards

“Members of a Tenure Committee may make judgements on the appropriateness of a venue and assess the significance of a candidate’s scholarship, in the context of the standards and best practices of the discipline, when they have the disciplinary expertise required. Because appropriate venues vary with the discipline and the purpose of the scholarship, a candidate may need to justify why a venue is appropriate” (Tenure, Permanency, and Promotion Handbook, 2024, v 3.0, p.20).

Faculty are responsible for recognizing and avoiding any opportunities presented by vanity presses or predatory publishers (or conferences or awards), as these may harm their academic reputation and impact progress toward tenure and promotion. Faculty should seek guidance if they are uncertain about the legitimacy of a publisher or opportunity.

1.6 Peer review

The ITP Criteria (2024) states that candidates for Associate Professor must have communicated significant results produced within their program of scholarship through dissemination in appropriate, peer-reviewed venues. Thus, peer review is embedded in our tenure and promotion system. BCSA recognizes that, while peer review is a ubiquitous component of research quality assurance and assessment, the practice of peer review varies from project to project and between disciplines.

Some empirical research projects may undergo peer review before data collection. Pre-registration involves publicly publishing plans prior to accessing or collecting data. This facilitates transparency and is a key practice in open science. The same project may be peer-reviewed (often via multiple rounds of revisions) at the time of publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Alternatively, an in-depth, evidence-based reported publication in recognized, credible media would have been reviewed by fact-checkers and an editorial team. Peer review in the context of creative scholarship might involve a panel of academics, artists, and community members evaluating public engagement with a creative output. Finally, a peer-reviewed textbook or edited volume might have received extensive feedback from two peer experts in the field as well as an editor.

1.7 Impact

BCSA recognizes that “outputs other than research articles will grow in importance in assessing research effectiveness in the future, but the peer-reviewed research paper will remain a central research output that informs research assessment.” (San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment, DORA, 2024). Aligned with DORA, BCSA is committed to assessing research quality and impact holistically using a range of quantitative and qualitative indicators. Examples include but are not limited to bibliometrics, policy influence, societal and community-based contributions. Candidates are encouraged to explain how they have applied their scholarly knowledge to public and/or private sector organizations or communities - including Indigenous communities in Canada - to achieve tangible benefits.

BCSA recognizes the complex interplay among quantity, quality, and impact. For example, it might take longer to publish a 4-study manuscript in a top-tier journal than to publish a single study in a low ranked journal. Similarly, high-impact community-based contributions may involve lengthy timelines. Candidates are encouraged to articulate the quality and impact of their scholarly outputs in the document “Reflective Assessment of

Scholarship" (Form 105) or in a document outlining how they have had a demonstrable impact on the work of other scholars, professionals, or within appropriate academic or professional communities (when applying for Full Professor).

1.8 Open scholarship

BCSA encourages faculty members to disseminate work widely through open access venues when possible, enhancing societal visibility and accessibility. BCSA encourages reproducibility and FAIR principles in research (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability). Open scholarship intersects with equity by increasing accessibility to research, particularly for those without access to institutional journal subscriptions.

1.9 Transparency and equity

BCSA is committed to having transparent criteria and engaging in equity-focused evaluative processes that support inclusivity. When evaluating Indigenous Research, please see "Guidance for Implementing Appendix D: Applying Indigenous Perspectives to Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria." Committees are also encouraged to consult SSHRC's Guidelines for the Merit Review of Indigenous Research (2024) and the First Nations Principles of OCAP (2025).

1.10 MRU's Tenure and Promotion Criteria

The Institution's research and scholarship criteria can be found within the Tenure, Permanency, and Promotion Handbook (2024, v 3.0) and the Collective Agreement (2024, Article 11.2.2.2).

Level 1: Assistant Professor

The faculty member on the Teaching-Scholarship-Service work pattern clearly demonstrates adequate preparation for scholarship, including the extent to which duties have been carried out in a responsible and professional manner.

The criterion is:

- 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 MRU context.

Level 2: Associate Professor

The candidate clearly demonstrates significant results from scholarship, including the extent to which duties have been carried out in a responsible and professional manner.

The criteria are that the candidate:

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

Level 3: Professor

The candidate is an exemplary scholar.

The criteria include all the criteria for significant results from scholarship, including the extent to which duties have been carried out in a responsible and professional manner, plus the following:

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

2. THE TABLE

The Table that follows provides **examples** of evidence that tenure and promotion candidates can use to explain how they have met the research and scholarship criteria in the Faculty of Business, Communication Studies and Aviation. These examples are not exhaustive.

2.1 Tenurable Period

In a typical tenurable timeline (5 years), Tenure Committees will be evaluating candidates at the Assistant Professor level during years 1 and 2.

The mid-term evaluation (taking place in Fall of Year 4) is particularly important, as a tenurable faculty member needs to know at the halfway point whether or not their scholarly activities are likely to lead to significant results (Associate Professor criteria).

Normally, **at the mid-term evaluation**, the candidate should be able to demonstrate the completion of:

- 1-2 examples of scholarship at the Assistant Professor Level, and;
- 1-2 examples of scholarship at the Associate Professor Level, including at least 1 peer-reviewed publication (Section B).

Normally, by the 5th year of the probationary period, it will be expected that the candidate will be able to demonstrate the completion of significant results within their program of scholarship, including at least 2 scholarly publications disseminated in appropriate, peer-reviewed venues (Associate Professor Level; Section B).

For tenurable candidates who have been given credit toward the probationary period, or candidates applying for Full Professor after being hired with tenure, there is the expectation that candidates will be producing new significant results within their program of scholarship after coming to Mount Royal University.

2.2 Applying for Full Professor

While the typical tenure process at MRU lasts anywhere between 3 and 6 years, promotion to Full Professor can happen at any point after receiving tenure and prior to retirement. Therefore, the number of scholarly outputs and the nature of a scholar's national/international impact can vary considerably. Please consider items included at the Full Professor Level as a non-exhaustive list of possible examples of evidence.

Table: Examples of Research and Scholarly Evidence

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	FULL PROFESSOR
A. Presentations		
Presentation or panel participation at MRU or locally.	Keynote speaker or an invited speaker at a peer-reviewed conference.	Keynote speaker at a peer-reviewed conference (national and international).
Invited speaker/research talk at MRU.	Invited speaker at another university.	Invited speaker at another university (national and international).
Poster presentation at a conference.		
Discussant at a conference.	Presenting original research at a peer-reviewed conference.	
A public presentation to a non-academic audience.	Presenting original research at a symposium or seminar.	
B. Publications and Scholarly Contributions		
Peer-reviewed creative knowledge mobilization resulting in public-facing application of scholarly knowledge, as relevant to the candidate's discipline. Examples may include public exhibits, creative works, performances, and similar acclaimed formats.	Peer-reviewed creative knowledge mobilization resulting in multiple public-facing applications of scholarly knowledge, as relevant to the candidate's discipline. Examples may include public exhibits, creative works, performances, and similar acclaimed formats.	Peer-reviewed, nationally or internationally recognized creative knowledge mobilization resulting in public-facing application of scholarly knowledge, as relevant to the candidate's discipline. Examples may include public exhibits, creative works, performances, and similar acclaimed formats.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	FULL PROFESSOR
Journalism/public scholarship (e.g., opinion-editorial piece) published in recognized media that is acknowledged within the field for professionalism and credibility.	An in-depth, evidence-based reported piece published in recognized media that is acknowledged within the field for professionalism and credibility.	Leading an in-depth, evidence-based reported series (or documentary) published in nationally or internationally recognized media that is acknowledged within the field for professionalism and credibility.
Journalism and/or creative outputs (podcasts, documentaries, promotional material such as ads, short films, exhibits) that are acknowledged within the field for professionalism and credibility.	Leadership role on journalism and/or creative outputs (podcasts, documentaries, promotional material such as ads, short films, exhibits) that have been peer-reviewed, published in recognized venues that are acknowledged within the field for professionalism and credibility.	Leadership role on journalism and/or creative outputs (podcasts, documentaries, promotional material such as ads, short films, exhibits) that have been peer-reviewed, published in nationally or internationally recognized venues that are acknowledged within the field for professionalism and credibility.
Book review in an academic journal.	Peer-reviewed book chapter in an edited volume or textbook.	Peer-reviewed book chapter and/or work in peer-reviewed journal.
	Edited a peer-reviewed book, critical edition of a primary source, and/or a peer-reviewed special issue of a journal.	
Published paper in peer-reviewed conference proceedings.	Published paper in peer-reviewed journal.	Published paper in peer-reviewed journal.
Completion of a paper that is under review.		

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	FULL PROFESSOR
	Adapting an existing, peer-reviewed academic textbook for a new audience or new edition; or secondary authorship of an academic textbook or monograph.	Primary authorship of new peer-reviewed academic textbook.
Production of a digital or online resource or tool that is publicly accessible.		
Peer-reviewed monograph or book published through a reputable literary or scholarly publisher.	Peer-reviewed monograph or book published through a reputable literary or scholarly publisher.	Peer-reviewed monograph or book published through a reputable literary or scholarly publisher.
Published commentary/editorial in a peer-reviewed journal.		
Government or industry report.	Published government or industry report that was invited based on a peer-review or competitive selection process.	Published government or industry report that was invited based on a peer-review or competitive selection process and has had demonstrated national/international impact.
Publication of case studies in recognized venues.		
Creative or professional works which draw on the candidate's academic or scholarly expertise.		
Design for a commissioned or built project that is research or scholarship informed.	Designed project that is built or implemented, and is accessible for review.	Designed project that is competitively selected or peer-reviewed and built or implemented, that is accessible for further formal review.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	FULL PROFESSOR
	Creative or designed project that is conceptual or theoretical in nature, that has been published or displayed and available for review.	Creative or designed project that is conceptual or theoretical in nature, which has been published or displayed after being competitively selected or peer-reviewed, and accessible for further formal review.
C. Grants		
Successful internal grant or research/scholarship-related funding opportunity.	Successful major external grant(s), design commission(s), or fellowship(s) at national or international levels.	Successful major external grant(s), design commission(s), or fellowship(s) at national or international levels.
Application for major external funding, award, design project, or grant.		
D. Recognitions / Distinctions		
Research/scholarship fellowship or award (local/regional).	Research/scholarship fellowship or award (national).	Research/scholarship fellowship or award (national or international).
Creative or design prize or award (local/regional).	Creative or design prize or award (national).	Creative or design prize or award (national pinnacle in the discipline, or international).

References

First Nations Information Governance Centre (2025). *The First Nations Principles of OCAP*.

<https://fnigc.ca/ocap-training/>

Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria (2024). "Appendix D: Applying Indigenous Perspectives to the Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria." p.42-45.

https://www.mtroyal.ca/AboutMountRoyal/OfficesGovernance/_pdfs/gfc_itpc.pdf

Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria (2024).

https://www.mtroyal.ca/AboutMountRoyal/OfficesGovernance/_pdfs/gfc_itpc.pdf

MRFA Collective Agreement July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2024 (2022).

<https://mrfa.net/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Collective-Agreement-2020-2024.pdf>

Research and Scholarship Criteria, Evidence and Standards for Tenure and Promotion; For the Faculty of ARTS at Mount Royal University (2022).

https://www.mtroyal.ca/AboutMountRoyal/OfficesGovernance/_pdfs/gfc_arts_scholarship.pdf

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (2024). *Guidelines for Merit Review of Indigenous Research*.

https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/merit_review-evaluation_du_merite/guidelines_research-lignes_directrices_recherche-eng.aspx

Tenure, Permanency, and Promotion Handbook Version 3.0 (2024).

<https://www.mtroyal.ca/AboutMountRoyal/OfficesGovernance/OfficeofProvostandVice-PresidentAcademic/Tenure-Permanency-and-Promotion-Handbook-v3.0.pdf>

San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA; 2024). <https://sfdora.org/>

Wilkinson, M., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. *et al*. The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Sci Data* 3, 160018 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>.

<https://www.nature.com/articles/sdata201618>