

# Criteria, Evidence and Standards for Tenure and Promotion

For the Faculty of  
Science and Technology  
at Mount Royal University

---

# Table of Contents

---

Criteria and Standards Tables .....	3
Teaching Criteria and Standards for Hiring, Midterm Review, Tenure and Promotion .....	3
Scholarship Criteria and Standards for Hiring, Midterm Review, Tenure and Promotion ...	5
Service Criteria and Standards for Hiring, Midterm Review, Tenure and Promotion .....	6
Guiding Principles for Criteria and Standards for Assessing Acceptable Evidence in Teaching ..	8
Evaluation of Teaching.....	8
Teaching Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor on the basis of Teaching Excellence.....	10
Guiding Principles for Criteria and Standards for Assessing Acceptable Evidence in Scholarship .....	11
Evaluation of Scholarship.....	12
Scholarship Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor .....	12
Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor on the basis of Scholarship .	13
Guiding Principles for Criteria and Standards for Assessing Acceptable Evidence in Service ...	14
Evaluation of Service .....	14
Service Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor.....	15
Service Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor .....	15
Categories of Service.....	16
Appendix A - Teaching.....	17
Table A1. Examples of Evidence for Competent Teaching – Level I.....	17
Table A2. Examples of Evidence for Scholarly Teaching – Level II .....	19
Table A3. Examples of Evidence for Excellence and Leadership in Teaching – Level III	20
Appendix B - Scholarship.....	21
Table B1 – B3. Examples of Evidence for Scholarly Outcomes .....	21
Appendix C – Scholarship Challenges .....	23
Appendix D - Service.....	24
Table D1. Examples of Evidence .....	24

# Criteria and Standards Tables

---

## Teaching Criteria and Standards for Hiring, Midterm Review, Tenure and Promotion

Activities	Criteria for hiring	Criteria for Assistant Professor Midterm Review	Criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor	Criteria for promotion to Full Professor based on Teaching
<b>A. To align with Mount Royal University's focus on undergraduate education, provide the following types of evidence:</b>				
1. student evaluations of instruction	Recommended	Expected	Expected	Expected
2. peer evaluations of teaching	Recommended	Expected	Expected	Expected
<b>B. Normally provide at least one piece of satisfactory evidence for each of the following criteria:</b>				
1. demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the relevant subject area[s]		Expected	Expected	Expected
2. organizes and presents course content clearly		Expected	Expected	Expected
3. communicates high expectations		Expected	Expected	Expected
4. fosters interaction between students and faculty		Expected	Expected	Expected
5. encourages active learning		Expected	Expected	Expected
6. develops collaboration and cooperation among students		Expected	Expected	Expected
7. emphasizes time on task		Expected	Expected	Expected
8. gives prompt and meaningful feedback		Expected	Expected	Expected
9. respects diverse talents and ways of learning		Expected	Expected	Expected
10. performs course-related administrative tasks efficiently		Expected	Expected	Expected

<b>C. Normally provide at least two pieces of satisfactory evidence for each of the following criteria:</b>				
1. demonstrates currency in his/her discipline[s]			Expected	Expected
2. engages in teaching and learning professional development			Expected	Expected
3. utilizes pedagogical best practices for the discipline			Expected	Expected
4. aligns teaching philosophy, intended outcomes, learning activities and assessment strategies			Expected	Expected
5. engages in systematic reflection on teaching practices			Expected	Expected
<b>D. Demonstrate a sustained commitment to Excellence and Leadership in Teaching and Learning by providing evidence for each of the following criteria:*</b>				
1. demonstrates a sustained and significant impact on teaching beyond his/her classes				Expected
2. influences professional dialogue about teaching beyond the academic unit				Expected
3. provides leadership for major educational initiatives in or beyond the university				Expected
4. champions the ongoing enhancement of undergraduate education				Expected
5. contribution to teaching and learning is recognized by peers at the national or international level				Expected

\* Recommended output rates of high quality evidence for Category D are:

D1. One piece of evidence per year

D2. One piece of evidence per year

D3. One piece of evidence per year

D4. One piece of evidence per three years

D5. Three pieces of evidences per five years

## Scholarship Criteria and Standards for Hiring, Midterm Review, Tenure and Promotion

Activities	Criteria for hiring	Criteria for Assistant Professor Midterm Review	Criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor	Criteria for promotion to Full Professor based on Scholarship
<b>A. Demonstrate the establishment of a program of scholarship that is feasible with respect to time and resources in the MRU context by normally providing evidence for each of the following criteria:</b>				
1. Formulation of a detailed, well structured and achievable Scholarship Plan.	Recommended	Expected	Expected	Expected
2. Successful funding application if necessary.			Expected	Expected
<b>B. Produce significant outcomes as established in “The Principles of and Recommendations for Assessing Faculty Engaged in Research and Scholarly Activity” (see Appendix C) and normally provide at least two pieces of satisfactory evidence for each of the following criteria:</b>				
1. Scholarly outcomes accepted for dissemination/publication through peer reviewed venues.			Expected	Expected
2. Presentation of outcomes at conferences and/or appropriate venues as recognized by departmental TPC.				Expected
<b>C. Produce additional Scholarly Activities as recognized by the “Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship and Service in the MRU Collective Agreement”, and provide at least one piece of evidence for the following criteria:</b>				
1. Additional scholarly activities			Expected	Expected
<b>D. Demonstrate external recognition and distinction by providing at least one piece of evidence for each of the following criteria:</b>				
1. Sustained record of successful scholarship program as determined by the departmental TPC within the MRU context. The candidate must exceed the normal expectations required at the Associate Professor level.				Expected
2. Complete at least <i>one</i> of the following activities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Invited and acted as a speaker, panel leader, moderator, and/or discussant at national or international meetings or conferences in area of study.</li> <li>b. Acted as editorial board member of journal(s) or other means of dissemination.</li> <li>c. Acted as an external peer-reviewer of any of the outcomes means of dissemination (e.g. journal, map, software, etc.)</li> <li>d. Acted as a legal expert in its field of study if applicable.</li> </ol>				Expected
3. Respected figure in their field. Typically justified by, but not limited to, citation rates, impact factors, external references, patents, awards, grants, keynote presentations or other types of recognition.				Expected

## Service Criteria and Standards for Hiring, Midterm Review, Tenure and Promotion

Activities	Criteria for hiring	Criteria for Assistant Professor Midterm Review	Criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor	Criteria for promotion to Full Professor
<b>A. Provide satisfactory evidence for each of the following criteria related to participation in service activities</b>				
1. Attend department and discipline meetings	Recommended	Expected	Expected	Expected
2. Attend department and faculty-level colloquia	Recommended	Recommended	Recommended	Recommended
3. Serving on departmental committees	Recommended	Expected	Expected	Expected
4. Attend meetings of Science and Technology Faculty Council		Expected	Expected	Expected
5. Participating in department hiring by attending candidates' presentations and, if possible, helping with hiring-related activities such as tours of MRU, airport pick up, etc.		Expected	Expected	Expected
6. Attending department meetings associated with tenure, promotion, and the granting of leaves				Expected
7. Unpaid class substitutions/guest lectures		Recommended	Recommended	Recommended
8. Course coordination of two or more faculty members		Recommended	Recommended	Recommended
9. Repeatedly and continually participate in other forms of service, as described in Appendix D	Expected	Expected	Expected	Expected
<b>B. Provide satisfactory evidence for each of the following criteria related to contribution in service activities</b>				
1. Share knowledge with other faculty on an informal basis		Recommended	Recommended	Expected
2. Mentoring of sessional, tenure track (and tenured) colleagues				Expected
3. Peer evaluations of colleagues				Expected
4. Contribute significantly* in at least one of the following areas, as described in Appendix D: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. service to the academic unit and faculty</li> <li>b. service to the university</li> <li>c. service to academic fields of study</li> <li>d. service to the broader community, in a faculty member- or discipline-related capacity</li> </ul>		Recommended	Expected	Expected

<b>C. Provide satisfactory evidence for each of the following criteria related to significant contribution or leadership in service activities</b>				
1. Demonstrates leadership <sup>†</sup> in at least one, or significant contributions in at least two, of the following areas, as described in Appendix D: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. service to the academic unit and faculty</li> <li>b. service to the university</li> <li>c. service to academic fields of study</li> <li>d. service to the broader community, in a faculty member- or discipline-related capacity</li> </ul>			Recommended	Expected

\* In referencing activities in Appendix D, Generally, multiple and sustained contributions at level 2 would constitute Significant Contributions. Level 3 service activities are deemed to be more significant, and therefore a smaller number of Level 3 activities would also constitute Significant Contributions.

<sup>†</sup> In Appendix 1, leadership activities are listed at level 4. Some level 3 activities may also demonstrate leadership, although perhaps with a lesser commitment of time or efforts. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate why a service activity demonstrates Leadership. If the candidate chooses to show how they have made Significant Contributions in two areas, they must demonstrate the scope and nature of those contributions.

# Guiding Principles: Criteria and Standards for Assessing Acceptable Evidence in Teaching

---

The APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria have requested input from all of the University Faculty Councils. This report addresses how teaching should be evaluated in the Faculty of Science and Technology. This report should be taken as expanding on the content of its parent document: APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria.

The following guidelines provide a general overview of the sorts of evidence of teaching quality that arise in our faculty and relate these types of evidence to the criteria for evaluating teaching outlined in the APTC recommendation. These recommendations should not be taken as exhaustive or definitive, but rather, should serve as a guide to assist both applicants and reviewers in generating and evaluating evidence. Teaching standards have not been distinguished between the two work patterns (TS and TSS) except for promotion to Full Professor on the basis of Excellence and Leadership in Teaching.

Especially at the higher expectation levels, activities appear in two or three of the teaching, service and scholarship documents. This is intentional. For example, course co-ordination can count as both leadership in teaching and as departmental service. In cases where one activity is counted in multiple areas, the candidate must be transparent about this dual use and explain what aspects of the activity meet the requirement(s) of each area.

Academic units' Tenure and Promotion Committees are best able to evaluate teaching, given their knowledge of the context in which the applicant is working, which includes the candidate's workload and discipline specific factors. The teaching context may include such factors as the number of students in the class, the frequency and degree of technological updates required for a course, the rate of change in the details of the course content, whether or not a delivery of the course is the first time through, and the variety of courses the applicant teaches. Individual departments are in a position to evaluate the appropriateness of evidence according to the standards for each category of rank.

The evidence used by a candidate may include but is not limited to the types of evidence listed in this document. The onus on establishing the validity of any piece of evidence for one of the criteria for competent, scholarly, or leadership in teaching lies with the applicant.

## **Evaluation of Teaching**

In accordance with the APTC recommendations, three levels of teaching which might be evaluated during a faculty member's career at Mount Royal University have been identified. Note that the levels identified by APTC build on each other. For example, the criteria for Tenure

and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor include both Competent Teaching and Scholarly Teaching:

1. for Lecturer and Assistant Professor: Competent Teaching
2. for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor: Scholarly Teaching
3. for promotion to the rank of Full Professor using Excellence and Leadership in Teaching as the applicant's chosen criterion under point 1 of section 5 of the APTC  
Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion criteria: Excellence and Leadership in Teaching

The criteria given in the APTC document are given in the left hand columns of the tables in Appendix A, while forms of evidence are given in the right hand columns. Evidence used for any criterion may include but are not limited to those listed here. That is, the intent of this list is to provide guidelines for faculty and committees rather than to provide an exhaustive checklist of required forms of evidence. In addition, the candidate may report on other activities and make a case for why those additional activities count as evidence for the relevant criteria. Due to the diversity among FST departments, it is expected that this list will continue to be refined and grow as MRU continues to change. However, the following list of evidence should be mandatory for all tenure and promotion candidates:

1. Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEI) including both quantitative and qualitative data
2. Peer and Chair Evaluations

**Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)** records should be read for patterns, both positive and negative. Low numerical scores seen in one area of a single evaluation should be of less concern than consistent low scores in the same area among a variety of records. Likewise, student comments that are repeated by several students among several records should bear more weight than a comment made only once.

Student response rates should normally be 50% or higher. Patterns of high or low response rates should be addressed. However, the scores and comments from evaluations with low student numbers or results from less than half the enrolled students should be treated with caution. Results from different courses should be included in the candidate's tenure or promotion dossier.

The faculty acknowledges that SEI scores are imperfect measures and must not be the exclusive standard for teaching performance. Trends and patterns in SEI scores and comments, both positive and negative, should be considered more than a definite number. Individual departments are in a position to understand influences on SEI scores, which may include deployment of new teaching initiatives that could affect student perceptions, and therefore have discretion in modifying minimum standards expected for each candidate.

**Peer Evaluations** should be formative and reflect the range of the candidate's teaching. When possible, different courses at different levels of instruction (1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000) should be considered. The candidate should spread the peer and chair evaluations throughout the semester and try to maximize the number of different people who serve as evaluators. Trends and patterns in peer evaluations should be given more weight than individual reports.

Successful candidates for tenure or promotion will meet or exceed departmental norms. In cases where the department is recommending the candidate for tenure or promotion it is normally expected that reviews from the Chair, Dean, and departmental TPC will document significant improvement or be consistently positive.

### **Teaching Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor on the basis of Teaching Excellence**

Faculty members who wish to be promoted to the rank of Professor on the basis of excellence and leadership in teaching and learning must exceed the customary levels of proficiency expected for the level of Associate Professor. The candidate must demonstrate excellence and leadership in teaching and learning.

Excellence should be developed and maintained throughout an individual's career. Sustained evidence for competent as well as proficient and scholarly teaching is expected for all individuals who successfully advance to Professor on the basis of excellence and leadership in teaching and learning. In addition, evidence of excellence should be provided for all of the associated categories listed in the table in Appendix A.

The table in Appendix A outlines the standard for normal frequency of evidence of excellence in the years leading up to a candidate's application for full promotion. At the request of a candidate departmental TPCs may recognize an interruption or variation from these normal frequencies as a result of changes in work pattern, leaves, service as departmental chair or other appropriate events. It is the duty of the candidate to apprise the TPC of any such events and provide supporting information. The decision of the TPC regarding a request for an atypical frequency of evidence must be clearly communicated to the candidate in writing. When preparing their recommendation, the TPC should also consider the significance and relative weighting of each piece of the candidate's evidence.

# Guiding Principles: Criteria and Standards for Assessing Acceptable Evidence in Scholarship

---

The present document is in accordance with the *Addendum on Teaching, Scholarship and Service* in the MRU Collective Agreement, which states the following:

Scholarship may include, but is not restricted to, the following activities:

- Research
- Scholarly and artistic work
- Professional work
- Publishing
- Presenting at, participating in and coordinating conferences
- Collaborating with, and reviewing and editing the work of, peers
- Developing primary and secondary texts and learning materials
- Providing scholarly opportunities for students
- Scholarship of teaching and learning
- Dissemination of effective teaching and learning resources and strategies
- Creation and extension of resources or programs to support teaching
- Sharing teaching expertise externally
- Significant leadership in teaching excellence beyond the institution

The following guidelines provide a general overview of the type of acceptable evidence of scholarship activities in the Faculty of Science and Technology, as well as how that evidence should be evaluated.

These guidelines have been created in accordance to the “Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee of the General Faculty Council (APTC of GFC) Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria” and the “Principles of and Recommendations for Assessing Faculty Engaged in Research and Scholarly Activity (RSA)”, approved unanimously by the Science and Technology Faculty Council on March 5, 2010. Examples of acceptable outcomes for research and scholarship activities are stated in Appendix B.

The criteria and standards provided in Appendix B are designed with the objective of consistency and equitability across the disciplines/academic units of the Faculty. Given the diversity of disciplines in the Faculty of Science and Technology, it is expected that not all types of scholarship are appropriate to each discipline. It is the responsibility of the candidates to justify

how their peer-reviewed outcomes are applicable to their profession. It is also incumbent upon the candidate to explain and provide evidence on how they satisfy the criteria and standards for tenure and promotion in the Faculty of Science and Technology. In the event that the criteria are not met, the candidate is required to explain why their circumstances are atypical.

The TPC will assess the significance of a candidate's scholarship as a whole in accordance to the criteria and on the basis of the TPC members' professional integrity and competence.

Especially at the higher expectation levels, activities appear in two or three of the teaching, service and scholarship documents. This is intentional. In cases where one activity is counted in multiple areas, the candidate must be transparent about this dual use and explain what aspects of the activity meet the requirement(s) of each area.

## Evaluation of Scholarship

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."

## Scholarship Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

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.

For tenure-track faculty members in the TSS stream a Scholarship Plan is an essential component of their tenure dossier. 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 Faculty of Science and Technology Principles & Recommendations for Assessing Faculty Engaged in RSA which provides examples of the types of scholarship that must be demonstrated.

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 will assess results and provide constructive feedback to candidates. It also will respond 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 acceptable scholarly results.

The TPC will 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. The peer-reviewed venues a candidate proposes to use must be outlined in the candidate's Scholarship Plan so that the TPC can assess and provide annual feedback on the appropriateness of the venues.

### **Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor on the basis of 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."

# Guiding Principles: Criteria and Standards for Assessing Acceptable Evidence in Service

---

## Evaluation of Service

The APTC Recommendations on Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria have requested input from all of the University Faculty Councils. This section addresses how service should be evaluated in the Faculty of Science and Technology.

Although many existing service activities have been collected and ranked, the quantification of service has been deliberately omitted, due to its dynamic and qualitative nature. These recommendations should not be taken as exhaustive or definitive, but rather, should serve as a guide on service efforts. Service standards have not been distinguished between the two work patterns (TS and TSS).

Especially at the higher expectation levels, activities appear in two or three of the teaching, service and scholarship documents. This is intentional. For example, course co-ordination can count as both leadership in teaching and as departmental service. In cases where one activity is counted in multiple areas, the candidate must be transparent about this dual use and explain what aspects of the activity meet the requirement(s) of each area.

It is our belief that academic units' tenure and promotion committees are best able to evaluate service, given their knowledge of faculty service opportunities, a candidate's workload and discipline specific factors. For every faculty member, their service must be evaluated within the context of the department's workload

Evidence of service is normally limited to a list of items in a candidate's annual reports, with brief descriptions of the roles, responsibilities, and outcomes. Candidates are encouraged to follow institutional tenure and promotion submission instructions regarding the inclusion of any additional documentation.

The APTC recommendation states:

*The faculty member clearly demonstrates collegial participation. The criteria are:*

- 1. the candidate participates in the governance and activities of the academic unit*
- 2. the candidate participates in academic governance at the faculty council level*

In Appendix D, many examples of Participation activities are listed. It is essential that a candidate repeatedly and continually demonstrate participation in service activities as listed in section "A" of the table (Service to the Academic Unit and Faculty).

## Service Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

The APTC recommendation states:

*The candidate clearly demonstrates contribution in service. The criteria include 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*

Appendix D lists many examples of Contribution activities for service (Level 2). It also lists activities that are considered Significant Contributions (Level 3). It is essential that a candidate be able to demonstrate that they contributed significantly to their academic unit, faculty, university, field of study or broader community. Generally, multiple and sustained contributions at level 2 would constitute Significant Contributions. Level 3 service activities are deemed to be more significant, and therefore a smaller number of Level 3 activities would also constitute Significant Contributions.

## Service Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

The APTC recommendation states:

*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*

In Appendix D, leadership activities are listed at level 4. Some level 3 activities may also demonstrate leadership, although perhaps with a lesser commitment of time or efforts. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate how a service activity demonstrates Leadership.

If the candidate chooses to show how they have made Significant Contributions in two areas, they must demonstrate the scope and nature of those contributions.

## Categories of Service

According to the APTC recommendation candidates and TPCs should be aware of the difference between participation, contribution and leadership. Many service activities defy clear classification, since not all similarly titled activities require the same level of preparation or commitment. It is always the responsibility of the candidate to justify the claimed level of service and to provide evidence that they have attained the standard set forth in the collective agreement and the APTC criteria.

All service activities have been included together in Appendix D for completeness. However, it should be noted that some service activities are limited to tenured faculty.

Level of Service	Description
Level 1 Participation	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 / Faculty Council/ General Faculties Council and contributing to discussion.
Level 2 Contribution	Collegial contribution which requires significant preparation and contributes to a deliverable. 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. Examples: being an active member of a department committee, serving as a member of an S&T FC, MRFA, or university-wide committee, evaluating tenure-track or part-time colleagues, mentoring one's colleagues as required.
Level 3 Significant Contribution or Leadership	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: Chair/Secretary of an MRFA committee, Chair of Department Committee, conference organizer, student mentorship, member of a major GFC committee.
Level 4 Leadership	Leadership, 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. Examples include Chair of APPC, Chair of GFC, Lead negotiator for the MRFA. 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. Given that many of these positions require victory in an election, service at level 4 should not be a pre-requisite for tenure or promotion to full professor.

# Appendix A - Teaching

**Table A1. Examples of Evidence for Competent Teaching – Level I**

Criteria	Examples of Evidence
demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of the relevant subject area[s]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational qualifications or certifications appropriate to the courses assigned</li> <li>• Course outlines reflect appropriate breadth and depth of material for that instructional level</li> <li>• The instructor uses discipline-specific techniques in class to help students understand the material</li> <li>• Field trips to relevant sites appropriate to course curriculum</li> <li>• SEI comments largely support (or do not contradict) that the instructor has satisfactory knowledge of the relevant subject areas</li> <li>• Peer evaluations support that the instructor has satisfactory knowledge of the discipline</li> </ul>
organizes and presents course content clearly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course outline and class materials state clear, relevant learning outcomes</li> <li>• Course outlines conform to departmental expectations</li> <li>• Material is delivered in a manner outlined in the course outline</li> <li>• Assignments reflect “best practices” of the discipline or otherwise are innovative and appropriate</li> <li>• Assessment tools are appropriate to instructional techniques</li> <li>• Peer evaluations comment on good organization and clarity of instruction.</li> <li>• SEI comments largely support (or do not contradict) that students are satisfied with instructor organization and clarity</li> </ul>
communicates high expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor marks in such a way that student performance required for grade levels is clear.</li> <li>• Course outlines contain detailed expectations for student performance</li> <li>• Rubrics developed and shared with students</li> <li>• Students are provided with examples of different qualities of work (<i>e.g.</i> examples of poor / satisfactory / excellent assignments)</li> <li>• SEI comments are congruent with (or do not contradict) the instructor’s articulated standards</li> </ul>
fosters interaction between students and faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course outlines indicate office hours or other suitable opportunities for student contact</li> <li>• Acknowledgement by student groups / student societies</li> <li>• Evidence in SEIs show appropriate contact (<i>e.g.</i> comments about rapid email responses)</li> <li>• Teaching philosophy acknowledges the importance of student / faculty interaction</li> <li>• Peer evaluations comment on positive student / faculty interaction (<i>e.g.</i> notes regarding respectful and clear answers to student queries)</li> <li>• SEI comments are largely congruent with (or do not contradict) the instructor’s involvement with students</li> </ul>
encourages active learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course outline(s) refer to cases and / or clickers in class</li> <li>• Documented use of software / simulators that allows students to practice course material</li> <li>• Use of debates or group activities to stimulate deeper learning (<i>e.g.</i> referred to in the mark breakdown)</li> <li>• Develops tutorial and / or laboratory activities that engage students in the discipline (<i>e.g.</i> documentation of new development)</li> <li>• SEI comments are largely congruent with (or do not contradict) the instructor’s use of active learning techniques</li> </ul>

Criteria – Continued	Examples of Evidence for Competent Teaching – Continued
develops collaboration and cooperation among students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulation of a strategy for creating and assessing group work (<i>e.g.</i> course outline describes group work and assessment)</li> <li>• Instructor provides and monitors an environment for collaboration and cooperation outside of class (<i>e.g.</i> discussion board; blog with comment region)</li> <li>• SEI comments are congruent with (or do not contradict) the instructor’s efforts to develop collaboration and cooperation among students</li> </ul>
emphasizes time on task	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The instructor’s BlackBoard site contains learning opportunities that students may pursue at their own pace</li> <li>• Course outlines contain statements regarding appropriate time investment on the curriculum</li> <li>• Course outlines contain detailed chapter / page information for students to prepare for class time</li> <li>• Some assignments are constructed to allow sufficient time and direction for revisions</li> <li>• Course outlines or permission sheets indicate field trips appropriate to student learning</li> </ul>
gives prompt and meaningful feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course outlines contain details regarding to assignment expectations / grade scale</li> <li>• Detailed rubrics are used to assess student performance</li> <li>• SEI comments are largely congruent with (or do not contradict) the instructor’s provision of timely and meaningful feedback.</li> </ul>
Respects diverse talents and ways of learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course outlines provide links and suggestions for a variety of learning tools</li> <li>• The teaching philosophy acknowledges the diversity of student learning preferences and provides details about how these may be met</li> <li>• The instructor uses a variety of materials in class or asynchronously (<i>e.g.</i> through BlackBoard) for students to engage with the curriculum</li> <li>• The instructor accommodates students with exceptional learning circumstances (<i>e.g.</i> works with Accessibility Services when required)</li> <li>• SEI comments are largely congruent with (or do not contradict) that the instructor uses a variety of instructional methods or provides different forms of materials</li> </ul>
performs course-related administrative tasks efficiently	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair and / or coordinator evaluations reflect the instructor’s involvement with the oversight and delivery of courses</li> <li>• Course materials (<i>e.g.</i> laboratory manuals) are revised and kept up-to-date</li> <li>• Schedules meetings between instructors of multi-section courses to maintain consistency between sections (<i>e.g.</i> as documented with meeting minutes)</li> <li>• Updates and publishes, or disseminates online, major teaching materials (<i>e.g.</i> lab manuals, booklets of original worksheets)</li> </ul>

**Table A2. Examples of Evidence for Scholarly Teaching – Level II**

Criteria	Examples of Evidence
demonstrates currency in his/her discipline[s]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The instructor has memberships in professional organizations consistent with the curriculum taught</li> <li>• Scholarly work that reinforces currency (<i>e.g.</i> publications)</li> <li>• Participation in conferences (discipline-specific and / or related to modern teaching practices)</li> <li>• Curriculum is revised to accommodate new teaching practices or discipline information / practices</li> <li>• Laboratory or tutorial materials reflect recent best practices / skills in the discipline</li> </ul>
engages in teaching and learning professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum and course development documents are regularly reviewed and revised</li> <li>• Participation in teaching and learning workshops</li> <li>• Attends professional development seminars / workshops / colloquia</li> <li>• Participates in one or more learning communities (<i>e.g.</i> FLC, Triad, or other formal consultation with colleagues)</li> </ul>
utilizes pedagogical best practices for the discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching philosophy reflects an understanding of some of the current best practices of pedagogy</li> <li>• Activities and assessments reflect current best practices of pedagogy (<i>e.g.</i> innovative tutorial or laboratory materials)</li> <li>• The instructor’s annual report reflects elements of current pedagogical best practices</li> </ul>
aligns teaching philosophy, intended outcomes, learning activities and assessment strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a detailed teaching philosophy</li> <li>• Course outlines provide university-wide and course-specific outcomes / aims</li> <li>• Assessment and exercises mirror or simulate discipline-specific activities and tasks</li> <li>• Curriculum and / or course development documents align with teaching philosophy</li> </ul>
engages in systematic reflection on teaching practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of modifying class exercises (<i>e.g.</i> SEI comments for that class over time)</li> <li>• Evolution of teaching philosophy that accommodates student and peer feedback</li> <li>• Participates in mentoring colleagues</li> <li>• Informal discussion with peers regarding instructional practices (<i>e.g.</i> through Triad participation)</li> <li>• Maintenance of a public forum (<i>e.g.</i> a blog) where reflection on teaching is evident. This must be maintained and updated regularly over a period of not less than one year</li> <li>• Faculty Class Notes (FTC 103) demonstrate reflection</li> <li>• Changes in rubrics or other assessment devices is evident over time</li> </ul>

Note that expectations from Level I continue to apply to the applicant, but a higher standard should be met.

**Table A3. Examples of Evidence for Excellence and Leadership in Teaching – Level III**

Criteria	Examples of Evidence	Standard
demonstrates a sustained and significant impact on teaching beyond his/her classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizes conferences, workshops, outreach, or professional development activities</li> <li>• Contributes to the professional development of others</li> <li>• Creates educational initiatives</li> <li>• Develops published learning materials</li> <li>• Coordinates initiatives that impact courses outside of those assigned to the faculty member</li> </ul>	At least one piece of evidence per annum
influences professional dialogue about teaching beyond the academic unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents at teaching and learning workshops or activities</li> <li>• Presents at provincial, national, or international conferences</li> <li>• Contributes to peer evaluations in the institution</li> <li>• Publishes work that contributes to knowledge about teaching and learning</li> </ul>	At least one piece of evidence per annum
provides leadership for major educational initiatives in or beyond the university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develops programs, minors, or other educational initiatives</li> <li>• Participates in assessment or crediting bodies that establish educational qualifications or criteria</li> <li>• Leads teaching and learning workshops</li> <li>• Serves as a mentor for full-time and / or part-time colleagues at the institution</li> <li>• Develops or assists significantly in the development of new programs and / or undergraduate credentials</li> </ul>	At least one piece of evidence for a major initiative
champions the ongoing enhancement of undergraduate education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leads educational activities of professional associations (or equivalent)</li> <li>• Publishes work that contributes to teaching and learning</li> <li>• Is nominated for awards or recognition at the local, national, or international level</li> <li>• Takes a leadership role in an initiative to improve undergraduate education either interdepartmentally at the university or between different academic institutions</li> </ul>	At least one piece of evidence approximately every three years
contribution to teaching and learning is recognized by peers at the national or international level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is nominated for awards or recognition from internal or external bodies</li> <li>• Serves as a major speaker at a national or international meeting or conference</li> <li>• Publishes in materials disseminated nationally or internationally</li> <li>• Contributes in a significant way to educational activities of professional associations</li> <li>• Publishes work that contributes to knowledge about teaching and learning in peer-reviewed sources and / or textbooks</li> <li>• formally reviews educational materials for a third party</li> </ul>	At least three separate pieces of evidence approximately every five years

# Appendix B - Scholarship

---

The following tables provide examples of how final outcomes of Research and Scholarly Activities (RSAs) might be organized by typical levels of peer review and the implied newness and impact of the knowledge. This is not meant to be a prescribed list, but rather examples from each category of scholarly contribution.

The scholarship of discovery is work that fits the traditional model of discovery research. This category represents the type of research with which most faculty members in FST are familiar and reflects their training.

The scholarship of integration is work that compiles, interprets and can generate new insights from original research. This type of scholarly work offers an analytical and integrating perspective on other work by addressing the question: Is it possible to interpret what has been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive or unique understanding?

The scholarship of application is applied research where theory and practice intersect. This form of scholarship applies new or existing knowledge to a process or for a practical application.

## Table B1. Examples of Evidence for the Scholarship of Discovery

Table B1: Possible final outcomes of RSA in the Scholarship of Discovery
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• peer-reviewed journal article(s)</li><li>• peer-reviewed article(s) in proceedings of a conference</li><li>• invited talked or keynote presentation at a conference</li><li>• editorial role in relevant journal(s)</li><li>• peer reviewed book chapter(s)</li><li>• peer-validated discipline specific outcomes including, but not limited to geological or geographical maps, software and open source projects</li><li>• work conducted as a reviewer in academic journal(s)</li><li>• peer-reviewed extended abstract(s) in proceedings of a conference</li><li>• peer-reviewed abstract and poster presentation at a conference</li></ul>

## Table B2. Examples of Evidence for the Scholarship of Integration

Table B2: Possible final outcomes of RSA in the Scholarship of Integration

- peer-reviewed journal article(s)
- book or textbook writing/publication
- textbook chapter writing /publication
- article(s) published in magazines after editorial review
- peer-validated discipline specific outcomes including, but not limited to geological or geographical maps, software and open source projects
- peer-reviewed film/documentaries
- editorial role in relevant journal(s)
- work conducted as a reviewer in relevant journal(s)
- peer-reviewed abstract and poster presentation at a conference
- work as a member of a M.Sc. or Ph.D. thesis defence committee

## Table B3. Examples of Evidence for the Scholarship of Application

Table B3: Possible final outcomes of RSA in the Scholarship of Application

- peer-reviewed journal article(s)
- peer-validated government documents
- peer-validated specialized technical reports
- peer/field-validated materials
- peer-validated discipline specific outcomes including, but not limited to geological or geographical maps, software and open source projects
- editorial role in relevant journal(s)
- work as a reviewer in relevant journal(s)
- technology transfer from the institutional setting to a company
- an innovation, patent or invention
- contract work in industry
- peer/field validated design work
- development and acceptance of new standards documents for a field
- work as a member of a M.Sc. or Ph.D. thesis defence committee

# Appendix C – Scholarship Challenges

---

Few faculty members were involved in RSAs prior to the establishment of the TSS work pattern, and their accomplishments should be recognized and celebrated. With the increased number of faculty engaged in RSAs, and the variety of RSAs they bring to MRU, it is difficult for the university to provide adequate or even minimal support to all TSS faculty members.

Faculty engaged in RSA in the FST face a number of challenges, including:

1. The process for human research ethics is fairly new to MRU, and only recently (November 2010) a process for *medical* human research ethics was put in place, permitting faculty at MRU to apply for medical ethics through the University of Calgary ethics board. There is more to be done in this area, including education of faculty about the processes involved and training of faculty in human and medical human research ethics.
2. The process for animal care and animal research ethics is in the development stages. There is still work to be done in this area.
3. Most FST departments do not have a well-established history of faculty members participating in scholarship.
4. With a dramatic increase in faculty engagement in RSAs there is an insufficient level of funding to support the multitude of research and scholarly programs. This is reflected in constraints on:
  - a. Personnel – Limited funds for student salaries; scientific research typically requires extensive technical training and there are no graduate students for faculty to work with; many faculty are anxious to involve undergraduate students in their research, but there is a limited selection of B.Sc. degrees and some senior students continue to transfer to other institutions, limiting the number of skilled third and four year students currently available
  - b. Equipment – Traditional start up funds for equipment are not negotiated at time of hiring at MRU, hindering the ability of most faculty in the FST to pursue RSAs in their field of training
  - c. Space – Even if the challenges of personnel and equipment were resolved, research facilities for the sciences are still very limited or non-existent for most faculty at MRU, this includes both laboratory space and student data analysis space
  - d. Time – Teaching and service focused workload and scheduling constraints limit the time for research activities

Increased institutional support at overcoming the above constraints will be an important part of fostering an environment of successful external grant applications.

# Appendix D - Service

**Table D1. Examples of Evidence**

Type of Service	Participation	Contribution		
	Level 1 <i>Participation</i>	Level 2 <i>Contribution</i>	Level 3 <i>Significant Contribution or Leadership</i>	Level 4 <i>Leadership</i>

<b>A. Service to the Academic Unit and Faculty</b>
--

<i>A1. Commitments to colleagues and to department and faculty governance</i>				
• Attend department and discipline meetings	Expected			
• Attend meetings of Science and Technology Faculty Council	Expected			
• Department Colloquium	Recommended	Faculty member gives a research/professional presentation at a dept. colloquium or speaker series	Faculty member organizes a series of colloquia/speakers	
• Mentoring of tenure track, part time (and tenured) colleagues. Faculty member shares knowledge with others on an informal basis		Expected	Faculty member mentors 3 or more colleagues	
• Participating in department hiring by attending candidates' presentations and, if possible, helping with hiring-related activities such as tours of MRU, airport pick up, etc.	Expected	Faculty member serves on hiring committee	Faculty member serves on hiring committee responsible for more than one position, or serves as Chair of hiring committee	Chair of hiring committee

Type of Service	Participation	Contribution		
	Level 1 Participation	Level 2 Contribution	Level 3 Significant Contribution or Leadership	Level 4 Leadership

• Peer evaluations of colleagues		Expected	Multiple evaluations	
• 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	
• Serving on departmental committees	Member	Member or Chair	Chair	

<b>A2. Curriculum Support</b>				
• Course coordination	By default, level 1. Large amounts of coordination, and leadership of multiple colleagues would be reason to qualify for level 2 or 3			
• Discipline/Degree/Cluster coordination		By default, level 2. Large amounts of coordination, and leadership of multiple colleagues would be reason to qualify for level 3 or 4		
• Faculty/Unit Curriculum Committees		Member with contribution	Elected Chair/ Secretary	
• Class substitutions/guest lectures if unpaid	Substituting for colleagues attending conferences, etc. (Depends on number of guest lectures)			
• 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 with contribution		

Type of Service	Participation	Contribution		
	Level 1 Participation	Level 2 Contribution	Level 3 Significant Contribution or Leadership	Level 4 Leadership

<b>A3. Student support</b>				
• Writing letters of reference for students	Writes letters as requested			
• Faculty advisor for student society	Faculty advisor			
• Regularly attending student events related to discipline/dept.	Regular attendance	Contributing to organizing such events	Taking a major/lead role in such events	
• Attending Open House	Attendance	Preparation of materials		
• Helping with faculty/university wide activities such as Majors and Minors Fair, Degree Information Evening, New Student Orientation	Attendance	Taking a major role in organizing such events	Elected Chair/Secretary	
• Ad Hoc Committees		Member	Elected Chair/Secretary	
• FDC		Member		
• Supervision of an undergraduate thesis/research assistants		Supervision of students		
• Other Science and Technology Faculty Committees		Member	Elected Chair/Secretary	

Type of Service	Participation	Contribution		
	Level 1 Participation	Level 2 Contribution	Level 3 Significant Contribution or Leadership	Level 4 Leadership

**B. Service to the University**

**B1. Service to the MRFA**

• Attending MRFA meetings	Regular attendance	Regular Contribution to meetings		
• Serving on an MRFA Committee		Member (commitment may vary according to number of meetings and tasks performed )		
• Chairing, Secretary or Subcommittee Membership			Chair/ Secretary/ member	
• Serving on MRFA executive			Executive position	Executive position
• Board of Governor’s Representative			BOG Representative	
• Negotiations Committee			Member	

**B2. Service on University Committees**

• APTC (Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee)			Member	Chair/Secretary
• UPTC (University Tenure and Promotion Committee) /Tenure Granting Committee		Member		
• APPC (Policy and Program Committee)			Member	Chair/Secretary
• Leave Granting Committee		Member		
• Other University committees	Up to the candidate to justify the level with supporting evidence			
• Member of GFC		Member		Chair
• Member of GFC Committee		Member		Chair/Secretary
• Human Research Ethics Board		Member		Chair/Secretary
• Research Committee (University-wide)		Member		Chair/Secretary
• Bylaws and Striking Committee		Member	Chair/Secretary	

Type of Service	Participation	Contribution		
	Level 1 <i>Participation</i>	Level 2 <i>Contribution</i>	Level 3 <i>Significant Contribution or Leadership</i>	Level 4 <i>Leadership</i>

<b>C. Service to Academic Fields of Study</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizing a conference</li> </ul>		Helping organize is level 2. More commitment (with possibly leadership) would merit a level 3.		Major/Lead organizer of a conference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participation in professional organizations/societies related to disciplinary expertise</li> </ul>	Candidate to justify the level with supporting evidence			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board of directors of a professional society</li> </ul>			Member	Board Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholarly activities can be counted towards service if they are not counted as evidence of a candidate's scholarship activities</li> </ul>	Candidate to justify the level with supporting evidence			

<b>D. Service to the Broader Community</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participation in MRU-sanctioned activities that foster community involvement</li> </ul>	Participation is level 1, contribution to such events would be level 2		Chairing an MRU-sanctioned initiative	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commenting for the media in one's primary area of expertise</li> </ul>	Depending on frequency and level of participation/contribution			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presenting to non-academic community organizations in an area related to one's discipline</li> </ul>	Variable depending on time and responsibility			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities related to recruiting students from high schools</li> </ul>	Participation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judging contests related to one's area</li> </ul>	Participation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discipline Specific outreach/workshops for students</li> </ul>	Participation	Minimal contribution	Organizing/sustained contribution	