

**University of Winsor
Department of Philosophy
Renewal, Tenure and Promotion Criteria
2023-2024
(January, 2024)**

First Approved by UCAPT – June 24, 2021

Re-approved by UCAPT – March 18, 2024

Preamble:

The following applies to Renewal, Tenure and Promotion to associate professor, and Promotion to full professor. The criteria are consistent with Senate bylaw 23 and Article 13:11 of the collective agreement. The criteria are designed to supplement the criteria outlined in that bylaw and article.

The RTP Committee will consider the candidate’s research statement, their teaching dossier, their service statement, the parts of the ECV that relate to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, the Head’s evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship and Service, as well as any other information and relevant documents the candidate submits in support of their case. In addition, the RTP Committee will recognize that some scholars (e.g. those working in an Indigenous tradition) may work either in a conventional academic tradition (engaging in a program of research and inquiry that is in accordance with the principles of western scholarship) or in a dual academic tradition that combines conventional academic notions of scholarship with alternative approaches (e.g. Indigenous, community-based research). Although all candidates are expected to produce some conventional written scholarship, candidates working in a dual tradition are not expected to produce the same amount of written scholarship as those working in a conventional tradition. Candidates who work or plan to work in a dual tradition should indicate their intention in their research statements as soon as is reasonable in the RTP process and make clear which research projects are included in the alternative tradition.

The RTP Committee will be supported in their review of an application (for Tenure and/or Promotion) by three external letters of reference.

Candidates are expected to provide a *teaching dossier*. This should provide a narrative of the evolution of the candidate’s teaching and lay out their teaching accomplishments during the period under consideration for the application in question. The dossier should provide relevant evidence, such as syllabi, sample assignments, and other supporting documents. The dossier should also include a plan for the development of the candidate’s teaching.

Candidates are expected to provide a *research statement*. This should provide a narrative of the candidate’s research work and accomplishments during the period under consideration for the application in question. The statement should provide

relevant evidence, such as published articles, work in progress, and other supporting

documents. The statement should also include a plan for the development of the candidate's research and scholarship.

Candidates are expected to provide a *service statement*. This should provide a narrative of the candidate's service work and accomplishments during the period under consideration for the application in question. The statement should also include a plan for the development of the candidates' service work.

It is the candidate's responsibility to supply all the documents and other relevant information needed for their application for renewal, tenure, or promotion.

The criteria for Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion are measures of *academic excellence*. A guiding principle is that Teaching and Scholarship carry greater weight than Service when assessing academic excellence. It is possible, however, that Service may be granted extra weight in rare, special cases. For example, a candidate applying for Promotion to Full Professor may have attained such an exceptional level of Service to the University, the academic community, or the broader community in general, that it may justify overriding some shortcomings in their Teaching or Scholarship.

Standards for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion reflect the variety of practices, contexts and endeavors typical of a diverse and accomplished faculty complement. This means that in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service the standards offer flexible pathways in many areas, indicating a variety of contributions that can be considered.

Candidates for Renewal should satisfy **all** the criteria for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service that are listed for Renewal.

Candidates for Tenure or Promotion should satisfy **all** the criteria for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for the position for which they are applying.

It is possible that some criteria may be given more weight than others in rare, special cases. For example, a candidate applying for Promotion to Full Professor may have attained such an exceptional level of academic excellence in Teaching that it may justify overriding some shortcomings in their Scholarship (e.g. a lower rate of publication). Conversely, a candidate's Scholarship may be so exceptional that it may justify overriding some shortcomings in their Teaching (e.g. lower SET scores or SPT scores).

*For Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, the standard for Renewal is **competent** (as detailed below), the standard for Tenure and Associate Professor is **good** (as detailed below), and the standard for Full Professor is **superior** (as detailed below). Since there may be different ways of satisfying these criteria, the specific profile, teaching context, and research agenda of a candidate may also be considered.*

TEACHING

Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

Teaching Criteria	Renewal: Competent Teaching	Tenure/Associate Professor: Good Teaching	Full Professor: Superior Teaching
A candidate's application for Renewal, Tenure, or Promotion will be judged against the following criteria:	Teaching that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>competent</i> :	Teaching that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>good</i> :	Teaching that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>superior</i> :
1. Course Organization and Preparation	1. Course organization and preparation must meet the standards set by the University, during the period under review.	1. Course organization and preparation must meet the standards set by the University and should show a general <i>willingness</i> to revise and improve (when deemed potentially helpful), during the period under review.	1. Meets the standards for Associate Professor but should also show a general <i>commitment</i> to revise and improve (when deemed potentially helpful), during the period under review.
2. Availability to Students (e.g. Contact Information, Office Hours, etc.)	2. Availability to students must meet the standards set by the University, during the period under review.	2. Meets the standards for Renewal but should also show a general <i>willingness</i> to participate in activities that will help advance the academic life of their students, during the period under review.	2. Meets the standards for Associate Professor but should also show a general <i>commitment</i> to participate in activities that will help advance the academic life of their students, during the period under review.
3. Teaching Quality	3. Teaching quality should be deemed <i>competent</i> , during the period under review.	3. Teaching quality should be deemed <i>good</i> during the period under review.	3. Teaching quality should be deemed <i>superior</i> , during the period under review.

TEACHING

Evidence for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

Teaching Evidence	Renewal	Tenure/Associate Professor	Full Professor
Evidence for evaluating a candidate's teaching may include the following:	Evidence of <i>competent</i> teaching:	Evidence of <i>good</i> teaching:	Evidence of <i>superior</i> teaching:
1. Course Organization and Preparation: a) Course Syllabi b) Course Evaluation, e.g. Exams, Assignments c) Pedagogical Methods d) Student Feedback	a) Evidence (e.g. sample Syllabi, Course Outlines) should show evidence that they meet the standards set by the University (e.g. include a list of readings, a timetable, a list of clearly identified methods of evaluation and their assigned value, all well-aligned with learning outcomes), during the period under review. b) Evidence (e.g. sample exams, assignments, or other methods of evaluation from courses taught) should show that the methods of evaluation utilized are generally clear, at an appropriate level of difficulty for the course in question, are well-aligned with learning outcomes, and so on, during the period under review. c) Evidence (e.g. syllabi, feedback from students, testimonials) should show that pedagogical methods	a) As outlined for Renewal but evidence (e.g. comparisons between Syllabi) should also show a general <i>willingness</i> to improve Syllabi, during the period under review. b) As outlined for Renewal, but evidence (e.g. comparisons between exams, assignments, and other methods of evaluation) should also show a general <i>willingness</i> to review, revise and improve methods of evaluation (if deemed potentially helpful), during the period under review. c) As outlined for Renewal but evidence (e.g. syllabi, testimonials) should also show a general <i>willingness</i> to review, revise and improve pedagogical methods (if deemed potentially helpful), during the period under review.	a) As outlined for Associate Professor but evidence (e.g. comparisons between Syllabi) should also show a general <i>commitment</i> to improve Syllabi (e.g. provide a detailed list of Readings, a list of Recommended Readings, a detailed timetable, a list of clearly identified and detailed methods of evaluation and their assigned value, all well-aligned with learning outcomes), during the period under review. b) As outlined for Associate Professor, but evidence (e.g. comparisons between exams, assignments, and other methods of evaluation) should also show a general <i>commitment</i> to review, revise and improve methods of evaluation (if deemed potentially helpful), during the period under review.

	<p>are appropriate to the material being covered and are well-aligned with learning outcomes, during the period under review.</p> <p>d) Student feedback (e.g. testimonials, SPT scores, SET scores for “Course Evaluation”, etc.) should be <i>largely</i> positive, during the period under review. The potential for implicit bias in student feedback ought to be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>d) Student feedback (e.g. testimonials, SPT scores, SET scores for “Course Evaluation”, etc.) should be <i>strongly</i> positive, during the period under review. The potential for implicit bias in student feedback ought to be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>c) As outlined for Associate Professor but evidence should also show a general <i>commitment</i> to review, revise and improve pedagogical methods (if deemed potentially helpful), during the period under review.</p> <p>d) Student feedback (e.g. testimonials, SPT scores, SET scores for “Course Evaluation”, etc.) should be <i>predominantly</i> positive, during the period under review. The potential for implicit bias in student feedback ought to be taken into consideration.</p>
<p>2. Availability to Students:</p> <p>a) Office Hours</p> <p>b) Undergraduate Student Mentoring</p> <p>c) Graduate Student Mentoring or Supervision</p>	<p>a) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews) should show that the candidate was reliably and consistently available for scheduled Office Hours, notifying students in advance (when possible) if Office Hours need to be moved, cancelled, etc., during the period under review.</p> <p>b) Evidence for work in a mentoring capacity is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.</p> <p>c) Evidence for the mentoring or Supervision of graduate students is not required but may be considered, during</p>	<p>a) As outlined for Renewal but evidence (e.g. performance reviews) should also show a general <i>willingness</i> to be available to students beyond regular Office Hours (when justified), during the period under review.</p> <p>b) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews, testimonials) should show a general <i>willingness</i> to work with students in a mentoring capacity, during the period under review.</p> <p>c) Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae, performance reviews, student feedback, etc.) should show a general</p>	<p>a) As outlined for Associate Professor but evidence (e.g. performance reviews) should also show a general <i>commitment</i> to be available to students beyond regular Office Hours (when justified), for the period under review.</p> <p>b) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews, testimonials) should show a general <i>commitment</i> to work with students in a mentoring capacity, during the period under review.</p> <p>c) Evidence (e-cv, performance reviews, student feedback, etc.) should show a general <i>commitment</i> to</p>

	the period under review.	<i>willingness</i> to work with graduate students in a mentoring or Supervisory capacity, during the period under review.	working with graduate students in a mentoring or Supervisory capacity (e.g. serving as the Supervisor or Reader of Theses or Major Papers, regular attendance at and participation in the Oral Defense of Graduate Theses and Major Papers within their AAU, regular attendance at and participation in Conferences and other modes of presentation for Graduate work, etc.), during the period under review.
3. Teaching Quality: a) Performance Reviews b) Student Feedback c) Teaching Self-Improvement Initiatives d) Curriculum Development e) Awards f) SET Scores	a) Performance reviews should be <i>largely</i> positive, during the period under review. b). Student feedback (e.g. testimonials, SPT scores, SET scores for “Teaching Effectiveness in promoting academic pursuits and stimulating student interest”, etc.) should be <i>largely</i> positive, during the period under review (with the potential for implicit bias in student feedback being taken into consideration when evaluating SPT and SET scores). c) Evidence for participation in self-improvement initiatives is not required but may be	a) Performance reviews should be <i>strongly</i> positive, during the period under review. b) Student feedback (e.g. testimonials, SPT scores, SET scores for “Teaching Effectiveness in promoting academic pursuits and stimulating student interest”, etc.) should be <i>strongly</i> positive, during the period under review (with the potential for implicit bias in student feedback being taken into consideration when evaluating SPT and SET scores). c) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews, e-mails, or other forms of correspondence) should show a general <i>willingness</i> to take part	a). Performance reviews should be <i>predominantly</i> positive, during the period under review. b) Student feedback (e.g. testimonials, SPT scores, SET scores for “Teaching Effectiveness in promoting academic pursuits and stimulating student interest”, etc.) should be <i>predominantly</i> positive, during the period under review (with the potential for implicit bias in student feedback being taken into consideration when evaluating SPT scores, SET scores). c) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews, e-mails, or other forms of correspondence) should show a general

	<p>considered, during the period under review.</p> <p>d) Evidence for participation in curriculum development is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.</p> <p>e) Evidence of teaching awards is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.</p> <p>f) SPT scores and SET scores for “Instructor Evaluation” should be <i>largely positive</i>, during the period under review (with the potential for implicit bias in student feedback being taken into consideration when evaluating SET scores).</p>	<p>in self-improvement initiatives (if deemed potentially helpful), during the period under review.</p> <p>d) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews, minutes of Dept Council meetings) should show a general <i>willingness</i> to participate in curriculum committees and other aspects of curriculum development, during the period under review.</p> <p>e) Evidence of teaching awards is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.</p> <p>f) As outlined for Renewal.</p>	<p><i>commitment</i> to take part in self-improvement initiatives (if deemed helpful), during the period under review.</p> <p>d) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews, minutes of Dept. Council meetings) should show a general <i>commitment</i> to participate in curriculum committees and other aspects of curriculum development, during the period under review.</p> <p>e) Evidence of teaching awards is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.</p> <p>f) As outline for Renewal.</p>
--	---	---	---

SCHOLARSHIP

Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

Research Criteria	Renewal: Competent Scholarship	Tenure/Associate Professor: Good Scholarship	Full Professor: Superior Scholarship
A candidate's application for Renewal, Tenure, or Promotion will be judged against the following criteria:	Research and scholarly activity that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>competent</i> :	Research and scholarly activity that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>good</i> .	Research and scholarly activity that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>superior</i> .
1. Rate of Publication	1. Publications should be at a rate of .75 journal articles per year (or equivalent, e.g. articles that are forthcoming or in progress, books or monographs, chapters in books, entries in academic encyclopedias, academic book reviews, submissions to academic newsletters etc., with the weight assigned to these 'other' works being determined by the RTP committee with the general expectation that the weight of some, e.g. books, may count for multiple journal articles while the weight others, e.g. book reviews, will tend to count for less individually than the weight of an individual journal article), during the period under review. For those in a dual academic stream, publications should be at a rate of .5 journal	1. Publications should be at a rate of 1 article per year (or equivalent, e.g. articles that are forthcoming or in progress, books or monographs, chapters in books, entries in academic encyclopedias, academic book reviews, submission to academic newsletters, etc., with the weight assigned to these 'other' works being determined by the RTP committee with the general expectation that the weight of some, e.g. books, may count for multiple journal articles, while the weight of others, e.g. book reviews, will tend to count for less individually than the weight of an individual journal article), during the period under review. For those in a dual academic stream, publications should be at a rate of .75 journal articles per year (or	1. Publications should be at a rate of 1.5 articles per year (or equivalent, e.g. articles that are forthcoming or in progress, books or monographs, chapters in books, entries in academic encyclopedias, academic book reviews, submissions to academic newsletters, etc., with the weight assigned to these 'other' works being determined by the RTP committee with the general expectation that the weight of some, e.g. books, may count for multiple journal articles, while the weight of others, e.g. book reviews, will tend to count for less individually than the weight of an individual journal article), during the period under review. For those in a dual stream, publications should be at a rate of 1 journal article per year (or

	articles per year (or equivalent, see above), during the period under review.	equivalent, see above), during the period under review.	equivalent, see above), during the period under review.
2. Quality of Publications	2. Journal articles (or equivalent) should be in refereed publications (with due consideration given to scholarship in emerging fields), during the period under review.	2. Meets the standards for Renewal, but at least 25% of journal articles (or equivalent) should be in refereed publications with a national or international reputation (with due consideration given to scholarship in emerging fields), during the period under review.	2. Meets the standards for Renewal, but at least 50% of journal articles (or equivalent) should be in refereed publications with a national or international reputation (with due consideration given to scholarship in emerging fields), during the period under review.
3. Academic Reputation	3. Academic reputation is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.	3. Academic reputation is not required but should show <i>potential</i> for becoming an expert in their field, during the period under review.	3. Should be generally regarded by their peers as an <i>expert</i> in their field, during the period under review.
4. Other Scholarly Activity	4. Other scholarly activity is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.	4. Should show a general <i>willingness</i> to engage in other scholarly activity that is supportive of scholarship within their field, during the period under review.	4. Should show a general <i>commitment</i> to engage in other scholarly activity that is supportive of scholarship within their field of expertise (e.g. reviewing manuscripts, conference papers or grant applications, serving as a member of an editorial board, and so on) during the period under review.

Scholarship

Evidence for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

Evaluation of Scholarship Evidence	Renewal: Competent Scholarship	Tenure/Associate Professor: Good Scholarship	Full Professor: Superior Scholarship
Evidence for evaluating a candidate's research may include the following:	Evidence of <i>competent</i> research and scholarly activity.	Evidence of <i>good</i> research and scholarly activity.	Evidence for <i>superior</i> research and scholarly activity.
1. Rate of Publication	1. Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae) should show an average rate of publishing .75 journal articles per year (or equivalent, see the Criteria above), during the period under review. For those in dual academic streams evidence should show an average rate of publishing .5 journal articles per year (or equivalent, see above), during the period under review.	2. Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae) should show an average rate of publishing 1 journal article per year (or equivalent, see the Criteria above), during the period under review. For those in dual academic streams evidence should show an average rate of publishing .75 journal articles per year (or equivalent, see the Criteria above), during the period under review.	3. Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae) should show an average rate of publishing 1.5 journal articles per year (or equivalent, see the Criteria above), during the period under review. For those in dual academic streams evidence should show an average rate of publishing 1 journal articles per year (or equivalent, see the Criteria above), during the period under review.
2. Publication Quality a) Publications are refereed or peer reviewed. b) Publications are widely recognized nationally or internationally (with due consideration to scholarship in emerging fields). c) Tracking Recognition,	a) Evidence (e.g. publisher statements, e-mails, or other forms of correspondence) should show that journal articles (or equivalent) are refereed or peer reviewed, during the period under review. b) Evidence that the publications in which the candidate's work appears are nationally or internationally recognized is not	a) As outlined for Renewal. b) Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae, journal editorial board, etc.) should show that some, e.g. at least 50%, of the publications in which the candidate's work appears are recognized nationally or internationally (with due consideration to scholarship in emerging fields), during the period under review.	a) As outlined for Renewal. b) Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae, journal editorial board, etc.) should show that the majority, e.g. at least 75%, of the publications in which the candidate's work appears are recognized nationally or internationally (with due consideration to scholarship in emerging

<p>e.g. published reviews of the applicant's work, extended discussions of the applicant's work by others, citations by other scholars.</p>	<p>required but may be considered, during the period under review. c) Evidence of tracking recognition is not required but may be considered as an indicator of publication quality, during the period under review.</p>	<p>c) Evidence of tracking recognition is not required but may be considered as an indicator of publication quality (especially in cases of scholarship in emerging fields), during the period under review.</p>	<p>fields), during the period under review. c) As outlined for Associate Professor.</p>
<p>3. Academic Reputation a) Candidate is acknowledged by their peers, e.g. through referees' letters, e-mails, etc. to be an expert in their field during the period under review. b) Tracking recognition, e.g. published reviews of the applicant's work, extended discussions of the applicant's work by others, citations by other scholars, etc.</p>	<p>a) Evidence of peer-acknowledged expertise is not required but may be considered, during the period under review. b) Evidence of tracking recognition is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.</p>	<p>a) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews, referees' letters) should show <i>potential</i> for peer-acknowledged expertise, during the period under review. b) As outlined for Renewal.</p>	<p>a) Evidence (referee's letters, e-mails, or other forms of correspondence) should show that the candidate is largely acknowledged to be an expert in their field, during the period under review. b) Evidence (e.g. book reviews, citation records, and other forms of peer recognition or academic interest) should be largely supportive of peer-acknowledged expertise, during the period under review.</p>
<p>4. Other Scholarly Activity: a) Conference participation, e.g. keynote speaker, presenter, commentator,</p>	<p>a) Evidence of conference participation is not required but may be considered, during the period under review. b) Evidence of academic editorial work is not required</p>	<p>a) Evidence (e.g. formal submissions to or registrations in conferences) should show a general <i>willingness</i> to participate in academic conferences (e.g. as a presenter,</p>	<p>a) Evidence (e.g. conference itineraries, correspondence, etc.) should show a general <i>commitment</i> to participate in academic conferences (e.g. as a keynote speaker, presenter,</p>

<p>organizer, session chair.</p> <p>b) Academic editorial work, e.g. editor of a journal, book, conference proceedings, newsletter, etc.</p> <p>c) Research Grants or Awards</p>	<p>but may be considered, during the period under review.</p> <p>c) Evidence of research grants or awards is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.</p>	<p>commentator, organizer, session chair, etc.), during the period under review.</p> <p>b) Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae, research statement, performance reviews) should show <i>potential</i> to participate in academic editorial work, during the period under review.</p> <p>c) Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae, research statement) should show <i>potential</i> to pursue research grants, during the period under review.</p>	<p>commentator, organizer, session chair, etc.), during the period under review.</p> <p>b) Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae, research statement) should show a general <i>willingness</i> to participate in academic editorial work (e.g. editing a journal, book, conference proceedings, etc.), during the period under review.</p> <p>c) Evidence (e.g. grant applications) should show a general <i>commitment</i> to pursue research grants, during the period under review.</p>
---	--	---	--

SERVICE

Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

Service Criteria	Renewal: Competent Service	Tenure/Associate Professor: Good Service	Full Professor: Superior Service
A candidate's application for Renewal, Tenure, or Promotion will be judged against the following criteria:	Service that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>competent</i> :	Service that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>good</i> .	Service that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed <i>superior</i> .
1. Performance of Administrative duties.	1. Routine administrative duties should be performed as expected, during the period under review.	1. Routine administrative duties should be performed as expected and should show a general <i>willingness</i> to take on a fair share of the tasks assigned by Dept. Council, during the period under review.	1. Routine administrative duties should be performed as expected and should show a general <i>commitment</i> to take on a fair share of the tasks assigned by Dept, Council, during the period under review.
2. Acceptance of Reasonable Responsibilities to the University or Academic Community.	2. Should show a general <i>willingness</i> to accept reasonable University responsibilities, during the period under review.	2. Meets the standards of Renewal but should also show a general <i>willingness</i> to undertake additional responsibilities within the AAU and the University in general, during the period under review.	2. Meets the standards of Associate Professor but should also show a general <i>commitment</i> to undertake additional responsibilities within the AAU, the University in general, and the Academic Community, during the period under review.

SERVICE

Evidence for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

Evaluation of Service Evidence	Renewal: Competent Service	Tenure/Associate Professor: Good Service	Full Professor: Superior Service
Evidence for evaluating a candidate's service may include the following:	Evidence of <i>competent</i> Service.	Evidence of <i>good</i> Service.	Evidence of <i>superior</i> Service.
1. Service to the University: a) Performance of routine administrative duties, e.g. submission of syllabi, submission of grades, etc. b) Acceptance of reasonable University responsibilities, e.g. AAU portfolios or committees, Faculty committees, University Senate, etc.	a) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews) should show that routine administrative duties (e.g. submission of syllabi, grades, etc.) were performed as expected during the period under review. b) Evidence (e.g. performance reviews) should show a general <i>willingness</i> to accept reasonable University responsibilities (e.g. regular participation in Departmental Council meetings, participation in AAU functions, etc.), during the period under review.	a) As outlined for Renewal. b) As outlined for Renewal but evidence (e.g. performance reviews, e-mails, or other forms of correspondence) should also show a general <i>willingness</i> to take on additional responsibilities within the AAU (e.g. Portfolios, Committees, etc.), the Faculty (e.g. Representative on Faculty Council), or the University in general (e.g. serving on Senate), during the period under review.	a) As outlined for Renewal. b) As outlined for Associate Professor, but evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae, performance reviews, minutes of Meetings, e-mails, or other forms of correspondence) should also show a general <i>commitment</i> to take on additional responsibilities within the AAU, (e.g. portfolios, Committees, etc.) the Faculty (e.g. Representative on Faculty Council), and the University in general (e.g. serving on Senate), during the period under review.
2. Service to the Academic Community, e.g. refereeing for peer-reviewed journals, reviewing manuscripts for conferences or for academic publishers, reviewing grant applications, serving as editor of a journal, serving as a board	2. Evidence for service to the academic community is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.	2. Evidence (e.g. performance reviews, e-mails or other forms of correspondence) should show <i>potential</i> to serve the academic community in some respect (e.g. reviewing manuscripts, for conferences), during the period under review.	2. Evidence (e.g. curriculum vitae, performance reviews, e-mails, or other forms of correspondence) should show a general <i>willingness</i> to serve the academic community in some respects (e.g. refereeing for peer-reviewed journals, serving on an editorial

<p>member for journals or academic publishing houses, editing conference proceedings, serving as president of an academic society, etc.</p>			<p>board, etc.), during the period under review.</p>
<p>3. Service to the Community at Large, e.g. organizing community events, volunteering for community groups, etc.</p>	<p>3. Evidence for service to the community at large is not required but may be considered, during the period under review.</p>	<p>3. As outlined for Renewal.</p>	<p>3. As outlined for Renewal.</p>