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 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

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 competent:	Teaching that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed good:	Teaching that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed superior:
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

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:
 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	 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.

	are appropriate to the material being covered and are well-aligned with learning outcomes, during the period under review. 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.	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.	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. 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.
2. Availability to	a) Evidence (e.g.	a) As outlined for	a) As outlined for
Students:	performance reviews)	Renewal but evidence	Associate Professor but
a) Office Hours	should show that the	(e.g. performance	evidence (e.g.
b) Undergraduate	candidate was reliably	reviews) should also	performance reviews)
Student	and consistently	show a general	should also show a
Mentoring	available for scheduled	willingness to be	general commitment to
c) Graduate	Office Hours, notifying	available to students	be available to
Student	students in advance	beyond regular Office	students beyond
Mentoring or	(when possible) if	Hours (when justified),	regular Office Hours
Supervision	Office Hours need to	during the period	(when justified), for the
	be moved, cancelled,	under review.	period under review.
	etc., during the period	b) Evidence (e.g.	b) Evidence (e.g.
	under review.	performance reviews,	performance reviews,
	b) Evidence for work in	testimonials) should	testimonials) should
	a mentoring capacity is	show a general	show a general
	not required but may	willingness to work with students in a	<i>commitment</i> to work with students in a
	be considered, during the period under	mentoring capacity,	mentoring capacity,
	review.	during the period	during the period
	c) Evidence for the	under review.	under review.
	mentoring or	c) Evidence (e.g.	c) Evidence (e-cv,
	Supervision of	curriculum vitae,	performance reviews,
	graduate students is	performance reviews,	student feedback, etc.)
	not required but may	student feedback, etc.)	should show a general
	be considered, during	should show a general	<i>commitment</i> to

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

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

SCHOLARSHIP

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

Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

2. Quality of Publications	 articles per year (or equivalent, see above), during the period under review. 2. Journal articles (or equivalent) should be in refereed publications (with due consideration given to scholarship in emerging fields), during the period under review. 	equivalent, see above), 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.	equivalent, see above), 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

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

Evidence for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

e.g. published reviews of the applicant's work, extended discussions of the applicant's work by others, citations by other scholars.	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.	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.	fields), during the period under review. c) As outlined for Associate Professor.
 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. 	 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. 	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.	 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.
4. Other Scholarly Activity: a) Conference participation, e.g. keynote speaker, presenter, commentator,	 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 	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,	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,

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

SERVICE

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 competent:	Service that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed good.	Service that satisfies the following criteria shall be deemed superior.
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.

Criteria for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

SERVICE

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.
 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

Evidence for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

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