(Psychology AAU Approved December 19,2023) (UCAPT approved March 18, 2024)

Introduction

This document establishes the assessment criteria for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion in the University of Windsor, Department of Psychology. What follows is consistent with Senate bylaw 23 and is considered valid for all candidates. The Committee will consider the candidate's research statement, their teaching dossier, their service statement, the parts of the ECV that relate to research, teaching and service, the Head's evaluation of research, teaching and service, and the evaluations of external reviewers.

Adjudication Process

Faculty members in the Department of Psychology will be assessed with regard to their contributions in three general areas of activity: scholarship, teaching, and service. To evaluate a candidate for contract renewal, tenure and promotion, it is necessary to consider the total contribution.

Assessing an individual's contributions and achievements is a difficult process, with some aspects being non-negotiable, such as effective teaching, quality research, and competent contributions to departmental operations. It is recognized that Faculty may excel in their work in different ways. The RTP process sets out minimum standards for renewal, tenure, and promotion; however, it is incumbent upon the candidate to make a strong case that they have met or even exceeded the criteria for RTP. These minimum standards are set out in the tables constituting the body of this document. **Bolded** criteria indicate criteria that must be met. Non-bold criteria can be met to improve the strength of a candidate's overall application.

The Committee will take an equity-informed approach in its assessment. Diversity is to be honoured as integral to the quality of the University's intellectual mission, in both discipline and methodology. Thus, research, teaching, and service in non-traditional areas and methodologies and/or by members of historically disadvantaged and/or designated groups will be considered equitably. When asked to do so by candidates and provided with an explanation of the interruptions, the Committee will take into consideration both career interruptions and special circumstances that have affected the performance or productivity of the candidate during the period under consideration. This includes when a candidate is taken away from normal teaching, research, and/or service work for an extended period(s) of time due to health, family, administrative, or other applicable circumstances. Social context (this may include social markers of race, gender, indigeneity, disability, and sexuality) will also be considered with respect to student perceptions of teaching effectiveness and other measures of assessing institutional competence. Finally, the research scholarship, teaching, and service records of candidates who have held previous tenure track positions will also be taken into consideration.

The Committee will be cognizant of and value various teaching and research methodologies and recognize that candidates may work with more than one methodology. Interdisciplinary scholarship, including the scholarship of teaching and learning, Indigenous Studies, and/or studies of race/ethnicity will be treated equally with more traditional Psychology-focused work. The Committee also recognizes that Indigenous colleagues may work either in a western conventional academic tradition ("those individuals who engage in a program of research and inquiry in accordance with the principles of the western academy and whose effort is primary but not exclusively reflected in the production of written work")2 or a dual-academic tradition which combines both conventional and traditional Indigenous approaches to research ("a dual tradition school is an individual whose scholarship is based in and informed by principles and methods appropriate to and exploration and explication of traditional aboriginal knowledge as well as those of the western disciplinary tradition")3. Although all colleagues are expected to produce some conventional written scholarship, colleagues working in a dual tradition may provide evidence of scholarly contributions in a variety of ways. Colleagues who work or plan to work in a dual tradition should indicate so in their research statements as soon as

reasonable in the RTP process.

Finally, the Committee will ensure that the work and practices of dual tradition scholars is peer reviewed by assessors with relevant knowledge and experience. Advice on suitable assessors will be sought from Indigenous scholars with relevant experience, elders, and/or community cultural leaders where required. Moreover, where Indigenous teaching methods are employed, the Committee will ensure that, if at least one member does not have knowledge of relevant Indigenous teaching methodologies, that an external assessment by an independent reviewer with knowledge of the relevant methodology will be sought.

Members must consider any special circumstances that have had an effect on the performance or productivity of the applicant. This includes delays in disseminating research results due to health problems, family responsibilities, parental leave, disabilities, or other applicable circumstances. Members are to recognize delays and assess the quality of the applicant's performance and/or productivity during their active period (i.e., excluding the period of special circumstances).

Research Scholarship and Teaching

A research statement should provide a narrative of the research work and accomplishments of the candidate carried out prior to tenure (for permanence/promotion to associate professor) or following tenure (for promotion to full professor). The statement should also set out a future plan for the scholarly work of the candidate. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case for his or her promotion.

A teaching dossier should provide a narrative of the evolution of the candidate's teaching and lay out their teaching accomplishments carried out prior to tenure (for permanence/promotion to associate professor) or following tenure (for promotion to full professor). The dossier should provide relevant evidence, such as syllabuses, support documents, etc., and set out a future plan for the development of the candidate's teaching. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case for his/her/their promotion. See UCAPT's teaching dossier template for a guide to expectations.

Standards for achievement of tenure and promotion reflect the variety of practice, context, and endeavours typical of a diverse and accomplished faculty complement. This means that in both research and teaching, the standards offer flexible pathways in many areas, indicating a variety of contributions that can be considered. Bolded indicators are mandatory, whereas others should be understood as potentially contributing to the overall decision regarding those criteria. Candidates for tenure and promotion must achieve the standard set for all criteria although they may do so in different ways, and must meet the minimum standard for research, teaching, and service. The specific profile, research agenda, and teaching context of specific researchers may also be taken into account in identifying the critical determining factors.

Service

Candidates must provide the Committee with a service statement. The statement should provide a narrative of the service work and accomplishments of the candidate carried out prior to tenure (for permanence/promotion to associate professor) or following tenure (for promotion to full professor). The statement may also set out a plan for future service goals and activities. The committee will consider the candidate's service statement; CV; the report from the Head and other submitted evidence, e.g., media reports; feedback from participants in programs, services, and other initiatives; letters of recognition; appreciation and awards; and evidence of contributions to initiatives.

Under conditions of employment, 20% of a faculty member's workload is devoted to service. For the typical faculty member, this would involve approximately 322 hours over a 46-week work year or about seven hours per week on average. However, the assessment of service considers more than time served: as with all aspects of promotion and tenure criteria, the nature, quality, and impact of the individual's contributions are also considered. Individuals make contributions to the institutional mission in diverse ways, contributing to collegial governance, and to the necessary management, fostering, and enhancement of learning, scholarly practice, knowledge creation, and knowledge mobilization as these occur within the institution, in the community, and in relevant professional or disciplinary societies. These contributions can take many forms. In addition to evidence of a spirit of willing cooperation to participate in an equitable number of committee assignments, the Committee will assess the quality and depth of an individual's contributions to service, taking into account dimensions such as:

- Degree of consistency and flexibility in assuming service roles in which the individual's knowledge and good judgment could benefit the Faculty.
- The individual's consistency in attending departmental, area, and committee meetings to ensure a general knowledge of departmental issues and contributing to solutions.
- The individual's effectiveness in forwarding projects and objectives of service, with an emphasis on efforts to build leadership capacity across the department by mentoring and sharing leadership responsibilities.
- Effectiveness in collaboratively forwarding projects and objectives of service and/or in building teams and networks to further the institutional mission through service.
- Degree of leadership, responsibility and agency demonstrated, in both formal and informal roles.
- Evidence of a reputation for excellence and integrity in service.

Scope of service beyond the departmental or local level.

Considerations of the RTP committee in assessing service contributions:

- 1) Committee membership should be assessed in light of the individual's actual service through that committee and the degree of activity of that committee. Membership on committees that were not active in the year of membership do not constitute a service contribution but might be seen as contributory evidence of willingness to serve. Candidates must describe the nature of service work undertaken rather than simply providing titles or committee names.
- 2) Service contributions to the development, operation, and management of academic programs may overlap with contributions to teaching or research. For instance, the development of course infrastructure, streams, or academic programs have clearly defined and interconnected teaching and service components. Original contributions to policy, institutional practice, or partnership based in disciplinary expertise may overlap with research. Candidates are welcome to apply these contributions as they see fit to make their case but should be aware that the Committee will consider the degree to which contributions are being attributed to multiple elements of their case.
- 3) Although service to academic, professional, and broader communities is valued, as set out in Criteria 2 and 3, service to the Faculty & University, as set out in Criteria 1 is mandatory for RTP purposes. Criteria 2 and 3 could be one, the other, or combination.
- 4) The committee will take into account the degree to which service responsibilities have been offset by teaching release: the minimum service requirement for faculty must be met without including service for which release from teaching has been provided.
- 5) As with other aspects of these RTP criteria, the Committee can choose to take into account individual circumstances.

Criterion 1: Expertise in research area, relevant methodologies, and effective and ethical project management		
	Associate Professor	Full Professor
a) An active and well- constructed research activity plan, and a history of successful plans or programs Clearly focused research plan articulated in a research statement.	The candidate demonstrates an ongoing, clearly focused, and highly active research program, with a continued pattern of quality articles under review.	Well-articulated and successful research agenda. History of research goals being met and exceeded, of ongoing re-evaluation and planning reflecting the development of new directions and expanding reach or depth. Evidence of continuing productivity (e.g., pending publications, under review, grants submitted).
b) Conformity with all relevant institutional, disciplinary, and funding agency ethical and research guidelines	The candidate must have authored/co-authored an application for at least one major external research grant. A pattern of conformity with relevant institutional, disciplinary, and funding agency ethical research guidelines.	Has met all indicators of (b) for Associate Professor since earning tenure. Has either obtained external funding, has a continuous record of attempting to obtain a major external research grant, or has been included as a contributor or co-PI on external research grants.

Criterion 2: A record of high-quality refereed publications, other demonstrated scholarly outputs		
	Associate Professor	Full Professor
a) Publishes in journals or with publishing houses with a strong academic reputation at a pace consistent with disciplinary standards for strong scholarly performance	Successful applicants should publish, on average, 1.00 peer-reviewed journal articles per year. Book chapters can be counted as peer- reviewed journal articles so long as they do not constitute the majority of the work and are published by reputable publishing houses. At least two to three of the papers should be first author works. Assessment of this criterion can take into account the following: quality of the journal, single-author publications, methods of data collection (longitudinal data collection can count more), the use of archival data sets or data not collected by the candidate, and intra- disciplinary variations (with evidence provided by applicant).	Since promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member must publish on average 1.00 peer-reviewed journal article per year. Book chapters can be counted as peer-reviewed so long as they are published by reputable publishing houses. Faculty member must publish a minimum of seven or more peer-reviewed papers or book chapters being first or senior author. Assessment of this criterion can take into account quality of the journal, single-author publications, methods of data collection, and the use of archival data sets or data not collected by the candidate.
b) Research dissemination is at the national and international level	Publications are peer reviewed and are generally published in well- respected journals and when possible, journals with wide readership. Assessment of journal quality can be based on impact factors, rejection rates, circulation, number of citations of the author's work, or publishing house (e.g., APA/CPA journals). Conference presentations have taken place at well-respected national and/or international conferences.	Many publications are published in journals with high impact factors in their sub fields and cited with some frequency. The faculty member can provide impact factors for the journals in which they have published and how those impact factors compare to other journals within their sub field. Additionally, faculty can provide citation counts of their work relative to similar work to demonstrate the impact of their work. Research dissemination is consistently widely recognized at national and international levels. May include talks or invited talks at national and/or international conferences.
c) External peer review indicates that publications are of high quality	External peer review indicates that publications are of high quality, and some are placed in journals of high quality.	External peer review indicates that publications are of excellent quality.

Criterion 3: Evidence of independent and original contributions to research or creative activity, which have an impact on the field of expertise.		
	Associate Professor	Full Professor
a) Original contributions to the field of study that influenced thinking and/or practice in the field.	Evidence of original contributions that have the potential to influence the evolution of the field, practice, or thinking within the discipline or new applications of existing theory and research that have the potential to change the field.	Evidence of major original contributions with significant impact within the discipline or through practical applications. Major contributions could be through empirical or theoretical breakthroughs, solutions to long-standing problems, continued contribution to understanding long-standing or difficult problems in psychology, or disseminating scholarly work via writing books.
b) Extent to which research is considered, referred to, and read	Evidence of recognition within the area of research, such as citations, invitations to contribute chapters to books, participate in conferences, give guest lectures or keynote addresses, fellowships, residencies, or exchanges.	Strong evidence of international recognition in the area of research, such as: keynotes, guest residencies, major and highly competitive research fellowship, residencies, or exchanges; or impact factors of journals, citation counts, and metrics of dissemination of research on such open access scholarly sites as Academia.edu, Scholarship at UWindsor, etc.
c) National recognition/ leadership within the area of research specialty	Evidence of national recognition within the area of research, including: participation on the program of major national conferences; reviewing book or article manuscript submissions for an academic press of scholarly journal; or sitting on a journal's editorial board.	Evidence of national recognition within the area of research, including: chairing panels at major national conferences; reviewing book or article manuscript submissions for an academic press of scholarly journal; sitting on a journal's editorial board; acting as a consultant for government agencies, NGOs, or commercial entities; or establishing a media presence as an expert in the research field.

Criterion 4: Capacity building through income generation, collaboration development, and infrastructure development strategies¹

development strategies ¹		
	Associate Professor	Full Professor
a) Internal or external research funding; OR	Funding of research grants judged as significant by departmental peers and chairs/directors, either as Principal Investigator or Contributor or small internal grants with attempts to obtain external funding. OR	History of regular, repeated, and evolving success in major granting competitions, including those considered being the most highly competitive within the discipline, given the career stage of the candidate. OR
b) Partnerships that directly contribute to research capacity or the development of research or creative activity infrastructure	Beginnings of, or attempts to begin community, industry, or academic partnerships that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.	Exceptional degree of community, industry, or academic partnerships, or data networks that contribute to research capacity materially, creatively, or intellectually.

¹ At the Associate Level, indicators under Criterion 5 can be considered contributory to overall capacity building in the discipline.

Criterion 5: Demonstrated ability to attract and successfully mentor and train students in research² **Associate Professor Full Professor** Clear and sustained evidence that the a) Successful Evidence that graduate students were recruited based on the candidate attracts graduate students, and graduate student successfully supervises and mentors them to candidate's reputation or actions, or recruitment and that graduate and undergraduate high achievement. High achievement would retention, students supervised or mentored imply strong post-doctoral positions, strong supervision, and regularly met with solid success, internship/job placements, research, and mentorship including student publications or ingrant success. process publications. Evidence that students explored b) Graduate Clear and sustained evidence that graduate external funding opportunities (Tristudents explored external funding student access to Council/OGS funding) and had opportunities and had normative (for the external funds normative (for the department) department) levels of success. levels of success. A pattern of collaboration with The faculty member needs to also show c) Evidence of students as evidenced by coevidence of routinely publishing with collaboration authorship on projects, not all of students, not just on student work, but on with and support which were student required faculty-led work. for (graduate) projects. student publication and research

² At the Associate Level contributions related to Criterion 5 will be considered contributory to Criterion 4 (Capacity Building)

Criterion 6: Influence on and contributions to the academic and broader national/international community		
	Associate Professor	Full Professor
a. Evidence of capacity to build productive research collaboration OR	Evidence of collaborative research activity indicating a developing national research profile.	The candidate for full professor should be able to demonstrate participation in productive research networks. Productivity can be judged by publication output, grant money, and training opportunities or funding for students.
b. Publicly engaged academic work OR	Evidence of activity such as public presentations, collaboration with local community organizations, libraries, or schools, or publication or interviews in media outlets, as well as development of websites or blogs to disseminate research and information to the public.	It is a larger responsibility as faculty and paid scientists to engage with the public either directly or indirectly, toward some greater good. This may take the form of public presentations, scientific task forces, collaboration with practitioners in the community, schools, government, or local social service organizations, informed by our research work. Candidate may also develop websites or blogs to disseminate research and information to the public.
c. Leadership contributions to national disciplinary academic associations or to the disciplinary community	Evidence of emerging connections, with disciplinary academic associations or the disciplinary community, for example, conference participation, organization of panels at conferences, serving on conference committees; or evaluating article and book submissions for journals and academic presses, etc.	Evidence that the faculty member has established a prominent position within national disciplinary academic associations or the disciplinary community in the form of: chairing panels at conferences, conference organization, the giving of keynote addresses; or holding office in national or international disciplinary academic associations, sitting on the board of editors for journals, editing series for academic presses, etc.

Criterion 1: Design and Planning of Learning Activities

Planning, development, and preparation of learning activities, learning resources and materials for a course, course or degree program, including coordination, involvement in leadership, or curriculum design and development

	Accordate Duefocco	Dueferson
	Associate Professor	Professor
Clarity and appropriateness of course materials (e.g., course outlines, course materials posted online, instructions and resources for assignments, texts, or teaching materials assigned to the class)	Learning materials are consistently well-aligned, effective, and stimulating. Activities reflect informed approach to learning design	Learning materials are consistently well-aligned, effective, and stimulating. Evidence of engagement with curriculum development and pedagogical innovation.
Sound and current course content and material ³	Sound and current course content and material, with evidence of practices to remain current	Meets the standard set for associate professor
Organization of class – effectiveness in providing activities to develop student learning	Course is organized in such way that it clearly and effectively supports student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes, and are consistently at an appropriate level of difficulty	Meets the standard set for associate professor
Methods of assessment are clear, aligned with intended learning outcomes, at an appropriate level of difficulty, and reflect current disciplinary practice	Assessment activities were generally clear, well-aligned with learning outcomes, and appropriately challenging for the course level.	Meets the standard set for associate professor
Fulfils teaching responsibilities of faculty member under the collective agreement and bylaws	No evidence of repeated failure to fulfil teaching responsibilities, including any patterns of irregularities outlined in performance reviews.	Meets the standard set for associate professor

³ Committees will take into account the degree to which instructors are teaching within or outside their areas of expertise, and evidence of efforts to ensure that, in this situation, the content is sufficiently robust to meet students' needs.

Criterion 2: Teaching and Supporting Student Learning and Departmental NeedsQuality teaching, including lecturing, classroom, on-line, workshop, and applied activities, undergraduate and graduate teaching.

and graduate teaching.		
	Associate Professor	Professor
Clarity and stimulation of interest	Students indicate that instruction is generally easy to follow and interesting.	Meets the standard set for associate professor
Evidence of creation of environments in which students feel and show respect and feel that they can ask questions	Evidence from students and/or peers indicates that the instructor has created a respectful environment with evidence of opportunities for student interaction.	Meets the standard set for associate professor
Supporting students in reaching goals for the course	Evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning, for example, which may be manifested by embedding principles of cultural diversity; equality; indigenous culture and traditions; support for students with special needs; or support for students in transition (e.g., 1st year).	Meets the standard set for associate professor
Timely and constructive feedback is provided to students	Student feedback or other evidence is timely and regular and was consistently appropriate to the nature of the course. Feedback provided useful guidance regarding how to improve for future work. 4	Meets the standard set for associate professor
Student perceptions of teaching	Instructor SET/SPT scores average 5.0 or higher in three out of four years prior of the tenure track period. *SET and SPT scores should be assessed in context: size of class, difficulty of subject material, required vs. elective status, and grading strictness should be taken into account in interpreting scores. It should also be recognized that racial, gender, and cultural diversity have been shown to affect student perceptions of teaching. Overall, the teaching dossier should be a privileged means of assessment.	Instructor SET/SPT scores average 5.0 or higher in 75% of courses in five of the six years leading up to submission.

1 Sychology Department KTT Citedia 2023: Teaching		
Availability for consultation (e.g.,	Evidence that the instructor has	Meets the standard set for
email, online, office hours,	established and communicated clear	associate professor
telephone)	and reasonable expectations with	·
	regard being available to students,	
	and conformity with expectations	
	under the collective agreement.	
Contributes to both the graduate	Pre-tenure faculty should have	Continues to contribute to both the
and undergraduate curriculum	taught multiple undergraduate	undergraduate and graduate (if
through teaching in both.	courses.	applicable) curriculum through
		teaching.

⁴ Committees are entitled to take into consideration the nature and size of the course in assessing this indicator.

Criterion 3: Integration of Scholarship, Research, or Professional Activities with Teaching			
	Associate Professor	Professor	
Integration of scholarship, research, or professional activities in pedagogical practices	For clinical faculty, process of registration in Ontario must begin in first year and must be registered to be tenured. Must maintain for consideration of promotion to full professor.	Meets the standard set for associate professor	
	Inclusion of ONE of: Current, discipline-based research forms a regular and integrated part of course content which also engage students with a culture of inquiry; or		
	Professional, industry, and work-based practice and experiences are incorporated in the curriculum; well-aligned with intended learning outcomes.		

Criterion 4: Continuing Professional Development and Efforts to Improve Individual Practice and Department Teaching Culture			
	Associate Professor	Professor	
Evidence of teaching related professional development	First renewal minimum): Discuss SET/SPT scores with AAU head Evidence of use of SET /SPTdata to identify areas for improvement and documentation of efforts to improve in those areas. Evidence of incorporation of feedback into classroom practice for improvement purposes. Feedback might include: analysis of SET/SPT data, other student comments or feedback, peer review of teaching, classroom observation, etc.	Has demonstrated a long-term commitment to continually improve his or her own teaching through activities such as self-directed reading, workshops, forums, conferences, or peer-led activities intended to enhance teaching and learning.	
Evidence of efforts to improve teaching and student learning in the department or beyond	*It should be recognized that Indigenous and other EDID faculty participate in a specialized way in curriculum renewal in developing courses and programs, often from the start of their careers, an extension of the teaching mission that should be credited.	Has contributed to the growth of knowledge and practice in teaching and learning within the department or beyond, for example through an inquiry-based approach to teaching and learning, presentations, publications, mentorship, or other leadership activities.	

The department will also comment on investigated student complaints, unusual patterns of student withdrawal, and other matters related to collective agreement responsibilities in his/her/their review, and these will form part of committee decision making.

Criterion 1: Service and leadership contributions to the department and University			
Indicators	Standard: Associate Professor (Level A)	Standard: Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)	
Scope and quantity of service is consistent with the requirements of the Faculty	Substantial service to Department of Psychology is mandatory. Faculty are encouraged to contribute at the University level. Clinical supervision of early-career faculty should be considered in this area.	Chairing departmental committees is mandatory for full professor as well as some service to the university, WUFA, or the profession.	
	*It should be recognized that Indigenous and EDID faculty often have heavier service loads in that the burden of program change in the interests of equity and representation tends to fall on the members of designated groups, often at the start of their careers. This service being critical to the mission of the university and the betterment of society, it should be given due weight in relation to teaching and research.		
Evidence of willingness to undertake necessary Faculty responsibilities, particularly those that are sometimes considered to be more onerous or challenging	Willing to undertake necessary Faculty responsibilities, both at the undergraduate and graduate level, particularly those that are sometimes considered to be more onerous or challenging.	Evidence of consistent responsibility, leadership, initiative, and agency in undertaking Faculty responsibilities, particularly those that are sometimes considered to be more onerous or challenging. Faculty must have taken on a leadership responsibility such as department head, undergraduate studies chair, graduate studies chair, clinical training director, or area coordinator ⁵ .	
Effectiveness and impact of an individual's service and contributions	Evidence of tangible, quality contributions to the smooth operation and/or positive growth of the Department or the University.	Evidence of tangible, quality contributions to the smooth operation and/or positive growth of the Department through chairing a committee competently.	
Effective collaboration and teamwork	Evidence of efforts to work collaboratively - and efforts to	Evidence of efforts to work collaboratively, provide peer mentorship	

	Service	
	enhance faculty, staff, and student sense of belonging and fairness.	(including mentoring related to teaching, research, or grant reviews), and systematic efforts to enhance faculty, staff, and student sense of belonging and fairness.
Evidence of willingness to serve competently on university committees.	At the Associate level, candidates may opt for university service, such as sitting on Senate, search committees, etc. This activity is not mandatory pretenure.	Evidence of competent service on a university level committee. This may be through service on various smaller committees (e.g., search committees) or term service on committees such as Senate or PDC, or a leadership role on a university level committee.
Evidence of the individual's reputation for integrity in service	Professional service to the community is consistent with Senate Bylaws and the Collective Agreement.	Professional service to the community is consistent with Senate Bylaws and the Collective Agreement.

⁵ Candidates can make a case for a combination of other responsibilities that constitute a similar level of contribution.

Criterion 2: Contributions to or Engagement with the Community: Community activities that engage with organizations or publics at large involving professional skills and knowledge or creating links between scholarship and programs in the University and those in the community

between scholarship and programs in the University and those in the community			
Indicators	Standard:	Standard:	
	Associate Professor (Level A)	Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)	
Evidence of willingness to engage with communities, broadly defined	Evidence of contributions at the local, provincial, national, or international levels. Examples of service might include membership on non-profit organizations or advocacy groups, mental health organizations, or agencies.	Evidence of significant contributions at the local, provincial, national, or international levels.	
	*In the case of Indigenous faculty and other EDID faculty, the research, teaching, and community service are more vitally integrated than in traditional Western models, and this should be recognized in assessing the triad.		
Evidence of the impact of an individual's service and contributions	Examples of impact might include: contributions to policy; consultation with non-profits, successful external community-based projects, and/or use of research in policy, pro-bono professional work, funding consultations, or mentorship/supervision of practitioners in the community	Examples of impact might include: contributions to policy; consultation with non-profits, successful external community-based projects, and/or use of research in policy, pro-bono clinical work, funding consultations, or mentorship/supervision of practitioners in the community	
Evidence of the individual's reputation for integrity in service	Professional service to the community is consistent with CPA/APA ethical guidelines.	Professional service to the community is consistent with CPA/APA ethical guidelines.	

Criterion 3: Contributions to one's professional or disciplinary societies and/or the psychology-sector more broadly		
Indicators	Standard:	Standard:
	Associate Professor (Level A)	Promotion to Full Professor (Level B)
Evidence of willingness to engage with communities, professional or disciplinary societies, and/or the justice sector more broadly	Evidence of regular service contributions at the local, provincial, national, or international levels. Examples of service may include: board membership of academic or professional organizations, editorial board membership, and disciplinary conference organization. Leadership roles in activities under this criterion should be noted in candidates' research statements as well in the service statement with the candidate indicating how the activity should be counted (research/service).	Evidence of regular service contributions at the local, provincial, national, or international levels. Examples of service may include board membership of academic or professional organizations, editorial board membership, and disciplinary conference organization. Leadership roles in activities under this criterion should be noted in candidates' research statements as well in the service statement with the candidate indicating how the activity should be counted (research/service). These activities are expected at the professor level.
Evidence of the impact of an individual's service	Examples of the impact of an individual's service may include contributions to the development of policies, procedures, and mechanisms to support disciplinary practice; evidence of contributions to the development of programs, services, and resources for practitioners; and the organization of disciplinary events.	Examples of the impact of an individual's service may include contributions to the development of policies, procedures, and mechanisms to support disciplinary practice; evidence of contributions to the development of programs, services, and resources for practitioners; and the organization of disciplinary events.
Evidence of a reputation for integrity in service	A reputation for competence and integrity in service may be demonstrated through election or appointment by disciplinary peers, invited memberships on boards or committees, engagement with equity and inclusion within the discipline, or evidence that service has been valued by interdisciplinary peers.	A reputation for competence and integrity in service may be demonstrated through election or appointment by disciplinary peers, invited memberships on boards or committees, engagement with equity and inclusion within the discipline, or evidence that service has been valued by interdisciplinary peers.