SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK RTP CRITERIA – TEACHING INTENSIVE FACULTY

For tenure-track Teaching Intensive faculty only hired on or after July 1, 2023

Contents

School of Social Work, University of Windsor
Criteria for Contract Renewal, Tenure & Promotion
Teaching Intensive Tenure-Track Faculty (hired on or after July 1, 2023)
Approved by School Council April 26, 2023

Approved by UCAPT May 25, 2023

1.0 Introduction:

Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion awards recognize professional excellence in an individual's academic career. No single model can fully delineate competence and excellence across all disciplines. Standards for achievement of tenure and promotion reflect the variety of practice, context, and endeavours typical of a diverse and accomplished faculty complement. The evaluation of candidates for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion must reflect their assignment. The specific profile, and teaching context of specific researchers may also be taken into account in identifying the critical determining factors.

This document establishes the assessment criteria for Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion in the School of Social Work at the University of Windsor. The School of Social Work intends this document to be consistent with the University of Windsor Senate approved Tenure and Promotion criteria and procedures outlined in Bylaw 23, and to supplement those criteria.

1.2 School of Social Work: Adjudication Process
Faculty members in the School of Social Work will be assessed with regards to their contributions in two general areas of activity: teaching and service. The Committee will consider the candidate's teaching dossier, the parts of the ECV that relate to teaching and service, the Head's evaluation of teaching and service, and the evaluations of three external reviewers, as well as the RTP submission components outlined in the UCAPT Resource Guide**. It is the candidate's responsibility to make a case for their promotion**. The department will offer preliminary opportunities for readings of submitted documents to suggest areas that might benefit from more complete documentation.

The Committee will take an equity-informed approach in its assessments. 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 instances where 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 Social Work-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 primarily but not exclusively reflected in the production of written work")[1] or a dual academic tradition which combines both conventional and traditional Indigenous approaches to research ("a dual tradition scholar 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")[2]. 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.

The School of Social Work's Renewal, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee will use the following scale, based on the rating system employed in the University's UCAPT rating system, in determining recommendations for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion in each of teaching and service:

- Excellence (6 to 7 on 7-point scale)
- Good/ (5 to 5.9 on 7-point scale)
- Competent/Good: (4 to 4.9 on 7-point scale)
- Poor: (1 to 3.9 on 7-point scale)

Successful performance for promotion to full professor will focus on the period when the candidate held the position of associate professor but will take into consideration the candidate's entire career. It is expected that normally a candidate for full professor will have spent a minimum of five years at the associate professor rank. Evaluation of the candidate will be based on the relevant Senate bylaws and the Collective Agreement. See Bylaw 23, section 6 and Article 13 of the Collective Agreement for relevant details.

1.3 Cross-Category Contributions
Within the profession of Social Work, contributions to the organization of scholarly meetings, research networks, and the funding of important projects supporting students and collaborators have both a service component and a scholarly component when the contribution is a service in which intellectual skills and scholarly background are necessary. Similarly, contributions to the development of teaching (through, for example, involvement at the Centre for Teaching and Learning) do not constitute direct teaching or supervision of students (the core of the teaching area) but are nevertheless contributions to teaching, just as they constitute service work.

The School of Social Work RTP Committee will be guided by the case made by the candidate, but that generally speaking candidates should ensure that any given contribution is only considered in one area.

---

[1] This definition is drawn from Trent University's 'Indigenous Studies Tenure Process and Criteria' document (2015).

[2] Ibid.

1.4 Hybrid Appointments

In the case of hybrid appointments between disciplines within the university, both disciplines will contribute to the evaluation of the candidate. See Bylaw 22, Section 3.1.2.

In the case of hybrid appointments involving the university and an outside agency, expectations regarding teaching and service will be adjusted to reflect the proportion of the candidate's time committed to the School of Social Work.

2.0 Evaluation of Teaching

2.1 Sources of Evidence:

The assessment of successful teaching performance when considering a faculty member for tenure and promotion will take into account the following sources of evidence:

1. A teaching portfolio prepared by the candidate;
2. Three external letters of reference
3. Student evaluations of courses taught by the faculty member (SET scores, Teaching Dossier, Teaching Awards);
4. Syllabi of the candidate's courses (the candidate is encouraged to include electronic information, such as reading lists or exam information);
5. The candidate's CV;
6. Peer reviews of the candidate's teaching by the head of the department, by other members of their department, or by the candidate's dean or representative of the dean;
7. Other relevant documents submitted by the candidate. At the full professor level, this should include evidence of the candidate's role in curriculum development or other educational leadership activities.

The use of a teaching dossier allows candidates to make the case that they meet the standards set out below, using multiple forms of evidence. The general expectation is that candidates will provide evidence demonstrating effective practice across all the criteria. Candidates are referred to the UCAPT-approved teaching dossier template, and may also wish to contact the Centre for Teaching and Learning for assistance. A teaching dossier may include the following non-exhaustive list of useful forms of evidence of effective practice and contributions to teaching: self-evaluation; Peer evaluations (by AAU Director and/or colleagues); student evaluation procedures in addition to the SET (e.g., course and/or degree exit surveys); evidence of direction of student work (e.g., senior assignment projects, special topics courses); evidence of high level of student achievement (e.g., student work recognized, accepted to conferences, published); records of PhD Supervision/chair and PhD committee member; evidence of good departmental citizenship (such as teaching introductory or service courses); participation in co-curricular academic activities (e.g., advisement of student organizations, participation in conversation hours and electronic bulletin boards); documentation of relevant awards and recognition received; evidence of innovations and their impact (e.g., new teaching methods, the design of new courses, addition of topical readings); record of participation in academic conferences geared towards pedagogical enhancement and innovation; and any other appropriate evidence of teaching excellence.

The Committee will also consider the AAU heads' evaluation of candidates' teaching effectiveness as well as the head's comments on investigated student's complaints, unusual patterns of withdrawal from the candidate's classes; or other which the AAU Head deems relevant.

2.2 Criteria for Evaluation

The Committee, utilizing the rating scale outlined above, will judge teaching on six criteria. For tenure, candidates must reach a level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) on all criteria. For full professorships, candidates must reach a level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7)

Criterion 1. Design and planning of learning activities

Criterion 2. Instructional Methods

Criterion 3. Assessment and giving feedback to students

Criterion 4. Developing effective environments, student support and guidance

Criterion 5. Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and in support of learning

Criterion 6. Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development

A rubric for the assessment of these criteria has been provided on pp. 9-14

2.3 General Considerations for Decision Making:

In assessing teaching, the Committee will be cognizant of and value various teaching methodologies. It is assumed that the "best practices" will be those that work for the candidate and enable students to acquire the intended course learning outcomes. Innovation in teaching is assessed through an examination of information on the development of new courses in new areas for the School and on the development of new pedagogical tools and teaching techniques. The School of Social Work values teaching that results in substantive knowledge acquisition and the development of strong study, research and critical analysis skills, with an emphasis on the latter.

The University of Windsor does not have a minimum standard for teaching. However, notwithstanding a consideration of diversity issues described above, a rating of Competence in teaching would normally require SET ratings consistently at or above 4 on the 7-point scale and contributions to student development. The committee will strongly consider other sources of variation, such as whether the course is undergraduate or graduate, class size, experimental and new in developing curriculum, as opposed to established within a curriculum that provides broad support for the course in question.

Therefore, the Committee will take into account significant variations in teaching context in assessing instructional competence. This may include factors such as the number of new course preparations compared to the norm, new or experimental curricula, classroom design suitability, course format, required or large-enrolment courses, courses that have traditionally been difficult or uncomfortable for students, the relative correspondence between course content and the candidate's areas of specialization and, with respect to student perceptions of teaching effectiveness, social context (this may include social markers of race, gender, indigeneity, disability and sexuality). The use of multiple forms of evidence to support a case for teaching effectiveness is important in ensuring equitable and fair decision making.

Undergraduate and graduate research supervision is an important component of faculty teaching responsibilities. Evaluation of this role requires examination of both the quantity and quality of research supervision, based on quantitative data such as the number of collaborative student-faculty research presentations and publications with undergraduate and graduate supervisees. As with classroom teaching, some faculty may attract and excel in undergraduate research supervision, while other faculty may be engaged in research supervision primarily with graduate students. Some faculty may supervise student research within a relatively narrow area, while others may supervise students exploring a wide range of topic areas.

Additionally, faculty members are often engaged as instructors of graduate students who are in field placements or internships. The capacity to effectively teach and liaise with students who are applying the knowledge and skills of social work is considered an important contribution to the academic preparation of graduate level students and will form one aspect of the teaching assessment for candidates.

A rubric for the assessment of these criteria has been provided on p. 9-14.

Please refer to Appendix A, *Teaching and Advising Activities*, which provides a sample set of comparative indicators of teaching and advising contrasting competence with excellence.

Table 1: School of Social Work Teaching Evaluation Rubric
Each page of the rubric provides descriptors for the indicators associated with one criterion.

Criterion 1 Standard for (level): *At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 4 out of 5 criteria at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full*

Criterion 1: Design and planning of learning activities				
	Poor (1-3)	**Competent (4)**	**Good (5-6)**	**Excellent (7)**
i. Preparation of teaching and learning materials	Teaching and learning materials and activities show little evidence of thoughtful or systematic design in candidate's assigned courses.	Some evidence of capacity to design effective and well-aligned teaching and learning materials and activities in assigned courses.	In assigned courses teaching and learning materials are consistently well aligned, effective, and stimulating. Activities reflect informed approach to pedagogy.	Teaching and learning materials and activities are exceptionally well designed and often innovative, possibly reflecting leadership in curriculum development and pedagogical innovation
ii. Course outline clearly details learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment	Course outlines are inconsistent with bylaw and policy, and do not clearly outline intended learning outcomes, learning activities and assessment	Course outlines are generally consistent with bylaw and policy, and outline intended learning outcomes, activities, and assessments with a degree of clarity	Consistently in compliance with bylaw and policy, outlines show the alignment of materials, activities, and assessments with intended course learning outcomes.	Consistently in compliance with bylaw and policy, course outlines are highly readable, and clearly explain how materials, activities, and assessment align with the intended learning outcomes.
iii. Planned learning activities designed to develop the students' learning	Planned learning activities do not or rarely appear to be designed to support student acquisition of the course's intended learning outcomes, including an appropriate difficulty level	Planned learning activities appear to be intended to foster student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes, but may not do so consistently	Planned learning activities clearly and effectively support student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes, and are consistently at an appropriate level of difficulty	Planned learning activities consistently and systematically support student acquisition of a course's intended learning outcomes and may also provide flexibility to further support or challenge diverse learners
iv. Sound knowledge of the course content and material[3]	Limited knowledge of the course content and material	Reasonable knowledge of the course content and material, some areas of weakness	Sound knowledge of the course content and material, with evidence of practices to remain current	Deep knowledge of the course content and material, with evidence of serious efforts to acquire depth of knowledge and remain current
v. Preparation for class	Evidence of lack of preparation for class or frequent disorganization	Generally well-prepared for class and well-organized.	Consistently well-prepared for class and well-organized	Consistently very well-prepared and organized in regard to all aspects of course development

---

[3] The committee is entitled to take into account evidence from the candidate's teaching context statement indicating the degree to which the faculty member has taken on teaching outside of their area of expertise in service to departmental needs.

Criterion 2 Standard for (level): *At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 5 out of 6 at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full*

Criterion 2: Instructional Methods				
	Poor (1-3)	**Competent (4)**	**Good (5-6)**	**Excellent (7)**
i. Learning-centered approach: Demonstrates understanding and application of specific aspects of effective teaching and learning support methods.	Very little evidence of efforts to support and enhance student learning	Some awareness of effective methods to support student learning, with uneven application of those methods	Consistent awareness and application of effective approaches to supporting and enhance learning	Highly effective and often innovative support and enhancement of learning
ii. Clarity of communication and explanation	Lack of clarity identified	Adequate or uneven clarity	Consistent clarity	Exceptional clarity
iii. Stimulation of interest SET A.6.	Students report disinterest or general decrease of interest over courses	Students' interest was generally maintained over courses, or trends were uneven	Students generally indicated interest or increased interest in the courses taught.	Student interest nearly always increased, or course feedback indicated high level of interest in the course
iv. Encouragement of appropriate student-faculty interaction	Little or no evidence of efforts to encourage student-faculty interaction[4] or interactions that inhibit learning	Some evidence of efforts to encourage student-faculty interaction [2]	Consistent effort to encourage appropriate student-faculty interaction[2]	Consistent evidence of highly effective and innovative efforts to encourage student-faculty interaction[2]
v. Encouragement of appropriate student-student interaction	Little or no evidence efforts to encourage appropriate student-student interaction[2]	Some evidence efforts to encourage appropriate student-student interaction[2]	Consistent evidence of efforts to encourage appropriate student-faculty interaction[2]	Consistent evidence of highly effective and innovative efforts to encourage appropriate student-faculty interaction [2]
vi. Supports students to develop and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes	Little or no evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning	Some evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning	Consistent evidence that instructional practices support student development of intended learning	Consistent evidence of highly effective and innovative efforts to support student development of intended learning

---

[2] Appropriate to the courses involved the committee will also consider Peer evaluations (by AAU Director and/or colleagues); student evaluation procedures in addition to the SET (e.g., course and/or degree exit surveys); evidence of direction of student work (e.g., senior assignment projects, special topics courses); evidence of high level of student achievement (e.g., student work recognized, accepted to conferences, published); records of PhD Supervision/chair and PhD committee member; evidence of good departmental citizenship (such as teaching introductory or service courses); participation in co-curricular academic activities (e.g., advisement of student organizations, participation in conversation hours and electronic bulletin boards); documentation of relevant awards and recognition received; evidence of innovations and their impact (e.g., new teaching methods, the design of new courses, addition of topical readings); record of participation in academic conferences geared towards pedagogical enhancement and innovation; and any other appropriate evidence of teaching excellence.

Criterion 3 Standard for (level): *At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 3 out of 3 criteria at the level of Good/ (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.*

Criterion 3: Assessment and giving feedback to students				
	Poor (1-3)	**Competent (4)**	**Good (5-6)**	**Excellent (7)**
i. Quality of assessment tools • Clarity • Alignment with learning outcomes • Appropriate level of difficulty	Assessment activities were hard to follow, poorly aligned with intended learning outcomes, or of an inappropriate level of difficulty	Assessment activities were inconsistent in terms of clarity, alignment, or appropriateness of difficulty, but generally appeared to be reasonable for the course level.	Assessment activities were generally clear, well-aligned with learning outcomes, and appropriately challenging for the course level.	Assessment activities were clear, well aligned, appropriately challenging, and provided innovative opportunities for student learning,
ii. Timely feedback is provided to students	Feedback is not timely – late and infrequent.	Assignment feedback is generally timely.	Assignment feedback is timely and occurs several times through the course.	Feedback is proactive, ongoing, and timely.
iii. Constructive feedback is provided to students[5]	Constructive feedback appropriate to the nature of the course was rarely or never provided to students, or was not constructive for future improvement	Assignment feedback was appropriate to the nature of the course and generally provided useful guidance to help students to know how to improve, including some strengths and weaknesses.	Student feedback or other evidence suggests that assignment feedback was consistently appropriate to the nature of the course and provided useful guidance regarding how to improve for future work.	Assignment feedback was appropriate to the nature of the course, detailed, balanced appropriately with strengths and weaknesses and provided systematic and highly effective guidance regarding how to improve

---

[5] Format and delivery appropriate to the courses involved

Criterion 4 Standard for (level): *At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 3 out of 3 criteria at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.*

		Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
Criterion 4: Developing effective environments, student support and guidance					
i.	Availability for consultation (e.g. email, online, face-to-face or telephone) in a timely manner	Rarely available for consultation outside of class time (face-to-face, online, or by telephone)	Somewhat available outside of class time: response patterns may be uneven.	Available to students outside of class time with evidence of systematic approaches to ensuring availability to students	Makes exceptional and systematic efforts to be available to students
ii.	Effective advisor/counsellor/supervisor	Ineffective as an advisor, student counsellor, or supervisor	Somewhat effective as an advisor, student counsellor, or supervisor	Generally perceived by students and peers to be effective, supportive, and knowledgeable as an advisory, student counsellor, or supervisor	Recognized by students and peers as a key advisor, student counsellor, and supervisor
iii.	Demonstration of respect for students and systematic attention to ensuring students demonstrate respect for others	Evidence of habitual insensitivity to student concerns or to students	Demonstrates a satisfactory degree of respect for students and some attempts to ensure students demonstrate respect for their peers	Actively and explicitly works to establish respectful practices and interactions with students and among students	Highly effective leader and mentor in the establishment of respectful learning and responsive learning environments with students and among students.

Criterion 5 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 3 out of 4 criteria at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.

Criterion 5: Integration of professional activities with teaching and in support of learning				
	Poor (1-3)	**Competent (4)**	**Good (5-6)**	**Excellent (7)**
i. Teaching and learning research incorporated into teaching practice	Teaching and planning shows no awareness of research on teaching	Occasional incorporation of ideas or practices based on teaching and learning research into practice	Research on teaching and learning forms a regular source for planning and decision making in teaching and course design, and informal inquiry forms an element of teaching improvement practice.	Teaching and learning practices is consistently driven by knowledge of the research, and by an inquiry-based approach to teaching and learning which may also have resulted in publications or presentations of teaching research.
ii. Inclusion of discipline-based research in the curriculum and engagement of students in pedagogically sound discipline-based research	Discipline-based research or creative practice is absent from the course curriculum or is not current	Discipline-based research or creative practice is somewhat evident in the course curriculum, and is somewhat current	Current, discipline-based research or creative practice forms a regular and integrated part of the curriculum	Cutting-edge discipline-based research is frequently and effectively incorporated in the course
iii. Incorporation of professional experiences into teaching practice and the curriculum	Professional experiences are not incorporated into the curriculum but were intended to be.	Professional experiences are somewhat incorporated into the curriculum but may not be well-aligned with intended learning outcomes or well supported.	Professional experiences are well incorporated in the curriculum, well-aligned with intended learning outcomes, and well supported.	Professional experiences are very effectively incorporated in the curriculum offering a highly integrated, well-supported, and exceptional learning opportunity for students.

Criterion 6 Standard for (level): *At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; 2 out of 2 criteria at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.*

		Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
Criterion 6: Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development					
i.	Participation in teaching related professional development	No evidence of participation in teaching related professional development	Some evidence of participation in workshops, forums, conferences, or peer-led activities intended to enhance teaching and learning	Consistent efforts have been made to engage in professional development related to teaching systematically over time, e.g., self-directed reading, workshops, forums, conferences, or peer-led activities intended to enhance teaching and learning	High degree of engagement and initiative with regard to teaching-related professional development, which may include leadership and facilitation of workshops and other events, as well as peer-reviewed conference presentations or publications on teaching and learning, and potentially grants related to teaching and learning initiatives
iii.	Self-evaluation leading to changes in teaching practice. Available in the teaching dossier under 3. Teaching Development item #2.	Very little evidence of efforts to enhance teaching skills or of self-reflection regarding teaching.	Able to provide several examples of changes to teaching practice based on reflection or engagement with professional development	Evidence of a consistently thoughtful and reflective approach to teaching, with ongoing examples of efforts to improve teaching emanating from that approach.	Evidence of an ongoing commitment to improvement-oriented and evidence-based practices based in a scholarly approach to teaching and teaching inquiry.

3.0 Evaluation of Service

This category includes all forms of professional service performed for the benefit of the School of Social Work, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the University of Windsor, the profession, and the public. The faculty members of the School of Social Work recognize a continuous obligation to provide service through its professional knowledge and skills, as well as growing demand for this service.

3.1 Sources of Evidence:

Service (for tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Full Professor)

The assessment of successful service performance when considering a faculty member for tenure and promotion will take into account several sources of evidence:

1. The candidate's CV
2. A report from the Department Head
3. Other relevant documents submitted by the candidate: a statement of service goals, activities, and impact written by the candidate is strongly recommended.

As a guide to candidates for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion, a partial list of activities that may be recognized in the area of service follows:

- Efforts to promote partnerships and engagement with public and/or community organizations
- Consultative or other service to any level of public or private institutions or professional organizations
- Participation in School of Social Work committees
- Advising Social Work students
- Service as Director or Coordinator of the School
- Member of Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Coordinating Council (FCC) or Faculty of Graduate Studies Graduate Council
- Advising students in School and University recognized student groups
- Service on FAHSS or University task forces
- Service as Dean, Associate Dean
- Participation in University governance
- Participation in University-wide committees
- Participation as a member of Faculty Senate or Graduate Council
- Activities in professional organizations
- Advising or assisting civic organizations in support of the School and/or University Missions
- Public outreach and community activities in support of the School and/or University Mission
- Activities in support of the advancement of the profession and/or professional education
- Activities in support of recruitment

As a professional discipline it is highly recommended that at a minimum, Social Work faculty members become members of the Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE). As well, faculty members are highly encouraged to become members of the Ontario Association of Social Workers (OASW) and seek registration with the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers

(OCSWSSW). In addition to the aforementioned, faculty members may also consider becoming members in other highly prestigious professional discipline specific associations such as the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Directors (BPD), the Society for Social Work Research (SSWR), the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) and the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW). As well, faculty members are encouraged to consider memberships in other credible professional associations relevant to their specific areas of scholarship and/or research.

Evidence of a developing reputation for excellence in professional service beyond the local level should be presented. As mentioned earlier, a distinction should be drawn between routine service, or citizenship, and service projects that relate to scholarship. Examples might include shaping public policy, serving clients in some exceptional way, working with public organizations to bring about substantial and significant change. In all of these instances, scholarly service should be shown to contribute to knowledge creation, transfer, and dissemination.

As pointed out earlier, the School of Social Work does not recommend that candidates take positions of heavy service responsibility prior to establishing substantial competencies in and teaching. However, there may be circumstances due to under resourcing in which the School of Social Work has no choice but to call upon the candidate to assume significant service responsibilities. In such circumstances, the Social Work RTP Committee will acknowledge the candidate's service contributions and evaluate scholarship and teaching competencies within this exceptional context.

Please refer to Appendix B, *Service Activity*, which provides a sample set of comparative indicators of service contrasting competence with excellence.

3.2 Criteria for Evaluation

The Committee, utilizing the rating scale outlined above, will judge teaching on one criterion. For tenure, candidates must reach a level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) on all criteria. For full professorships, candidates must reach a level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7)

Criterion 1: Service to the operation of the department, the faculty, university, professional academic community, and professional practice community

A rubric for the assessment of these criteria has been provided on p. 17.

Table 2: School of Social Work Service Evaluation Rubric

As a professional program, the Social Work RTP Committee will recognize some variation in terms of service emphasis to the AAU, university, community, and/or profession. The rubric provides descriptors for the indicators associated with each criterion.

Criterion 1 Standard for (level): At the level of Competent (4) to Good (5-6) for Tenure; at the level of Good (5-6) to Excellent (7) for Full.

Criterion 1: Service to the operation of the department, the faculty, university, professional academic community, professional practice community				
	Poor (1-3)	Competent (4)	Good (5-6)	Excellent (7)
i. Service to the operation of the department, FAHSS, university, professional academic community, professional practice community	There is little evidence of active participation and/or attendance in service to the department, FAHSS, university, professional academic community or professional practice community	Evidence of a spirit of co-operation to participate and meaningfully contribute in a normal number of School of Social Work committee assignments. (e.g. 2 (as required in the SSW) or more)	In addition to the previous criteria: • Evidence of having done an exceptional job in significant positions; • Other roles e.g., Student recruitment/ retention activities/Accreditation/ IQAP Committee/ Chair. • Service to the academic professional community (university, local, national, and international) • Service to the professional practice community (local, national, and international)	In addition to the previous criteria: • Strong evidence of having done an exceptional job in significant positions. In the School of Social Work these positions may include BSW Program Coordinator, Disabilities Studies Coordinator, MSW and MSW/JD Program Coordinator, On-Campus, MSW Program Coordinator, Off-Campus, or PhD Program Coordinator. • Evidence of an outstanding job in chairing/participating in University level committee(s) (FAHSS committee, REB, WUFA committee, Senate Student Caucus, or Senate Governance Committee). • Evidence of assuming a leadership role or being very active and supportive in developing and modifying curriculum and/or academic programs. • Evidence of a developing reputation for excellence in professional service beyond the local level should be presented. • Evidence of more than a routine amount, range, or depth of involvement in service and an assessment of the outstanding quality or effectiveness of that involvement.

Appendix A: Teaching and Advising Activities[6]

Indicators of Competence Examples	Indicators of Good/Excellence Examples
Average SET scores	Above Average SET scores
Participate in workshops to improve instruction	Deliver workshops to improve instruction
Nomination for teaching award	Receive teaching/achievement awards
Developing and sharing teaching materials	Publishing teaching materials

---

[6] This is a non-exhaustive list provided for illustrative purposes.

Appendix B: Service Activity[7]

Indicators of Competence Examples	Indicators of Good/Excellence Examples
Member of standing committee(s) of School Council other than Appointments and/or AAU RTP Committee	Member of Appointments and/or AAU RTP Committee and/or Chair of a standing committee of the School, Faculty, or University
Participate in the development of a new academic program	Initiate/develop a new academic program
Participate in accreditation process	Assume leadership role in accreditation process
Serve on committee to initiate/develop new academic program	Initiate/develop new academic program
Serve as faculty liaison to students on field placement/internship	Initiate/develop new field placement opportunities/settings
Member of professional discipline association (e.g., CASWE, OCSWSSW, OASW, etc.)	Taking formal leadership role in a professional discipline association committee or board (e.g., CASWE Board of Accreditation or OASW Standing Committee or Board of Directors, etc.)
Member of a community health or social service organization's Board of Directors	Officer of a community health or social service organization's Board of Directors
	Administrative role in the School of Social Work (e.g., Director or Coordinator)
	Administrative role in the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (e.g., Dean or Associate Dean)

---

[7] This is a non-exhaustive list provided for illustrative purposes.