



**UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

**COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Principles | 2 |
| B. Authority..... | 2 |
| C. Categories of Evaluation | 3 |
| Table A: Required Evaluation Categories | 3 |
| D. Standards For Each Category of Evaluation..... | 5 |
| 1. Academic Credentials | 5 |
| 2. Teaching Ability and Performance..... | 6 |
| Table B: Evaluation of Teaching | 7 |
| 3. Knowledge of the Discipline and Field of Specialization | 8 |
| Table C: Evaluation of Knowledge of the Discipline | 9 |
| 4. Research and Scholarly Work | 10 |
| Table D: Evaluation of Research | 11 |
| 5. Practice of Professional Skills..... | 12 |
| 5.1a Clinical Practice..... | 12 |
| Table E: Evaluation of Clinical Practice..... | 13 |
| 5.2a Scholarly Work associated with Clinical Practice: | 13 |
| Table F: Evaluation of Scholarly Work associated with Clinical Practice | 14 |
| 5.1b Educational Practice: | 15 |
| Table G: Evaluation of Educational Practice..... | 15 |
| 5.2b Scholarly Work associated with Educational Practice:..... | 16 |
| Table H: Evaluation of Scholarly Work associated with Educational Practice..... | 16 |
| 6. Contributions to the Administrative Responsibilities of the Department, College, University or Health Authority | 17 |
| Table I: Evaluation of Administrative Contributions to the Department, College, University or Health Authority..... | 18 |
| 7. Public Service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies | 19 |
| Table J: Evaluation of Public Service Contributions and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies..... | 20 |
| E. Process of Evaluation | 20 |
| Table K: Case File Check List..... | 21 |

A. PRINCIPLES

The award of tenure represents a long-term commitment of the University to a faculty member. It is a status granted as a result of judgement, by one's peers, on both the performance of academic duties and the expectation of future accomplishments. Promotion of colleagues involves an assessment of their success in performing their academic duties and an evaluation of the likelihood of future accomplishments.

Tenure and promotion both take place against a background of values most recently articulated in *A Framework for Planning at the University of Saskatchewan*, adopted by University Council in 1998. This document guides all of our decisions at the University of Saskatchewan including the collegial decisions of tenure and promotion, which are essential for the University's standing within the academic community. This document identified four major goals for the University.

- At the University of Saskatchewan, we have affirmed our intention to improve the quality of the instructional programs offered to students. This requires that considerable attention be paid to the evaluation of teaching to ensure that the instruction provided is, and continues to be, of high quality.
- At the University of Saskatchewan, we have affirmed that the "teacher-scholar" will be our adopted model for faculty development. This model builds on the principle that universities acquire their distinctive character through their capacity to unite scholarship with teaching. This capacity can only be realized by appropriate faculty personnel strategies, including those associated with tenure and promotion decisions.
- At the University of Saskatchewan, we have also affirmed that we will increase our research efforts. *A Framework for Planning* makes the following judgement: "At the University of Saskatchewan the commitment to research and scholarship needs to be intensified." To achieve this goal, we must ensure that our hopes are reflected in the standards that we set for ourselves.
- At the University of Saskatchewan, we have signaled our intention to respond to the needs of Aboriginal peoples. *A Framework for Planning* indicates that: "In Saskatchewan, the task of responding to specific, local needs and, simultaneously opening doors to the world, is particularly pressing in the context of Aboriginal peoples." To achieve this goal, we must ensure that the standards we adopt encourage the recruitment of Aboriginal peoples into academic positions and their successful career development.

In addition to these four broad goals, *A Framework for Planning* identifies three principles by which we must govern ourselves: autonomy, quality and accountability. At the University of Saskatchewan we believe that all of our decisions, including our collegial decisions, must take these principles into account. Finally, the University of Saskatchewan's Mission Statement indicates that we value interdisciplinary research and teaching and we should foster it within our institution. The Mission Statement highlights the four scholarships of teaching, discovery, integration, and application. This inclusive approach to scholarship is intended, among other things, to ensure that faculty who have interdisciplinary interests will be encouraged to pursue them and they will be taken into account and valued in the context of tenure and promotion considerations.

B. AUTHORITY

This document contains standards defining the expectations of performance for the award of tenure and promotion at the University of Saskatchewan.¹ The University Review Committee establishes the University's criteria and standards for renewal of probation, tenure, and promotion. Given the broad array of colleges and

A. PRINCIPLES

B. AUTHORITY

College of Medicine Standards for Promotion and Tenure **include and supplement** the University of Saskatchewan Standards for Promotion and Tenure for tenure-track, continuing status, with term, without term, and clinical faculty in the

disciplines represented at the University of Saskatchewan, differences will exist from department to department and from college to college. Colleges and departments will propose their own standards and these must be consistent with the intent and the framework of the University standards. All college standards must be approved by the University Review Committee before implementation at the college level. All department standards must be approved by the College Review Committee before implementation at the department level.

C. CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION

There are seven categories under which a candidate for tenure or promotion may be evaluated. These categories are:

1. Academic Credentials
2. Teaching Ability and Performance
3. Knowledge of Discipline and Field of Specialization
4. Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work
5. Practice of Professional Skills
6. (a) Contributions to Administrative Responsibilities of the Department, College or University
(b) Contributions to the Extension Responsibilities of the Department, College or University
7. Public Service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies

Standards of performance are established for each category in Section D below. All faculty are assessed under category four unless the letter of appointment states category five.

The categories in which candidates must meet the standards for tenure in the professorial ranks and for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor are shown in Table I. Each candidate will be evaluated for all categories that are applicable to the candidate's position and to the tenure or promotion decision under consideration. For a candidate to be awarded an overall rating of "meets the standard" for tenure and promotion they must have an overall rating of "meets the standard" in each and every category under consideration. If a department or college committee rates a candidate as "does not meet the standard" in any category they must vote no to the question "shall tenure or promotion be recommended". If there is *superior* performance in a category, or if there is a contribution where there is no requirement for one, this fact is seen as positive but does not compensate for failure to meet the standard in a required category.

Tenure will be awarded on the basis of three primary categories: academic credentials (Category One); effectiveness in teaching (Category Two); and, achievements in either research, scholarly and/or artistic work (Category Four) or practice of professional skills (Category Five). If faculty are being assessed in Category Five it will be stated in their letter of appointment. The promise of future development as a teacher, scholar and professional, achievement in scholarly activity beyond that demonstrated at appointment, and the attainment of a national or international reputation in the discipline, will be important criteria in the evaluation process.

Promotion through the ranks requires a judgement of performance against increasing expectations for effectiveness in teaching, significance of the scholarly or creative work, practice of a profession, and

College of Medicine. The college standards must be read in conjunction with the University Standards for Promotion and Tenure.

The college's Academic Programming Appointment Standards for Promotion and Tenure (approved June 29, 2011) and the college's School of Rehabilitation Science Standards for Promotion and Tenure (2011) are separate documents from these standards.

In these standards, the term 'Department Head' (DH) is understood to include, where applicable, those individuals named 'Provincial Heads' in the restructured Saskatchewan Health Authority. The abbreviation 'CoM' refers to the 'College of Medicine.'

In these standards, the term 'clinical faculty' refers to faculty appointees in the College of Medicine who are either MDs (or accepted equivalent) or clinical PhDs having direct or indirect responsibility for patient care. Academic appointment credentials may vary and are set by departments and/or the college, independent of these standards.

C. CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION

Consistent with the university's *teacher-scholar* model of faculty development, eligibility for tenure and promotion will require faculty to do teaching and scholarly work. Specific duties are determined at the time of appointment in discussion with the Department Head and are subject to approval by the Dean. Academic duties will naturally lie in the areas of expertise of the appointee and hence may change from time to time.

In compiling case files for review by departmental renewals and tenure committees, promotions committees, and the College Review Committee, it is essential that college faculty clearly state in their case files the relative emphasis placed on each of these activities, particularly in terms of time dedicated to each type of activity during the review period.

*TABLE A: Required Evaluation Categories **

| Evaluation Category | Required For: |
|--|--|
| Category 1: Academic and Professional Credentials | all faculty |
| Category 2: Teaching | all faculty |
| Category 3: Knowledge of the Discipline | all faculty |
| Category 4: Research and Scholarly Work | faculty primarily involved in research |
| Category 5.1a: Practice of Professional Skills: Clinical Practice | clinical faculty |

contributions to service within and outside the University community. With respect to teaching, research, scholarly and/or artistic work or practice of professional skills, candidates for promotion must have maintained and extended their knowledge of the discipline or field. In some cases, additional training and academic/professional credentials may be pre-requisites for promotion.

The standard for renewal of probationary appointments will be satisfactory progress towards meeting the tenure standards for the appropriate rank in all relevant categories. For this purpose, 'satisfactory progress' will be taken to mean that the candidate's teaching and research and scholarly activities indicate a reasonable likelihood that the tenure standards can be met within the allotted timeframe. If renewal of probation is not recommended, the Department Head or Dean (in non-departmentalized colleges) must demonstrate that the candidate has not made satisfactory progress towards the tenure standards for the appropriate rank.

In this document, the term college is understood to include both Graduate Schools and the University Library. Standards of performance and details of all categories for Librarian ranks are described in the University Library Standards; and, for Assistant Professors (Crop Development Centre – CDC), Associate Professors (CDC) and Professors (CDC) in the College of Agriculture and Bioresources standards. It is expected that these standards will parallel the progressive requirements of other members of faculty.

The requirements listed in Table I are considered a minimum. If a College Review Committee identifies more demanding requirements as appropriate for that college, it will submit a proposal to the University Review Committee. Because Table I does not provide requirements for tenure as Instructor, Lecturer or for promotion to Assistant Professor, in colleges where such appointments are common, the college standards will specify the minimum requirements. In other cases, the requirements for specific appointments should be established by the Search and Appointment Committees at the time of appointment.

These standards introduce a **requirement** for the creation of a **tenure or promotion case file** which describes the candidate's philosophy, activities, achievements, and plans in the categories of teaching, research and/or scholarly work or practice of professional skills, and other relevant categories (i.e., administration, extension and public service) and which describes the committees' evaluation, both qualitative and quantitative, of the candidate. One tenure or promotion case file will be submitted for each candidate under consideration. See Section E for a description of the required documentation.

| | |
|---|--|
| Category 5.2a: Scholarly Work associated with Clinical Practice | clinical faculty |
| Category 5.1b: Practice of Professional Skills: Educational Practice | faculty primarily involved in the theory and practice of medical education |
| Category 5.2b: Scholarly Work associated with Educational Practice | faculty undertaking scholarly work in medical education |
| Category 6: Administration | all faculty |
| Category 7: Public Service and Service to Professional Bodies | all faculty for promotion; none for tenure as assistant professor |
| <i>* further explanations for required evaluation categories are provided for Categories 4 and 5 in those sections of these standards</i> | |

NOTE:

For faculty with allocated time dedicated to specific activities (e.g. research, teaching, administration, clinical activity), the allocated Percentage Full Time Equivalent (% FTE) for each activity should be clearly stated on the candidate's cover page.

TABLE I- REQUIRED CATEGORIES

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
|--|--|---------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | Academic/ Professional Credentials | Teach- ing | Knowledge of Discipline | Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work | Practice of Professional Skills | (a) Admini- stration (b) Extension | Public Service And Service to Professional Bodies |
| Tenure as Assistant Professor | X | X | X | X | or | X | NR** |
| Tenure as or Promotion to Associate Professor | X | X | X | X | or | X | (a) X (b) NR** |
| Tenure as or Promotion to Professor | X | X | X | X | or | X | (a) X (b) NR** |

Candidates must demonstrate willingness to participate

Candidates must demonstrate willingness to participate

X = Candidate is required to meet the standard in this category.

NR = Candidate is not required to meet the standard in this category for promotion or tenure.

* Candidate is required to meet the standard in research, scholarly or artistic work except where the approved college standards state that practice of professional skills is an acceptable alternative for a department or other unit.

** For all ranks, candidate is required to meet the standard in extension service only if part of assigned duties of position.

Note: The table should not be considered in isolation, but only in conjunction with the text as a whole, in particular Section D where the standards (for promotion and tenure) in each category are described.

D. STANDARDS FOR EACH CATEGORY OF EVALUATION

The minimum acceptable standards for tenure and promotion at the University of Saskatchewan are described below.

1. ACADEMIC AND/OR PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS

Academic credentials will be reviewed as part of tenure and promotion decisions, but they are of particular importance in tenure considerations. Expectations regarding credentials and qualifications will be included in the candidate's letter of appointment.

The required academic credential for tenure and promotion is a Ph.D., or its discipline-specific counterpart, from a university/institution recognized by the University of Saskatchewan. Colleges will indicate in their standards which qualifications constitute the acceptable counterpart for the discipline in question. Each college will specify whether additional expectations will be required, e.g. professional credentials (such as specialty certification,

D. STANDARDS FOR EACH CATEGORY OF EVALUATION

The minimum acceptable standards for tenure and promotion in the College of Medicine are described below.

1. ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS

To be appointed to faculty in the CoM, candidates must have a PhD and/or MD, and/or a comparable degree (e.g. MBChB) from a recognized university as minimum academic credentials. Alternative credentials may be accepted in exceptional circumstances, such as in a meritorious record of scholarship or significant professional experience related to the assigned academic duties. While faculty seeking promotion or tenure must meet these minimum credentialing standards, additional required credentials for appointment are determined by the departments in consultation with the Dean and may vary by department.

registration or licensure in the profession). In cases where the Ph.D. or other qualifying credentials are not completed at the time of appointment, the letter of appointment will indicate that tenure cannot be awarded without the required credentials as specified in this section.

In exceptional cases, alternative qualifications will be accepted when such qualifications are deemed to be equivalent to the academic credentials typically expected in the discipline. The acceptability of these alternative qualifications must be explained and stipulated in the candidate's letter of appointment.

2. TEACHING ABILITY AND PERFORMANCE

Good teaching is expected of all faculty and evaluation of teaching will form an essential component of tenure and promotion considerations. University teaching requires more than classroom performance. Candidates will be expected to demonstrate mastery of their subject area(s) or discipline(s), to make thorough preparation for their classes, to communicate effectively with their students, to show a willingness to respond to students' questions and concerns, and to exhibit fairness in evaluating students¹.

Both before and after tenure is awarded, faculty are expected to remain committed to improving/enhancing their teaching performance and to remedy problems identified with their teaching. As faculty progress through the ranks, they will be expected to extend their knowledge of their field(s) or discipline(s), i.e. with respect to classes, currency of the material presented, and new teaching methods.

For tenure and promotion, assessment of teaching performance will be based on *a series of evaluations* of a candidate's teaching performance and teaching materials *over a period of time*. The assessment will involve both peer and student evaluation of aspects of teaching and evidence of performance described in Table II. Evaluations, both peer and student, will be obtained on an *ongoing basis* and should be shared with candidates for formative purposes.

College standards may specify which of the various teaching roles and aspects identified in Table II are to be evaluated and how the overall assessment of teaching performance is to be made, i.e., what items or activities are to be reviewed and by whom. College standards will specify those situations in which candidates must demonstrate satisfactory performance in specific teaching roles or aspects of teaching in order to receive an overall assessment of meeting the standard in this category. When evaluating a candidate's teaching performance, it may be appropriate in some cases to consider aspects and review items other than those listed in Table II; however, any additional elements must be included in the college standards and must be approved by the University Review Committee.

2. TEACHING ABILITY AND PERFORMANCE

As indicated in Part C, above, all college faculty seeking promotion or tenure should participate in teaching activity. Teaching responsibilities are determined at the time of appointment or thereafter at each periodic academic review, in discussion with the Department Head. It is not expected that all faculty must be involved in all of the teaching roles listed in Table II of the university standards, but only those roles set out for that faculty member in discussion with the Department Head or as determined according to applicable university processes, including the assignment of duties. Department Heads must remain mindful of achieving a balance of activities that, in total, facilitates rather than impedes progress towards promotion.

To be granted tenure or promotion, there must be compelling evidence of consistent improvement in teaching beyond that initially expected following appointment.

All faculty with teaching responsibilities are strongly encouraged to pursue teaching excellence by at least once-yearly attendance at a course or workshop designed to improve their teaching abilities. The appropriateness and applicability of courses or workshops aimed at teaching improvement will be determined by the Department Head in discussion with the candidate, utilizing advice available from faculty development leaders in the College of Medicine.

Teaching duties in the CoM range from supervision of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows to the teaching of undergraduate students and postgraduate medical residents. Teaching may include participation in undergraduate and graduate courses, teaching and/or supervision of students performing clinical work, teaching courses in certificate programs (e.g. ACLS, PALS, ALARM, ATLS), inter-professional teaching, teaching in courses provided by Continuing Medical Education (CME), teaching at a distance and teaching in faculty development workshops. The preceding list of teaching activities is not necessarily exhaustive.

The college recognizes that the amount of teaching performed will vary considerably from one individual to the next. Because of inter-department variability, the acceptable amount of teaching with respect to tenure or promotion will be discussed as the case is being evaluated, and in accordance with departmental norms and agreed upon assignment of duties.

To meet the standard for teaching in the CoM, peer evaluations and student evaluations must be collected every year and must be consistently satisfactory or show satisfactory evidence of ongoing improvement. While departments and/or the college may have processes in place to assist with this requirement, individual faculty have a responsibility to work with their Department Heads to ensure that teaching evaluations occur.

Table B is to be used to evaluate teaching participation and teaching quality. Scholarly work associated with teaching will be evaluated separately, in Categories 4, 5.2a, or 5.2b, as applicable.

TABLE B application:

Level 1: for use in evaluating teaching at the Assistant Professor level, renewal of probation as Assistant Professor, or tenure as Assistant Professor

Level 2: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Associate Professor

Level 3: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Professor

TABLE II - EVALUATION OF TEACHING

| Teaching Roles | Aspects to be assessed | Items and Activities to be reviewed |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> teaching in introductory undergraduate courses teaching in advanced undergraduate courses teaching in graduate courses clinical teaching in undergraduate or graduate courses teaching and/or supervision of students performing clinical work, practica or other types of field work, study-abroad or international exchange programs supervising honours students advising and supervising graduate students, post-doctoral fellows teaching courses in certificate or diploma programs co-ordination or administration of multiple section or multiple instructor courses contributions to internationalization of educational experience teaching at a distance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> organization of class/course preparation for classes appropriateness of material presented: i.e., volume, level, currency clarity of communication ability to stimulate students' interest responsiveness to students' questions and concerns fairness and adequacy of evaluation of students' performance willingness to try different or new teaching methods and technologies availability for students outside of class time adequacy of support and direction provided to graduate students fairness in dealing with students teaching innovation in curricular design incorporation of teaching innovations into teaching pedagogy extent to which scholarly work is brought into the classroom | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> teaching in the classroom teaching in clinical or laboratory settings course outlines/syllabi instructional materials -- written course materials, laboratory manuals, audio-visual resources, computer programs examinations involvement on graduate advisory and/or examination committees supervision of undergraduate and graduate student work progress/success of graduate students supervised teaching dossier development and supervision of academic exchange and/or study abroad programs pedagogical research, publications and presentations |

- a) **Evaluation by Peers:** Peer evaluation will embrace the various aspects of teaching described in Table II; e.g., classroom performance, the quality of examinations, course outlines and course materials, syllabi, reading materials, reading lists, laboratory manuals, workbooks, and classroom assignments. All peer evaluations will culminate in a written assessment. If senior colleagues make visitations to classrooms as part of the determination of a colleague's delivery, rapport, attentiveness and responsiveness to students, the written assessment will specify the teaching roles being performed.
- b) **Evaluation by Students:** The following methods of undergraduate and graduate student evaluation will be acceptable:
- written appraisals, obtained by the Department Head or Dean, and signed by students. If based on a specific course, the number of students enrolled in that course will be provided.
 - Questionnaires, approved at the department or college level, administered by a college or department official (other than the instructor) appointed for this purpose, and completed by students. A summary, including an interpretation, of the numeric results and any qualitative comments will be provided by the department or college at the time of tenure or promotion. Results of the questionnaire will include the enrolment in the course and the number of completed evaluations received.

TABLE B: Evaluation of Teaching

Expectations for all levels of evaluation:

Using student or peer teaching evaluations, faculty will provide evidence of:

- uniformly satisfactory teaching or satisfactory improvement of teaching
- willingness to accept feedback
- being well prepared for teaching
- being well organized while teaching
- using course materials appropriate for learner level
- the ability to communicate well with learners
- incorporating evidence from published scholarly work or recent research into all teaching activities
- use of innovative teaching methods or technologies when appropriate
- willingness to provide teaching to all levels of learners, as requested or assigned
- being a good role model or mentor for learners
- providing both formative and summative feedback to learners
- incorporating peer and student feedback into teaching practices
- fair and thorough evaluation of student performance, as per course director/organizer commentary
- using up-to-date and curriculum-relevant teaching material, as per course director/organizer commentary

Required Activities and Progress Indicators

| Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Required: All of the following, as applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> teaching in undergraduate or graduate courses as assigned advising or supervising graduate students and/or postdoctoral fellows <p>For clinical teaching, at least 3 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> small-group leader, co-leader or facilitator for any level of learner(s) teaching on ward rounds in any clinical setting (e.g. hospital, nursing homes) teaching at inpatient or ambulatory care clinics in hospitals, health centres, etc. emergency room teaching operating room teaching | <p>Required: All applicable Level 1 requirements, plus:</p> <p>For clinical teaching, at least 3 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> regular teaching for pre-clerkship students, clinical clerks, or residents teaching at local (department, college, health authority) CME events teaching as content expert at local faculty development events teaching in group clinical education (e.g. grand rounds, mortality rounds, sign-in or sign-out rounds) | <p>Required: All applicable Level 1 and 2 requirements, plus:</p> <p>For clinical teaching, at least 3 of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> teaching as course coordinator/leader, main instructor or frequent contributor in UG or PG event-based teaching (e.g. classroom, small-group, tutorial, academic half-day) frequent participant in UG event-based teaching teaching as content expert at faculty development events more frequently than demonstrated for Level 2 |

Peer and student evaluations will be coordinated by the Dean or Department Head (or designates) and will require consultation with the candidate to ensure that all committees have the necessary information upon which to base a decision. The Dean or Department Head may request written comments from the coordinator of multiple section or multiple instructor courses or other instructors of the course as part of the assessment.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> teaching provided while on-call, any setting teaching provided in clinical laboratories communications skills teaching clinical skills teaching for pre-clerkship students other event-based teaching (e.g. lectures, seminars, tutorials, academic half-days) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> participant in PG event-based teaching (e.g. academic half-days) participant in UG event-based teaching (e.g. classroom lectures, small-group facilitation, tutorials) participation in remedial teaching, as requested by UG or PG offices level of participation in department-based teaching increased over Level 1 expectations health care teaching using social media or other digital platforms – must be validated or authorized by department or college academic administrators regular participant in faculty development focusing on teaching improvement volunteering to teach without being requested (provide examples) recipient of teaching awards or other special recognition as a teacher* | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> identification as local faculty development leader at DME sites invited teaching at provincial, national or international CME events or conferences invited teaching at interdisciplinary continuing education or clinical in-service events participation in organized counseling or mentorship programs for students frequent teaching of multiple levels of learners health care teaching for students, patients, institutions and peers using social media and/or other digital platforms – must be validated or authorized by department or college academic administrators recipient of teaching awards or other special recognition as a teacher* |
|--|---|--|

*Awards are not a requirement for consideration of tenure or promotion; however, receipt of an award at any level is an indicator of excellence.

3. KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINE AND FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION

Candidates for tenure and promotion will have developed an academic field of specialization and/or an area of focus and will demonstrate knowledge of the field of specialization and its relation to the discipline. Evidence to be used to evaluate performance in this category will primarily focus on the breadth of the candidate's work and its relationship to the discipline. Evidence used to evaluate the candidate's knowledge of the discipline will include either:

- a written statement by the candidate, submitted in either Category 4 (Research, Scholarly and/or Artistic Work) or Category 5 (Practice of Professional Skills), outlining the candidate's research program and its relationship to the discipline.

AND/OR

- a seminar to colleagues at the University of Saskatchewan, at tenure, or at each rank for promotion, outlining the candidate's research program and its relationship to the discipline.

Additional evidence may be considered in this category, including peer-reviewed grants, peer-review activity for journals in the discipline, invited lectures and presentations at conferences directly relevant to the field of specialization.

3. KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINE AND FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION

In the College of Medicine, the term 'knowledge of the discipline' refers to the knowledge of a field of specialization within health care disciplines and/or health care research-related disciplines.

It is not the purpose of this evaluation category to duplicate the curriculum vitae or the information that will be summarized in Categories 4 or 5. Instead, faculty are asked to submit a list of examples of work-related activities, contributions and collegial recognition that serve to illustrate and confirm knowledge of the discipline and chosen field of specialization. Where relevant the field(s) of specialization should be clearly identified. It is recognized that there will be considerable overlap amongst the groups of examples shown below and that some examples will be noted again in Categories 6 and 7.

TABLE C application:

In Category 3, the acceptable and required standard will be the same for each level of evaluation (renewal of probation or tenure at any rank, and for promotion to associate professor or professor). Bulleted lists are provided as examples only.

To assess this category, Department and College Review Committees must indicate the evidence used in making the evaluation.

TABLE C: Evaluation of Knowledge of the Discipline

Clinical faculty: examples of personal clinical knowledge and expertise demonstrating recognition within the clinical community:

- participation on clinical guideline committees or clinical quality improvement programs or initiatives
- participation on clinical care delivery initiatives, quality assurance committees, or other clinical service committees
- participation in developing new clinical programs, therapies, treatment methods, investigations
- leadership and supervisory roles related to the organization or provision of clinical services
- clinically-related presentations, lectures, seminars or in-services provided to colleagues
- provision of clinical consultation services, or consultations to governments or health authorities
- participation as a committee member or chair for clinical professional bodies or associations

Science/research faculty: examples of personal scientific knowledge and expertise demonstrating recognition within the scientific community:

- participation on research grant review committees for any agency, institution or other body
- participation as a committee member or chair for scientific professional bodies or associations
- participation in interdisciplinary scientific and research collaboration, demonstrating leadership with advancing academic rank
- provision of scientific expertise or opinion to government, industry or the media
- membership on editorial boards for publishers of scientific journals, books, etc.
- member, chair or supervisor on research advisory committees for graduate or postgraduate students, or postdoctoral fellows

Medical educator/teacher faculty: examples of personal educational or teaching knowledge and expertise demonstrating recognition within the educator/teacher community:

- participation in or leadership of departmental, college or university educational committees
- membership on editorial boards for publishers of educational journals, books, etc.
- leadership or supervisory roles related to the provision or development of educational programming
- participation on local, national, or international medical education committees, boards or organizations
- participation on local, national, or international medical education examination, evaluation or assessment committees
- supervisor or member or chair on a supervisory committee for graduate or postgraduate students, or postdoctoral fellows

In addition to providing the information outlined above, faculty are encouraged to provide an open seminar to departmental and college colleagues prior to case file review. This seminar will focus on the chosen field of specialization and it will emphasize, in particular, the ways in which that field of specialization has relevance for and adds value to the applicable discipline. Peer evaluations of the seminar must be submitted with the case file.

PREAMBLE TO CATEGORIES 4 AND 5:

In the College of Medicine, research and scholarly work will be evaluated under either Category 4 or under one or both Category 5 subcategories (5.2a and 5.2b). The category used will be addressed in the letter of appointment or in

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>4. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND/OR ARTISTIC WORK</p> <p>Research, scholarly and/or artistic work is expected of all faculty. For the purposes of this document, and for faculty evaluated under this category, research, scholarly and/or artistic work is creative, intellectual work which is in the public realm and which has been subjected to external peer-review. This includes, in the case of artistic work, exhibitions and performances.</p> <p>Although academic disciplines may differ in the avenues for publication or presentation of scholarly activity, the primary and essential evidence in this category is publication in reputable peer-reviewed outlets or, in the case of performance or artistic work, presentation in reputable peer-reviewed venues.</p> <p>Evaluation of research, scholarly and/or artistic work for tenure and promotion at all ranks will address the quality and significance of the work. Evidence will include the peer-reviewed publications and presentations referenced above, but may also include other works (e.g. artistic works, performances, research related patents, copyrighted software and audio-visual materials).</p> <p>In some disciplines the award of research funding from provincial, national or international granting councils or agencies that employ a process of peer evaluation is also a significant indication of a candidate's performance. Colleges may specify the type and weighting of the contributions to be assessed in this category.</p> <p>Specific Requirements by Rank: In addition to the above general requirements, the following will form the basis of the recommendation:</p> <p>Tenure as Assistant Professor: For tenure to be recommended, there must be compelling evidence that a body of high quality scholarly work has been completed beyond that demonstrated at appointment. There must also be evidence of the promise of future development as a scholar, including the presence of a defined program of research or scholarship. Evidence of the ability to obtain adequate research funding will be required if specified in college or department standards.</p> <p>The quality of research, scholarly and/or artistic work will be assessed, using the tenure and promotion standards of the University of Saskatchewan, by at least three senior academicsⁱⁱⁱ drawn from comparable institutions.</p> | <p>discussion with the Department Head, and must be supported by the Dean, followed by submission to the Vice Provost Faculty Relations for approval, consistent with standard collegial practices.</p> <p>Category 4 is used for evaluating faculty whose major obligations involve medical or health-related research, while subcategory 5.2a is used for evaluating research and scholarly work performed by faculty whose major obligations are clinical. Subcategory 5.2b is reserved for evaluating the research and scholarly work performed by those whose major roles involve pedagogy and research in medical education.</p> <p>Rarely, and depending upon the nature of their academic contributions, clinical faculty might request that their research and scholarly work be evaluated according to criteria appearing in <i>both</i> subcategories 5.2a and 5.2b. Alternatively, a few clinical faculty may request that their research be evaluated using Category 4, rather than 5.2a (as might be appropriate for a CIHR Chair of clinical research). Requests made by clinical faculty to be evaluated in Category 4 are uncommon and require prior discussion and approval from the Department Head, Dean and Vice Provost Faculty Relations as applicable.</p> <p>Irrespective of the research evaluation category used, all clinical faculty are required to have their clinical practices evaluated under subcategory 5.1a (Practice of Professional Skills – Clinical Practice). Similarly, all faculty whose primary academic contributions involve pedagogy and medical education are required to have their educational practices evaluated under subcategory 5.1b (Practice of Professional Skills – Educational Practice).</p> <p>4. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY WORK</p> <p>For faculty being evaluated using Category 4, the College of Medicine requires compelling evidence of an active research program and/or program of scholarship, combined with evidence of adequate research funding. Primary and essential evidence in this category is publication in reputable peer-reviewed outlets. Research for consideration must have been undertaken following appointment at the University of Saskatchewan and during the period under review.</p> <p>The chosen publication outlet, including traditional formats, digital platforms and novel or innovative venues, must be acceptable to the departmental renewal, tenure or promotions committees, as articulated in departmental standards. To provide evidence of an increasingly productive and significant research program, an ongoing publication record is essential. In evaluating research productivity, the volume of published work will be judged in accordance with its impact, quality and significance. Applicable metrics will necessarily vary from specialty to specialty: if used, their relevance should be identified and explained in the case file.</p> <p>Ongoing, sustainable research funding will be taken as evidence of a promising upwards trajectory, but normally should be combined with a record of publication that meets or exceeds the expectations laid out in Table D. Departmental renewal, tenure and promotion committees have some flexibility in this regard: however, clear explanations must be provided by both the faculty and the Department Head in cases that might appear to fall short of the usual expectations described in Table D.</p> <p>Table D is to be used for evaluating research and scholarly work. The recognition of discipline-specific expertise one receives as a result of one's research activities is evaluated under Category 3, Knowledge of the Discipline.</p> <p><u>TABLE D application:</u></p> <p>Level 1: for use in renewal of probation as Assistant Professor or tenure as Assistant Professor Level 2: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Associate Professor Level 3: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Professor</p> |
|---|--|

Tenure as or Promotion to Associate Professor: For the award of tenure or promotion to be recommended, there must be compelling evidence of significant achievement in scholarly activity beyond that demonstrated at appointment and beyond that expected for the rank of Assistant Professor. Candidates will demonstrate through refereed publications or performances or exhibitions that the results of their research, scholarly or artistic work have made a contribution sufficient to be recognized by colleagues in their field in other parts of Canada or internationally. There must also be evidence of a program of research or scholarship, clearly defined and executed by the candidate, and a positive indication that the candidate will maintain activity in research and scholarly work. Evidence of the ability to obtain adequate research funding will be required if specified in college or department standards.

For tenure at the Associate rank (unless tenure is a condition of appointment), the quality of research, scholarly and/or artistic work will be assessed, using the tenure and promotion standards of the University of Saskatchewan, by at least three senior academics drawn from comparable institutions.

For promotion to the Associate rank, the candidate will be evaluated by colleagues in the candidate's department or college (in the case of non-departmentalized colleges). The candidate will provide an up-to-date *curriculum vitae* and, in collaboration with the Department Head/Dean, will provide a case file, and other relevant evidence for the purposes of this assessment.

Tenure as or Promotion to Professor: For the award of tenure or promotion to be recommended, there must be compelling evidence of significant achievement in scholarly activity beyond that demonstrated at appointment and beyond that expected for the rank of Associate Professor. Candidates will demonstrate, through publications in reputable, peer-reviewed outlets or through peer-reviewed performances or exhibitions, that the results of their research have made a contribution to the field of specialization, sufficient for this contribution to be recognized as substantial by authorities in the field in other parts of Canada and other countries as appropriate. There must also be evidence of leadership in the establishment and execution of a clearly defined program of research or scholarship and a positive indication that the candidate will maintain activity in research and scholarly work. Evidence of the ability to obtain adequate research funding will be required if specified in college or department standards. Candidates will also be expected to participate in the supervision of graduate students in departments or colleges that offer graduate programs.

For tenure (unless tenure is a condition of appointment) and/or promotion, the quality of research, scholarly and/or artistic work will be assessed, using the tenure and promotion standards of the University of Saskatchewan, by at least three senior academics drawn from comparable institutions.

TABLE D: Evaluation of Research

| Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> research for level 1 must be independent of former supervisors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> research for level 2 must be independent of former supervisors | |
| <p>For renewal of probation:</p> <p>There must be evidence of the <u>development</u> of a program of independent research with identifiable area(s) of major focus. Evidence should include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> local, provincial, or national peer-reviewed funding applied for or obtained, or industry-sponsored funding obtained author, co-author or contributing author of at least one peer-reviewed publication (accepted or published) author of at least one abstract in peer-reviewed conference proceedings <p>For tenure:</p> <p>There must be evidence of <u>establishment</u> of an independent research program. Evidence should include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> corresponding author of at least two peer-reviewed publications during the period since appointment author or co-author of at least one additional publication (e.g. peer-reviewed review article, clinical report, technical report, book chapter, etc.), which may be in alternate venues acceptable to the department primary supervision of a graduate student(s) and/or senior trainee(s) at least one presentation at a national or international scientific meeting | <p>There must be evidence of the <u>growth</u> of a productive, nationally recognized research program. Evidence should include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> corresponding author or co-author of at least five peer-reviewed publications, published during the period since appointment author or co-author of at least two additional publications (e.g. peer-reviewed review articles, clinical reports, technical reports, book chapters, etc.), including those published in alternate venues acceptable to the department, during the period since appointment at least two presentations at national or international scientific meetings during the period since appointment provincial or national peer-reviewed funding obtained as principal or co-principal investigator, at a level adequate to support research undertaken in the identified area(s) of focus primary supervision of graduate students and/or senior trainees participation as a reviewer in at least one regional or national peer-review program | <p>There must be evidence that the candidate <u>leads</u> a nationally and internationally recognized research and HQP training program. Evidence should include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> stable national or international ongoing funding obtained to fully support a recognized individual or collaborative research program corresponding author of at least five peer-reviewed publications since previous promotion author or co-author of at least three additional publications (e.g. peer-reviewed review articles, clinical reports, technical reports, chapters in texts, etc.), including those published in alternate venues acceptable to the department, since previous promotion one presentation per year, on average, since last promotion, as an invited/selected speaker at national or international scientific meetings, or at other universities or similar institutes primary supervisor of at least one successful completion of graduate student or postdoctoral fellow since previous promotion at least two of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> service on editorial board of a scholarly or scientific journal acceptable to the department principal investigator in an industry-sponsored trial author/co-author of a report to a scholarly society |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>5. PRACTICE OF PROFESSIONAL SKILLS</p> <p>Candidates considered for promotion and tenure under this category will, as a major part of their assigned duties, engage in a professional practice which involves a significant and continuing commitment of time. Research and scholarly work linked to their professional practice is expected of all faculty evaluated under this category of assessment.</p> <p>Professional practice means mastery of the professional skills associated with the discipline, and their effective use in a discipline-appropriate practice setting. Research and scholarly work is creative, intellectual work which is in the public realm and which has been subjected to external peer-review.</p> <p>Both the professional practice and the research and scholarly work components of this category of assessment will be taken into account in the overall evaluation of the candidate's performance. The evaluation should reflect the balance between the practice of professional skills and the research and scholarly work in which the candidate is engaged.</p> <p>5.1 Professional Practice Colleges will define professional practice in the context of their particular disciplines. Two examples are provided for illustrative purposes.</p> <p><i>Clinical Practice</i> applies to faculty members in one of the health science professions, and faculty members from other disciplines who engage in testing, diagnosis, remediation, coaching, counselling and similar activities. College standards will refer to some or all of the standards for practice identified in the list below and outline expectations.</p> <p><i>Educational Practice</i> applies to faculty members engaged in a professional practice in educational program development and delivery, and/or in instructional design. College standards will outline expectations ensuring that the practice is grounded in a conceptual framework that is supported by contemporary literature, and that there is evidence of results achieved.</p> <p>In colleges where this category of assessment is employed, colleges will provide definitions of professional practice similar to those provided above and will identify the elements of practice to be evaluated. College standards will include some or all of the following:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provincial or national peer-reviewed funding obtained as collaborator, PI, or co-PI for research undertaken in the identified area(s) of focus | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> leadership service on a national professional or scholarly society leadership service as primary organizer of a national conference, symposium or meeting |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for tenure at this rank, three external reviews provided by senior colleagues in other comparable institutions, within the same or another relevant discipline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for tenure at this rank, three external reviews provided by senior colleagues in other comparable institutions, within the same or another relevant discipline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for tenure at this rank, or for promotion to professor, three external reviews provided by senior colleagues in other comparable institutions, within the same or another relevant discipline |
| | <p>5. PRACTICE OF PROFESSIONAL SKILLS</p> <p>All clinical faculty, as defined in Section 1 of these standards, will have their clinical practices evaluated according to the standards described in subcategory 5.1a. The scholarly work they undertake in association with their clinical practices will usually be evaluated according to the standards described in subcategory 5.2a. Additional details were provided in the preamble to categories 4 and 5, above.</p> <p>Faculty with professional educational practices as defined in Section 5.1b, below, will have their professional educational practices evaluated according to the standards described in subcategory 5.1b. The scholarly work they undertake in association with their clinical practices will be evaluated according to the standards described in subcategory 5.2b.</p> <p>5.1a Clinical Practice:</p> <p>Clinical practice involves investigation, diagnostics and therapeutic/treatment decision-making in the provision of overall care and management of patients, families, communities and populations. Clinician faculty will be personally responsible for patient care as the MRP (most responsible physician) and/or the consulting clinician and/or the clinician responsible for producing or interpreting test results. The volume of clinical service provided will vary within specialties, subspecialties and departments, and depends in part upon the volume of related academic services provided. A satisfactory volume of clinical service, sufficient for evaluation under this subcategory, will be determined by the Department Head in discussion with the faculty. Satisfaction of the requirements for this subcategory are the same for all levels of evaluation.</p> <p><u>TABLE E Application:</u></p> <p>In Subcategory 5.1a, the acceptable and required standard will be the same for all CoM clinical faculty, at all levels of evaluation (renewal of probation and tenure at any rank, if applicable, and promotion to associate professor or professor).</p> | | |

- performance of professional skills (e.g., clinical management, counselling, program design and evaluation, diagnosis, systems analysis, applied government and/or private sector technical and policy reports)
- peer recognition (e.g., referrals and requests for services, provision of expert advice, testimonials from client organizations, professional association recognition)
- delivery of health care, technical or professional services
- completeness and accuracy of investigations, procedures, reports, case records, policy analyses, etc.
- effectiveness as a professional role model (for students and other trainees)
- willingness to accept and perform duties out of regular working hours and in emergencies where this is an integral part of professional practice
- adequacy and diversity of the service load where this is an integral part of professional practice
- communication with colleagues and clients
- evidence of the ability to organize and manage complex multi-faceted and large-scale programs
- evidence of the ability to establish effective relationships with professional colleagues, resource persons, clients and collaborators
- success in obtaining external funding
- leadership in the discipline with respect to the profession

In assembling evidence of professional practice, college standards will ensure that a broad-based consultative process is in place for tenure or promotion considerations. Following consultation with the candidate, the Department Head and/or Dean will request confidential, written evaluations from clients, client agencies or colleagues who are familiar with the technical and/or professional aspects of practice. Candidates may also provide letters of support (placed in the case file, see Section E). College standards may refer to standards/codes adopted by appropriate professional organizations as a guide for evaluation of practice of the profession.

5.2 Scholarly Work

Candidates for tenure or promotion will engage in scholarly work appropriate to the profession or discipline with the fundamental expectation that the results of scholarly work will be shared with other members of the profession and the academic community. Publication in reputable peer-reviewed outlets is the *primary* evidence in this category.

Evaluation of scholarly work for tenure and promotion at all ranks will address the *quality and significance of the work*. There must be a positive indication of involvement in scholarly work with research funding at levels appropriate to the discipline.

College standards will indicate the appropriate vehicles for dissemination or publication of scholarly work (e.g., publication of refereed articles, s; preparation of technical reports, reports to agencies; presentations at academic, scientific or professional meetings, dissemination of scholarly work to community organizations). College standards must make a case for standards of quality and significance equivalent to peer-reviewed publications if vehicles other than these are used as a basis for the assessment.

Specific Requirements for Each Rank: In addition to the above general requirements, the following will form the basis of the recommendation:

TABLE E (5.1a): Evaluation of Clinical Practice

Note: Relevant documentation for each bullet point, below, to be included with case file

Required:

- current appointment / privileges to health jurisdiction's practitioner staff
- current Regular license to practice medicine in Saskatchewan, if applicable
- current Certificate of Professional Conduct, or equivalent, from applicable provincial licensing/regulatory body
- current record of participation in required continuing professional learning activities (e.g. CFPC Mainpro+, RCPSC MOC)
- three confidential letters of recommendation, solicited by the Department Head, from local colleagues having regular clinical contact with the faculty being evaluated, addressing clinical competence (see first 4 requirements in Level 1, Table F) and professional collegiality
- a statement of recommendation from the Department Head or designated committee, addressing all of the following requirements:
 - confirmation of clinical competence, to the extent known through reputation
 - confirmation of timely and accurate clinical record-keeping, provision of expert advice, to the extent known
 - department head has not been made aware of professionalism concerns regarding clinical practice performance
 - skilled communication in the clinical context (patients, colleagues, learners, other health professionals, staff)
 - willingness to assume responsibility for fair share of clinical workload, given other professional commitments
 - willingness to accept and perform clinical duties out of regular work hours or in emergencies, as applicable
 - willingness to participate in health jurisdiction- or clinical department-required meetings, audits and activities
 - mindful and efficient use of health care resources; good stewardship of resources

5.2a Scholarly Work associated with Clinical Practice:

Clinical faculty seeking promotion are expected to adopt a scholarly approach in the practice of their professional skills. The CoM recognizes and values the scholarly work undertaken by clinical faculty in conjunction with the performance of clinical duties and clinical teaching. While participation in original research is encouraged and supported, the CoM recognizes that the mindful application, translation and teaching of new scientific knowledge in the clinical context merits acknowledgement and support, and qualifies as scholarly work.

Therefore, scholarly contributions evaluated using this subcategory include those made through scholarly clinical teaching and those made through the application of scholarly work in the organization, delivery and evaluation of clinical services, as well as those made through participation in clinical or discipline-specific scientific research.

TABLE F application:

Level 1: for use in renewal of probation as Assistant Professor or tenure as Assistant Professor

Level 2: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Associate Professor

Level 3: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Professor

For Tenure as Assistant Professor: There must be compelling evidence, beyond that demonstrated at appointment, that: 1) the candidate is developing a leadership role in the field of specialization with provision for further development; and, 2) the candidate is contributing to the creation and dissemination of knowledge through scholarly work. There must also be evidence of the promise of future development as a practitioner and scholar, including the presence of a defined professional practice and a defined program of scholarship. Evidence of the ability to obtain adequate research funding will be required if specified in college or department standards.

The quality of the candidate's professional practice and scholarly work will be assessed, using the tenure and promotion standards of the University of Saskatchewan, by at least three senior academics^{iv} drawn from comparable institutions.

For Tenure as or Promotion to Associate Professor: There must be compelling evidence, beyond that demonstrated for the rank of Assistant Professor, that: 1) the candidate has established a significant leadership role in the field of specialization and demonstrated exemplary standards of client service; and, 2) the candidate has contributed to the creation and dissemination of knowledge through scholarly work. There must also be evidence of continuing development as a practicing professional and as a scholar, including the presence of a clearly defined professional practice and a clearly defined program of scholarship. The results of significant investigations, such as experimental studies or clinical observations, must have been published in reputable peer-reviewed publications. This work must have made a contribution sufficient to be recognized by colleagues in their field in other parts of Canada or internationally. Evidence of the ability to obtain adequate research funding will be required if specified in college or department standards.

For tenure at the Associate rank (unless tenure is a condition of appointment), the quality of the candidate's professional practice and scholarly work will be assessed, using the tenure and promotion standards of the University of Saskatchewan, by at least three senior academics drawn from comparable institutions.

For promotion to the Associate rank, the candidate will be evaluated by colleagues in the candidate's department or college (in the case of non-departmentalized colleges). The candidate will provide an up-to-date *curriculum vitae* and, in collaboration with the Department Head/Dean, will provide a case file, and other relevant evidence for the purposes of this assessment.

For Tenure as or Promotion to Professor: There must be compelling evidence, beyond that demonstrated for the rank of Associate Professor, that: 1) the candidate has demonstrated a sustained high level of performance in the practice of the profession and established a reputation for expertise in the field among colleagues and, where appropriate, clients or client agencies; and, 2) the candidate has made a significant contribution to the creation and dissemination of knowledge through scholarly work. There must also be evidence of leadership in the establishment and execution of a clearly defined program of scholarship and a positive indication that the candidate will maintain activity in scholarly work as well as in professional practice. The candidate will have played a leading role in scholarly investigations and published the results in reputable peer-reviewed publications. The candidate will have made a contribution sufficient to be recognized by colleagues in their field in other parts of Canada and in other countries. In cases where the opportunity exists to supervise graduate students, candidates for Professor will have actively pursued these opportunities. Evidence of the ability to obtain adequate research funding will be required if specified in college or department standards.

For tenure (unless tenure is a condition of appointment) and/or promotion, the quality of the candidate's scholarly work will be assessed, using the tenure and promotion standards of the University of Saskatchewan, by at least three senior academics drawn from comparable institutions.

TABLE F (5.2a): Evaluation of Scholarly Work associated with Clinical Practice

| Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistent use of evidence-based clinical decision-making (colleagues' letters of recommendation – see Table E, above) consistent use of clinical practice guidelines and current scientific research in teaching (as confirmed by teaching evaluations and colleagues' letters of recommendation - see Table E, above) demonstration of willingness to seek clinical and instructional guidance from established senior academics (colleagues' letters of recommendation – see Table E, above) consistent use of current evidence while participating in analysis and discussion of cases and conditions (as confirmed by teaching evaluations and colleagues' letters of recommendation - see Table E, above) contributor, co-author or author of at least one peer reviewed publication, webinar, podcast, video or other digital conveyance <p>And, at least three of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> participation in faculty development events centered on effective knowledge translation for learners in the clinical workplace participation in quality improvement activities in clinical care that result in new evidence-based standards of care or local/regional best practices participation in self- | <p>Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> all Level 1 requirements during review period, principal investigator, co-PI or corresponding author of one or more peer-reviewed publications (e.g. case review, analytic study, book chapter, original research, webinars, podcasts, videos or other department-approved digital conveyance) <p>And, at least four of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> participation on organizing committee for clinical/scientific conference participation on review committee for poster selection for clinical/scientific conference peer-reviewed poster presentation or lecture at meeting or conference with published abstracts presentation of latest evidence or current best practices as invited expert at local/provincial clinical/scientific meeting or conference author or coauthor of technical report or clinical report or tool for improving health care delivery, health care quality, or patient safety in local health jurisdiction, area, division or department contributor of clinical expertise to the development of curricula, courses or lectures contributing author in clinical trial(s) resulting in peer-reviewed publication(s) participation as a reviewer of manuscript submissions for a peer-reviewed clinical/scientific journal regular participation in group-based teaching (e.g. grand | <p>Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> all Level 1 and 2 requirements <p>And, at least four of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> presentation of latest evidence or current best practices as invited expert at national or international clinical/scientific meeting or conference coauthor or principal investigator and corresponding author of at least one peer-reviewed publication, clinically relevant to the discipline contributing author of book chapter publication of peer-reviewed webinars, podcasts, videos, or other department-approved digital conveyances for teaching purposes, directed to any learner group increasing contribution to curricular development through course development, manual development, etc. member, chair or supervisor on research advisory committee for postgraduate students or postdoctoral fellows, based on expertise in field of specialization invited provider of scientific or clinical care advice to government or major health care organizations invited or elected leadership roles within national or international academic organizations (e.g. CFPC, RCPSC) due to recognized clinical expertise in an academic setting participation on an examination committee for a national academic organization recipient of peer-reviewed research funding for research |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>improvement or CPL/CME activities involving critical appraisal of the medical literature and subsequent clinical practice renewal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation in the organization of or maintenance of standards for multidisciplinary care delivery • demonstrates willingness to participate in research through the recruitment of patient subjects in own practice, if requested • participation in systematic patient safety initiatives as a planner, developer or recognized leader in the integration, application or teaching of patient safety | <p>rounds, academic half-days, undergraduate courses, faculty development events)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supervisor or advisor for medical student or resident research project(s) • committee member, chair or supervisor for research advisory committee for graduate student(s) or postdoctoral fellow(s), based on expertise in clinical field of specialization • applicant, as collaborator, co-PI or PI for research funding from any funding agency, with personal involvement in writing the grant request • contribution to curricular development through course development, manual development, etc. | <p>or innovation in clinical education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recipient of industry sponsorship for research, including clinical trials, resulting in peer-reviewed dissemination of results • collaborator as a clinical member of a research cluster or interdisciplinary research team • invitation for visiting professorship • develop or apply and teach new techniques or new clinical approaches to patient care • significant progress in the undertaking of an advanced degree in research, or completion of same • national or international leadership role in health care quality improvement and/or patient safety |
|---|---|--|

5.1b Educational Practice:

Educational practice is defined as program and curriculum design, development, implementation and evaluation; educational program administration and leadership; and faculty development (such as the teaching/mentoring of others in these skills).

TABLE G application:

Level 1: for use in renewal of probation as Assistant Professor or tenure as Assistant Professor
 Level 2: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Associate Professor
 Level 3: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Professor

| <i>TABLE G (5.1b): Evaluation of Educational Practice</i> | | |
|---|---|---|
| Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 |
| <p>Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributes to program and curriculum design and development (e.g. part of a course/module/rotation/CME event development team, etc.) | <p>Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all Level 1 requirements • leads program or curriculum design or development (at any level of medical education including faculty development) | <p>Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all Level 1 and 2 requirements • contributes to program or curriculum design and development at a regional/national/international level. (e.g. AFMC network, |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> participates in leadership activities at introductory levels (e.g. member of curriculum sub-committee, Residency Program Committee, CME advisory or program committee, etc.) contributes to faculty development* (co-facilitates or helps in development, etc.) participates in at least 2 professional development activities per year, in medical education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> takes leadership roles as appropriate (e.g. chair of curricular sub-committee, ad hoc curricular committee, module lead, etc.) at local and regional/ national level primary facilitator/moderator for workshops and other faculty development activities at local and national levels mentors other educators and teachers | <p>CFPC, RCPSC, MCC, CACMS, consultant/external reviewer, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> takes leadership role at the national/international level (e.g. chief or section editor of journal, chair of national medical education group or committee, etc.) contributes to the development and improvement of collegial mentoring processes and content |
|---|---|--|

* For some, faculty development may become their venue for teaching as in Category 2.

5.2b Scholarly Work associated with Educational Practice:

TABLE H application:

Level 1: for use in renewal of probation as Assistant Professor or tenure as Assistant Professor

Level 2: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Associate Professor

Level 3: for use in evaluating tenure as or promotion to Professor

| TABLE H (5.2b): Evaluation of Scholarly Work associated with Educational Practice | | |
|---|--|--|
| Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 |
| <p>Required: Clear documentation of consistent and appropriate engagement in educational scholarship* as evidenced through all of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> development/co-development of educational resources (includes creation of instructional documents, educational policies or technical reports, computer programs, A/V resources, innovation, invention), reviewed, implemented, adopted, and/or disseminated at a local level responsiveness to constructive feedback from course/workshop evaluations at least 3 authored or co-authored peer-reviewed publications in medical education (e.g. journals or peer- | <p>Required: Clear documentation of consistent and appropriate engagement in educational scholarship* as evidenced through all of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> curriculum development, innovation, research, or evaluation as a lead/collaborator or consultant at a <i>regional or national level</i> one peer-reviewed publication as PI, co-PI or corresponding author per year, on average, in medical education (e.g. journals or peer-reviewed repositories) during the period since appointment obtains external funding as principal or co-principal investigator or co-applicant for scholarship, research, or innovation in medical education | <p>Required: Clear documentation of consistent and appropriate engagement in educational scholarship* as evidenced through all of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> curriculum development, innovation, research, or evaluation as a lead/collaborator or consultant at a <i>national or international level</i> more than one peer-reviewed publication as PI, co-PI or corresponding author per year, on average, in medical education (e.g. journals or peer-reviewed repositories) during the period since previous promotion |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reviewed repositories) during the period since appointment obtains internal or external funding as principal investigator or collaborator for scholarship, research, or innovation in medical education presentation of medical education scholarship at local/regional conferences documentation of learner or peer mentoring (in any of the medical educator domains) contributes as peer-reviewer (e.g. journal, scholarly conference or research funding competition) at local or regional level award related to medical education scholarship** | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> presentation of medical education scholarship at national conferences supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate students, as appropriate, in medical education scholarship documentation of success of learner and/or peer mentoring (e.g. mentee awards, high-level success/recognition that can be linked to mentoring role) regular peer-review (e.g. journal, scholarly conference, or research funding competition) at local, regional or national level if invited, contributes as member on research advisory committee for postgraduate students or postdoctoral fellows, based on expertise in field of educational specialization award related to medical education scholarship** | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> leadership in education scholarship (e.g. journal editorial board, national committee or organization, conference planning committee, grant review committee) at any level supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate students, as appropriate, in medical education scholarship contributes as chair or member on research advisory committee for postgraduate students or postdoctoral fellows, based on expertise in field of educational specialization award related to medical education scholarship** |
| <p>6. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE OR EXTENSION RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY</p> <p>This category describes the candidate's commitment to the collegium and reflects "service" within and outside the university community. Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in the collegial decision-making processes, to participate in administrative work, and are encouraged to be involved in the activities of academic and professional organizations and, in some colleges, in extension work. Faculty should use good judgment in balancing their activities in this category with those in other categories of assessment.</p> <p>Candidates for tenure as Assistant Professor are not required to meet any requirements in this category unless such duties are specified on appointment. Candidates for tenure and promotion to higher ranks are required to meet the standard in category 6(a). Meeting the standard in category 6(b) will be a requirement for only certain departments/colleges (as specified in their respective standards) or positions (to be specified on appointment or in an amended letter of appointment).</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for tenure at this rank, three external reviews provided by senior colleagues in other comparable institutions, within the same or another relevant discipline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for tenure at this rank, three external reviews provided by senior colleagues in other comparable institutions, within the same or another relevant discipline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for tenure at this rank, or for promotion to professor, three external reviews provided by senior colleagues in other comparable institutions, within the same or another relevant discipline |

*References and rationale available at: <https://medicine.usask.ca/faculty/promotion-tenure.php#PromotionandTenureforUSFAFaculty>

**Awards are not a requirement for consideration of tenure or promotion; however, receipt of an award at any level is an indicator of excellence.

6. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OR HEALTH AUTHORITY

Faculty in the College of Medicine will be evaluated only in part (a) of this category (Administration). Although extension work (service to a community outside the university) is a valued contribution, many college faculty provide such services as part of their clinical activities, while others provide these services as recognized experts in a particular scientific field. Hence, their contributions will have been noted in earlier evaluation categories (Categories 2 – 5) or will be noted as a public service in Category 7. (Documentation of these activities need not be duplicated if previously evaluated or if they will be evaluated in Category 7, but their location in the file can be referenced).

Similarly, many faculty are involved in medical or academic administrative work that is more accurately classified as contributions to external academic or professional organizations (Category 7). Again, these activities should not be recorded and evaluated in this category.

Departmental tenure and promotions committees in the College of Medicine will be responsible for determining whether faculty seeking tenure or promotion have met the university's requirement regarding carrying one's 'share of

(a) Administration

Faculty are expected to carry their share of administrative work. Aspects to be evaluated include quality and impact of the candidate's contribution and the amount of time and/or effort involved.

Tenure as or Promotion to Associate Professor A fair and reasonable contribution to the administrative work of the Department, or College, or University is required.

Tenure as or Promotion to Professor A fair and reasonable contribution to the administrative work of the Department and College or University is required.

(b) Extension

Extension work (outreach and engagement) is defined as extending the University to the community through the provision of a service to the community outside of the University. It is expected that such service will be sponsored or sanctioned by the department and/or college in which the faculty member resides.

In the case of extension specialists and faculty for whom extension is a specific requirement of their position, these activities will usually be evaluated within categories 2 and 5. A candidate must have satisfactorily performed extension duties specified in their letter of appointment. College standards will specify which factors are to be considered and the methods by which information will be gathered and evaluated. Factors to be considered when assessing this category may include: the response of clients/audiences; the number and magnitude of undertakings; requests for services; the value of the contribution to the University; and the impact of the work. Statements from individuals who have personally observed the work performed by the candidate will be provided to review committees.

administrative work.' While the amount of work constituting a 'fair share' will naturally vary from department to department and from year to year, at least some administrative work is required from any faculty being evaluated in this category. In assigning administrative duties within departments and especially with respect to more junior faculty, Department Heads must remain mindful of achieving a balance of activities that, in total, facilitates rather than impedes progress towards promotion.

Faculty with significant academic administrative roles must provide documentation of satisfactory performance such as leadership survey results, annual performance feedback summaries, other representative assessments of administrative productivity and quality, or letters of support from senior colleagues, university or health authority administrators. Additionally, such faculty are expected to supply an up-to-date administrative dossier. The file should describe managerial contributions to sustained or new programming (academic and/or clinical), as applicable.

Note: the term 'academic' is used in the following table to signify administrative work primarily related to research or education. The term 'clinical' signifies administrative work primarily related to patient care. Some activities listed in the main organizational categories in Table I involve a large degree of academic/clinical overlap. 'Contributions to' is taken to include both chairing committees and membership on committees, as applicable.

TABLE I application:

In Category 6, the acceptable and required standard will be the same for all CoM clinical faculty, at all levels of evaluation, with the following 2 exceptions:

- 1) evaluation in this category is NOT REQUIRED for faculty seeking renewal of probation or tenure as Assistant Professor
- 2) clinician-administrators and scientist-administrators are expected to make contributions in senior leadership roles

| |
|---|
| <i>TABLE I: Evaluation of Administrative Contributions to the Department, College, University or Health Authority</i> |
| Typical Administrative Categories and Activities (list not exhaustive) |
| <p>Departmental Administrative Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to any departmental academic committee • Contributions to any departmental academic task force or project management team • Contributions to any departmental committee, team or project related to departmental operations, restructuring, management, efficiency, quality control • Contributions to academic inter-departmental committees, teams, or projects • Contribution as a Department Head, program director, or other department-based academic or administrative leadership role <p>College Administrative Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to any college committee as a departmental representative • Contribution to any college committee as a volunteer or following request from the college • Contribution to any college project team, task force, or other college-sanctioned activity requiring ongoing faculty representation • Contribution as a member of Faculty Council and any of its subcommittees • Contribution to accreditation administrative activities • Contribution as director, assistant dean, associate dean, vice dean, dean, or other college-based administrative leadership role |

7. PUBLIC SERVICE AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL BODIES

This category describes the candidate's commitment to the broader university community and to the general public. Meeting the standards in this category will be a requirement for only certain colleges and departments (as specified in their respective standards). In such cases, college standards will specify which factors are to be considered and the methods by which information will be gathered and evaluated.

Candidates for tenure as Assistant Professor are not required to meet any requirements in this category unless such duties are specified on appointment.

(a) Public Service

Public service is normally defined as the faculty member's provision of expertise to the outside community and will be accorded recognition insofar as the activities entail application of expertise associated with the candidate's position in the university.

(b) Service to Academic, Professional or Scientific Organizations

To be recognized within this category, service to academic and/or professional organizations must go beyond membership in an organization and focus on active participation. Such activities might include: service on the committees or executives of academic or professional organizations; service on selection committees for provincial, national or international granting organizations; or service on the editorial board for academic, professional or scientific journals.

University Administrative Work:

- Contribution as a departmental or college representative on any university committee, project team, task force, or other university-sanctioned activity requiring college or departmental representation
- Contribution to any university committee as a volunteer or following request from the university
- Contribution to any university project team, task force, or other university-sanctioned activity requiring ongoing faculty representation
- Contribution as a member of University Council and any of its subcommittees

Health Authority Administrative Work: Note – Clinical administrative work that has already been documented and/or evaluated in Categories 3 or 5 should not be duplicated in this category.

- Contribution to health authority committees, task forces, projects, quality improvement interventions
- Contribution as a health authority-appointed clinical leader, organizer, manager, or supervisor
- Contribution as a departmental, college, or university representative on a health authority committee, task force, project, or ongoing quality improvement intervention
- Contribution to health authority accreditation or credentialing administrative activities

7. PUBLIC SERVICE AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL BODIES

Public service is defined as the provision of professional expertise to the community outside the university. To be recognized in this category, the activities must entail application of expertise associated with the faculty member's position in the university or in the academic/clinical setting.

Service to academic, professional or scientific organizations, must go beyond simple membership in the organization and must involve active contribution. If the activities have been documented earlier in the case file and evaluated in Categories 2 – 6, they need not be repeated here but their location in the file can be referenced.

The university standards for promotion require faculty to "demonstrate willingness to participate" in public service and service to academic, professional or scientific organizations. In the College of Medicine, actual contributions such as those specified in Table J are required.

TABLE J application:

In Category 7, the acceptable and required standard will be the same for all CoM clinical faculty, at all levels of evaluation, as applicable, with the following exception: evaluation in this category is NOT REQUIRED for faculty seeking renewal of probation or tenure as Assistant Professor.

TABLE J: Evaluation of Public Service Contributions and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies

| Public Service Activities: (list not exhaustive) | Service to Academic and Professional Bodies: (list not exhaustive) |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of medical/scientific information in a media interview • provision of written medical/scientific information in contribution to a publication intended for use by the general public • provision of medical/scientific information at the request of a provincial/national government agency or international NGO • membership on the boards or committees of government agencies or NGO's as a contributor of medical/scientific expertise • provision of volunteer medical or scientific services to a charitable or humanitarian organization • provision of volunteer medical supervisory, assessment or diagnostic services to a sports team or organization • provision of public presentations on health or science related topics associated with one's field of expertise • provision of medical/scientific presentations, interactive learning activities, seminars, etc. to a public education body at the primary or secondary educational level • provision of volunteer medical/scientific advice or education to municipal, provincial or national community groups | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scientific publication editor, editorial reviewer, journal manuscript reviewer • member of an editorial board for a peer-reviewed journal or scientific publisher • committee member for a provincial or national or international academic association (e.g. RCPSC, CFPC, AAMC, CAME, AFMC) • lead organizer for a provincial or national professional association's annual or special conference • committee member for a provincial or national professional (clinical) organization (e.g. SMA, CMA, HQC) • participation as a team member on national or international academic or clinical accreditation bodies • contribution as a team member on accreditation preparation committees or accreditation teams external to the CoM |

E. PROCESS OF EVALUATION

The Dean, Executive Director or Department Head shall review the University, College and Department Standards with every faculty member as part of the annual review for faculty members who are candidates for promotion and tenure.

Evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion will take place within a process that is open and accountable. Both the committee chairs and the candidates are expected to share information about the evaluation process and to contribute to the collection of appropriate documentation for the consideration of all committees. Committee chairs are expected to provide opportunities for committee members to review the documentation, including the statement of rationale, prior to its submission to senior collegial committees.

Departments will consider eligible candidates for tenure and promotion according to their eligibility, unless a request for a deferral has been received. The candidate will confirm with the Department Head or Dean his/her desire to be considered for tenure or promotion and will supply the documents listed in tenure and promotion case files (identified below).

E. PROCESS OF EVALUATION

Faculty are encouraged to provide a well-organized case file and supporting documentation, such that review committees can easily access and evaluate all necessary materials. The case file should be organized in a manner consistent with the categories of evaluation outlined in these standards, preceded by a letter of self-assessment that is intended to direct the reviewers' attention to the most relevant parts of the file. The letter should be a general statement regarding progress in each category; it should not duplicate all of the particulars submitted for each category of the file.

The CV is intended to be a reference document for review committees. Faculty are expected to identify, in their letters of self assessment, the relevant sections in their CV that correspond with each evaluation category, so as to direct the attention of the review committee accordingly. Where supporting documentation is available, this should be placed appropriately in the case file. If the documentation is thought to be relevant for more than one evaluation category, its original location in the file can be referenced.

Faculty seeking tenure or promotion are responsible for providing some of the materials for the case file, while other documentation is provided by the Department Head. A final recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion is provided to the university by the Dean, as chair of the College Review Committee. The table shown below summarizes required information, as applicable, for each category of evaluation.

Tenure and Promotion Case Files: Case files will provide the basic evidence used to assess the candidate's case for tenure or promotion. Case files will include the following items:

1. *Provided by the Candidate:*
 - An up-to-date *curriculum vitae*.
 - A self-assessment of the candidate's progress towards tenure or promotion.
 - Evidence pertaining to teaching, including: a statement of the candidate's philosophy of teaching and an explanation of its application, student and peer evaluations (if provided to the candidate), a record of teaching roles (including time commitments and method of delivery) in undergraduate and graduate courses, teaching and/or supervision of students performing clinical work, undertaking *practica* or other types of field work, and advising and supervising graduate students.
 - Evidence pertaining to research and scholarly work including a statement on the nature of the candidate's research and future research plans, the candidate's contribution to joint publications and research grants, examples of published works, performances, manuscript materials, on the adequacy of the candidate's research funding support (where required in college/department standards), and other relevant evidence for the purposes of establishing research direction and accomplishment.
 - For candidates considered under Category 5 only, evidence pertaining to practice of professional skills including a statement on the nature and scope of the candidate's practice, a discussion of various leadership activities associated with the candidate's role in professional service whether delivered to a professional audience, individuals, groups, organizations, institutions, or the community.
 - Examples of materials pertaining to administration, extension and public service including a statement on the role of the candidate in service to academic and/or professional organizations, on the nature and extent of the candidate's contributions in these areas and statements from individuals (e.g. chairs, other committee members) who have personally observed the work and/or contributions the candidate has performed on committees, or as part of their administrative responsibilities.
2. *Provided by the Department Head or Dean (as committee chair) in addition to the documents listed under item 3 below:*
 - *For departmentalized colleges:* A Statement of Rationale from the college, signed by the Dean as Chair of the College Review Committee, explaining the decision at the college level and including both majority and minority views of committee members. This statement will be made available to committee members for review prior to submission to the senior committees. The statement of rationale must include:
 - An indication of the quality and significance of the candidate's work and how it was assessed
 - An indication of the committee's discussion of the evidence and the relative weighting of this evidence in the overall decision of the committee
 - Where required in the college standards, a statement of the adequacy of research funding support
 - A list of the College Review Committee members
 - *For non-departmentalized colleges:* A Statement of Rationale from the college, signed by the Dean as Chair of the College Review Committee, explaining the decision and including both majority and minority views of committee members. This statement will be made available to committee members for review prior to submission to the senior committees. The statement of rationale must include:
 - An indication of the quality and significance of the candidate's work and how it was assessed
 - An indication and assessment of the quality of the candidate's teaching

TABLE K: Case File Check List

| Category | | Required Documents | Provided By Faculty | Provided By D. Head |
|----------|--|--|---|--|
| | Case File | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self assessment letter • Curriculum Vitae (format as specified by college or university) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ ✓ | |
| 1 | Academic and Professional Credentials | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proof of credentials, if required by Department Head | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ | |
| 2 | Teaching | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written statement on philosophy of teaching • Teaching dossier (optional, but strongly recommended – if no teaching dossier provided, must provide complete summary of all teaching done during review period) • Student evaluations of teaching, both qualitative and quantitative, from throughout the review period • Peer evaluations of teaching from throughout the review period • Written statements from course coordinators or other course instructors (optional) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| 3 | Knowledge of the Discipline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proof of activities confirming knowledge of the discipline (letters from chairs or senior administrators, schedules, agendas, invitations to provide expertise, etc.) relevant to examples outlined in Table C, and/or: • Peer evaluations of open seminar presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ and/or ✓ |
| 4 | Research and Scholarly Work | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement on program of research, addressing its nature and scope • Relevant sections extracted from CV • Three external assessments for tenure at any rank and for promotion to Professor, as per university requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ ✓ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ |
| 5.1a | Practice of Professional Skills: Clinical Practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement on nature and scope of clinical practice • Copies of documents specified in Table E • Three letters of recommendation from the faculty's colleagues • Statement of recommendation from the Department Head addressing each of the requirements listed in Table E | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ ✓ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ ✓ |
| 5.2a | Scholarly Work associated with Clinical Practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters from at least 3 colleagues addressing factors identified in Table F • Letters from external organizations (e.g. health authority senior administrators) addressing factors identified in Table F (optional) • Identification by faculty of portions of student and peer teaching evaluations relevant to factors identified in Table F | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ ✓ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|---|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An explanation on how the student and peer evaluations were conducted, a summary of their contents and their interpretation by the college committee, and an indication of the types of courses evaluated ○ An indication and assessment of the quality of the candidate's research productivity within the context of the discipline including an indication of the quality of journals and other publications ○ An assessment of the candidate's current and potential program of research and scholarship within the context of the discipline ○ An assessment of, where required in college standards, the adequacy of research funding support ○ An explanation of the candidate's role in joint publications, presentations, or research grants, including a statement of confirmation by collaborators. ○ An indication of the committee's discussion of the evidence and the relative weighting of this evidence in the overall decision of the committee ○ A list of the College Review Committee members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>For departments:</i> A Statement of Rationale from the department, signed by the Department Head as chair of the department committee, explaining the decision at the department level and including both majority and minority views of committee members. This statement will be made available to committee members for review prior to submission to the senior committees. The statement of rationale must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An indication of the quality and significance of the candidate's work and how it was assessed ○ An indication and assessment of the quality of the candidate's teaching ○ An explanation on how the student and peer evaluations were conducted, a summary of their contents and their interpretation by the department committee, and an indication of the types of courses evaluated ○ An assessment of the candidate's current and potential program of research and scholarship within the context of the discipline ○ An assessment of, where required in department standards, the adequacy of research funding support ○ An indication and assessment of the quality of the candidate's research productivity within the context of the discipline including an indication of the quality of journals and other publications ○ An explanation of the candidate's role in joint publications, presentations, or research grants, including a statement of confirmation by collaborators ○ An indication of the committee's discussion of the evidence and the relative weighting of this evidence in the overall decision of the committee ○ A list of the department committee members <p>3. <i>Provided by the Department Head or Dean (as committee chair) in addition to the documents listed under item 2 above relating to the recommendations of the tenure or promotion committee:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Forms (T1/P1 and T2/P2). ● A copy of the letter sent by the department (or college in the case of non-departmentalized colleges) to external referees. ● A list of the persons identified as external referees and shown to the candidate. ● A list of the persons selected as external referees, including a brief description of their areas and accomplishments. ● The letters of evaluation submitted by the external referees with an indication of the role they played in the evaluation process. ● A complete list of persons consulted in the evaluation process (e.g. co-authors, other departments in the case of joint appointments, client organizations). ● In cases of associate memberships, comments on all categories relevant to the duties of the candidate will be solicited by the Dean or Department Head from all units with which a faculty member is associated. Individuals solicited for comments will be provided with copies of the | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identification by faculty of portions of teaching dossier relevant to factors identified in Table F ● Examples of original teaching materials, developed by the faculty in accordance with current evidence (optional) ● Three external assessments for tenure at any rank, if applicable, and for promotion to Professor, as per university requirements | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 5.1b | Practice of Professional Skills: Educational Practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Statement on nature and scope of educational practice ● Peer evaluations addressing factors identified in Table G ● Identification by faculty of relevant portions of teaching dossier that document activities identified in Table G ● Documentation confirming participation in and assessment of any activities or roles identified in Table G | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 5.2b | Scholarly Work associated with Educational Practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Examples of original scholarly work products identified in Table H (e.g. learner assessment techniques, course contents) ● Identification by faculty of relevant portions of CV documenting requirements identified in Table H ● Three external assessments for tenure at any rank and for promotion to Professor, as per university requirements | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 6 | Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Letter(s) from organizations, health authorities, committee chairs, senior administrators, etc. attesting to quantity and quality of administrative work performed by faculty ● For clinician-administrators or scientist-administrators, letter(s) from senior clinical, college or university administrator colleagues attesting to value and impact of faculty's leadership contributions ● Personal leadership evaluations from faculty or staff (optional) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 7 | Public Service and Service to Professional Bodies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documentation confirming contributions to public service ● Documentation confirming contributions to academic and professional bodies | ✓ | ✓ | |
| | | Case File | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Statement of Rationale for departmental review committee decision; contents as per university requirements ● Statement of Rationale for college review committee decision (provided by Dean on behalf of CRC), contents as per university requirements | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | | |

candidate's *curriculum vitae* and supporting documentation. The candidate will be informed that such information has been solicited.

- Any additional documents collected by the college committee, (in addition to those submitted by the department). These are to be identified as additional material available to the College Review Committee (e.g. letters or minority reports from members of the department committee).
- Any other information on the specific case that the University Review Committee should be aware of (e.g. sabbatical and other leaves, academic credentials verification).

In conducting their evaluation, department, college and university-level committees will be able to access progress reports, theses and other information internal to the University.

Senior Academics: For the purposes of external assessment in either Category 4 (Research, Scholarly and/or Artistic Work) or Category 5 (Practice of Professional Skills), a senior academic is a colleague holding an academic or research appointment at a comparable institution. In the case of tenure as Assistant Professor, one of the three senior academics may be at the Associate Professor level; two must be Full Professors or equivalent. In the case of tenure as Associate Professor or Professor, the three senior academics must be Full Professors or equivalent. In the case of promotion to Professor, the three senior academics must be Full Professors or equivalent. For candidates considered under Category 5 (Practice of Professional Skills) only, in some cases identified by the Dean, a non-academic may be appropriate to act as a referee but only one such person will act as a referee in any given case.

External Referees: Processes constructed for the selection of the external referees will ensure that the candidate has an opportunity to put forward names for consideration and to identify potential referees with a perceived personal bias. The University expects that this aspect of the process will be conducted in a fair and open manner and that it will protect the confidentiality of the external reviewers. The University recommends the following process:

- Normally, the Department Head or Dean of a non-departmentalized college will prepare a list of at least six qualified external referees. These external referees will have established national or international reputations in their field and will be able to judge whether the candidate's work is of the required standard. They must be sufficiently 'at arm's length' from the candidate so as to provide an objective assessment of performance; i.e., must not have been the candidate's colleagues, former supervisors (within the past ten years), or co-investigators. The candidate may suggest some names, but the Department Head or Dean (of a non-departmentalized college), in consultation with committee members, should provide at least half of the names on the list. The candidate will be permitted to ask that particular referees be dropped on grounds such as suspected personal prejudice, but may in turn be asked to provide an explanation of why a name should be dropped. When names are dropped, others will be added so that a minimum of five names is available to the Dean. The Dean will approve the final list and a description of the credentials/background of the external referees will be provided to the review committees for information.
- The Department Head, or Dean of a non-departmentalized college, will select at least three (usually four) external referees from this list and write letters requesting an assessment of the candidate's research, scholarly and/or artistic work. The candidate will **not** be informed of the referees selected. The letters to external referees should indicate that comments are sought only on the research, scholarly and/or artistic work of the candidate, or in the case of consideration under Category 5 (Practice of Professional Skills), on the professional practice in addition to the research, scholarly or artistic work of the candidate. External referees should be informed that their reply will be considered **confidential** and will be seen only by the committees and not by the candidate. Enclosed with the letter should be the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, the relevant approved standards, and appropriate sections of the case file including all materials germane to the category of evaluation [either Category 4 (Research and Scholarly Work) or Category 5 (Practice of Professional Skills)].

Part-time Appointments/Reduced Time Appointments. In cases of tenurable part-time appointments or in cases of reduced time appointments, individual letters of appointment will reflect expectations regarding the

appropriate timeframe in which to evaluate progress towards both tenure and promotion. Normally such candidates will be provided with extended periods of time in which to meet the standards commensurate with the precise nature of their appointment.

Category of Assessment: The Department Head and/or Dean will determine at the time of appointment, through discussion with the faculty member, whether assigned duties will be evaluated under Category 4 (Research, Scholarly and/or Artistic Work) or Category 5 (Practice of Professional Skills) and this agreement will be included in the letter of offer to the candidate. This determination will remain in effect until written confirmation from the Department Head and/or Dean indicates a change in category because of new or different assigned duties. Any change must be discussed with, and agreed to in writing by, the faculty member and approved by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic. All work completed under the original category of assessment will be reassessed under the new category at the time tenure or promotion decisions are made.

Timelines: Determinations at the department, college and university levels should be made in an expeditious fashion, mindful of collegial deadlines, but committee chairs should take the time required to prepare a comprehensive case for the consideration of senior committees.

F. DEFINITIONS

The University Standards refer specifically to the academic ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. However, the intent of the standards should also be read as applying to Librarian ranks, as well as Assistant Professors (CDC), Associate Professors (CDC) and Professors (CDC). In the case of the Crop Development Centre (CDC) and clinical faculty in the College of Medicine the appropriate terminology is continuing status.

(The preceding will need modification)

For clarity of communication in tenure and promotion proceedings throughout the University, the following standard terminology is to be used when assessing a candidate's performance in each of the appropriate categories:

- Does not meet the standard for (promotion or tenure)
- Meets the standard for (promotion or tenure)
- Exceeds the standard for (promotion or tenure) i.e., a superior performance

In most cases it is only necessary to determine whether a candidate meets the standard or not. However, in some cases it will be desirable to identify those who have made an unusually significant contribution and whose performance markedly exceeds the standards for a given rank. For this purpose the term *superior* should be used. The standards to be met, as well as the performance expectation for an assessment of superior, will vary with academic rank: e.g., an assessment of superior for promotion to professor implies a higher level of performance than for tenure as an assistant professor.^v

With reference to scholarly work, the term "published" means having appeared in print or having been accepted for publication. The latter (accepted for publication) means that a decision to publish a manuscript in present form (or with such minor revisions as to not require re-submission and a second review) has been made and communicated in writing to the author.

¹This document replaces the standards for promotion and tenure adopted by the University Review Committee February 1989, 2002. It also replaces the preliminary standards adopted by the University Review Committee in June, 2000.

² Readers are referred to the University Council *Guidelines for Academic Conduct*, approved in June 1999.

³ The definition of “senior academic” and the process for solicitation of letters from external referees is described in Section E.

⁴ The definition of senior academic and the process for solicitation of letters from external referees is described in Section E. In some cases, identified by the Dean, a non-academic may be appropriate to act as a referee but only one such person will act as a referee in any given case.

⁵ In this document, the word “superior” denotes performance in the top quartile of a large group of comparable persons. Approximation to such a norm can only be expected in large groups; e.g., the whole University or a group the size of a large college when evaluating teaching, or persons within the same rank and discipline in Canada when evaluating scholarly work. There is no implication that one-quarter of the faculty in a particular department or small college will be superior in teaching or research and scholarly work. Some units may have a high proportion of faculty with superior performance in a given category and some may have few. Of course, there is no way in which one can actually compare a given individual’s teaching with that of all faculty in the University or the candidate’s research with that of the candidate’s peers across the country in order to determine if they are in the top one-quarter. These illustrations are given solely to clarify the use of the word superior and to suggest the frequency with which it is to be applied in tenure and promotion cases.