

others, as well as the ways in which systemic inequalities may influence assessments of merit and performance. The Faculty will make efforts to remove and counterbalance biases to the extent possible and Faculty Assessment and Tenure and Promotion Committees should assess performance with these systemic inequalities in mind

- x As part of the assessment process, the Faculty Assessment Committee shall consider information about financial and other support the Faculty has provided to faculty members. In a given cycle in which the Faculty opts in to the OAA, the Faculty Assessment Committee will report to the Faculty on who received OAAs.

RESEARCH

[5] We affirm that the Faculty is committed to a transparent, inclusive, and responsible research assessment process in accordance with the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) principles. We have applied the DORA principles in developing the criteria in this section and our process for assessing research and scholarship activities in Appointment, Renewal, Transfer, Tenure and Promotion, and Assessment.

[6] The overriding factor for the assessment of research engaged in by a member of the academic staff shall be the *quality* of the research which will tend to be reflected in its influence. Research that is impactful is an essential component of an academic appointment.

[7] It is to be expected that the influence and stature of each faculty member's research should increase as they progress through the ranks.

[8] Factors relevant to assessing the quality and influence of the research may include:

- x whether the research has been subject to peer review or other forms of review prior to publication;
- x where the research is published (having regard to such considerations as journal impact factor, where available, and the review process and publisher prestige for books and book chapters);
- x the presentation of research to academic, professional, policy, governmental or lay audiences;
- x

period of time. It is also recognized that some publications may take more than one assessment cycle to complete. Monographs and doctoral dissertations may be claimed in no more than two assessment cycles. A member of the academic staff claiming a piece of work in more than one cycle must explain why it is appropriate to do so.

[10] The Dean, Department Head equivalent and the Faculty Assessment Committee or the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee shall consider the following as forms of research in the Faculty of Law:

- x books, texts, treatises, casebooks, and legal encyclopedias (including revisions) or sections thereof;
- x articles and commentaries in periodicals, journals, reviews and news (both legal and non-legal);
- x chapters in scholarly books;
- x case notes, annotations and book reviews;
- x audio, visual and digital communications designed to add to the knowledge of the law and its functioning, such as blog posts (including ABlawg posts) and podcasts;
- x research papers and reports for law reform bodies, governmental and nongovernmental bodies and agencies, and professional bodies and agencies;
- x research papers distributed to academic and professional audiences (in connection with conferences, seminars, workshops and similar meetings);
- x research presentations and keynote or plenary addresses to academic and professional audiences (at conferences, seminars, workshops and similar meetings);
- x written or oral communications to lay audiences for the purpose of knowledge translation or education;
- x applications for research funding;
- x editorial work on scholarly texts and journals;
- x unpublished casebooks and teaching materials used in a course taught by the member of the academic staff
- x academic theses leading towards the conferral of relevant higher degrees whether begun before or during the academic staff member's appointment at the University of Calgary

[11] We have tried to make the kinds of research that will be considered as comprehensive as possible. However, it is open to members of the academic staff to provide information about other forms of research work they have completed to the Dean, Department Head equivalent, Faculty Assessment Committee and/or the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee.

[12] We recognize that members of the academic staff frequently collaborate with other researchers, including those from other disciplines, and that the research produced from those collaborations is often co-authored. Given that co-authored research does not necessarily denote a particular division of labour, it is open to members of the academic staff to provide information about their individual contribution to co-authored research. It is also recognized that collaborative research, especially when it involves another discipline, may take more rather than less time than sole-authored publications and academic staff are encouraged to provide information about that.

[13] Another factor that may be taken into account is whether a member of the academic staff has developed and implemented a personal research agenda, including applications for funding.

- the importance of reconciliation between settlers and Indigenous persons;
- articulation of clear course and learning objectives;
- participation in teaching development programs and/or conferences and self-directed learning
- seeking out or providing mentorship with colleagues on teaching and learning;
- supervision of directed research projects along with the scope and outcomes of those projects
- supervision or participation in the examination of graduate students, both within and beyond the Faculty of Law;
- participation in mentorship activities related to teaching and learning, for example mentorship of student groups;
- the number of courses and credit hours taught by the instructor in the Faculty and elsewhere;
- the number and character of assignments and other forms of evaluation used by the instructor;
- the number of students enrolled in courses taught by the instructor, both in individual courses and overall
- whether the instructor is teaching courses within or outside their area of research expertise;
- whether a particular course is being taught for the first time by the instructor, and to what extent the instructor had to create the course and teaching materials
- whether the instructor's load consists of mandatory (1L or upper year/graduate) versus optional courses and how this load might impact their teaching and other responsibilities
- whether the instructor has sought, and/or received funding and other resources to support their teaching of particular courses;
- evidence of leadership in teaching

[17] Evidence to measure the above factors should include evidence from the instructor, students, and colleagues.

[18] Evidence from the instructor may include:

- a teaching dossier that includes selected course syllabuses, course assignments, examinations, skills-based exercises and other course materials
- statements of activities related to teaching, supervision and mentorship;
- statements of teaching philosophy and supervision/mentorship philosophy; presentations/publications on teaching, supervision or mentoring.

[19] Evidence from students may include:

- student feedback through the university's student feedback instruments
- faculty-developed teaching/instructor evaluations;
- instructor-developed evaluations;
- samples of student work;
- teaching awards and nominations received from students (e.g. Student Union Teaching Awards); letters of support from former students.

[20] Multiple sources of evidence must be used to obtain a holistic picture of the teaching expertise and effectiveness of the academic staff member. Student feedback cannot be used alone, and must be applied in a contextual manner

[21] Evidence from colleagues may include

- statements from instructors in the same course;
- written observations of the staff member's teaching;
- letters of support from colleagues;
- peerbased teaching awards and nominations;
- peerreviewed and other publications related to teaching and learning.

[22] The weight to be given to such material shall be determined by the Dean, Department Head equivalent, and the Faculty Assessment Committee or the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee, as the case may be.

[23] It is our belief that the criteria should be open ended to encourage creativity and innovation in the classroom and to encourage members of the academic staff to communicate these efforts to the Dean and our colleagues.

SERVICE

[24] Ours is a small law school that prides itself on its sense of community. We have never subscribed to the notion that Research and Teaching are the only truly important components of excellence in academic life. The lynchpin of this has been the willingness of our colleagues to share willingly and equitably the responsibilities of service and the goals of collegial governance of the Faculty and University. In that vein, these are the guiding principles for assessment of service and administrative responsibilities within the Faculty

[25] There is an expectation that with increased seniority, faculty members will take on increased administrative responsibility.

[28] Regular attendance at faculty meetings ~~expected~~ as is participation in judging first year moots