

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

PROCEDURES OF THE COLLEGE REVIEW COMMITTEE (CRC)

In accordance with Articles 15.9.3 and 17.3.4 of the USFA Collective Agreement, each departmentalized College shall have a review committee to consider all matters related to tenure and other matters specifically assigned to this committee in the Agreement. The College Review Committee shall be made up of no fewer than six tenured members of the College plus the Dean who shall be chair. The membership of the College Review Committee shall be the same in the case of salary recommendations as in the case of tenure.

Recommendations will initially be formulated by a subcommittee, one for each Division. These recommendations will then be considered by the entire CRC.

With respect to special increases for Department Heads and Assistant Deans, the College of Arts and Science will annually establish a College Salary Committee chaired by the Dean.

Conflict of Interest: Members will be excused from deliberations when in a conflict of interest. CRC members are expected to disclose any potential conflict of interest to the committee, and the committee has the right to exclude members from the deliberations of specific cases due to perceived conflict of interest. Conflict of interest includes, but may not be limited to, deliberation of the CRC member's own case or that of a family member and deliberation of a faculty member's case with whom the CRC member has an active collaboration. When individuals are excused from CRC deliberations due to conflict of interest, the remaining CRC members will conduct the deliberations relevant to the case at hand.

CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

Meritorious performance requires excellence in at least one category. The College will consider special increases in any of the categories listed under Article 17.2 of the Collective Agreement except 17.2.8. (Increases under 17.2.8 are under the jurisdiction of the President's Review Committee and outlined under Article 17.4.5.)

In making a judgement of meritoriousness in any area(s), the College Review Committee may take into account the faculty member's historical and ongoing activities and workload in all areas relevant to their appointment, rank, assigned duties and department.

Establishing excellence requires clear evidence that assigned duties have been performed at a level beyond the standard expected of a faculty member given his or her rank, as defined by the College's standards for tenure at that rank.

The basis for the allocation of merit shall be as inclusive as possible, respecting the diversity of forms of academic activity performed by faculty.

Decisions regarding meritorious performance will take into consideration the expectations outlined in Departmental merit standards. The interpretation of evidence will make use of criteria, guidelines, expectations and explanations given in the merit standards of the relevant department.

In determining meritorious performance, the CRC may take into account any time-release in effect during the period under consideration.

In the event of equally meritorious performance between faculty members at different ranks, the priority will be given to the member holding the lower rank.

Only performance since last merit can be considered. The candidate must specify the precise assessment period to be considered.

CRC PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING AND RECOMMENDING SPECIAL INCREASES

Teaching:

The assessment of teaching performance may involve both peer and student evaluations, as well as other forms of evidence as described in the College of Arts and Science Standards for Promotion and Tenure. The candidate must provide evidence of exemplary and innovative teaching through a record of superior evaluations or other appropriate forms of assessment.

Research and Scholarly Work:

Research, scholarly and/or artistic work are expected of all faculty. Evaluation for merit in this category will consider the quality and significance of the work.

Evidence to be considered will include publication (or accepted for publication) in reputable peer-reviewed outlets. Other materials (such as research-related patents, copyrighted software and audio-visual productions) may also be considered. In the case of performance or artistic work, evidence will include performances or exhibitions in reputable venues.

Evidence of research activity may also include graduate student and postdoctoral supervision, and thesis committee work.

Non-peer reviewed work cannot form the primary basis for merit but can contribute to the case.

Under certain circumstances, as outlined in Article 17.2.2 of the Collective Agreement, unpublished work may be considered as meritorious.

To be considered meritorious, contributions must have demonstrated an impact beyond the University of Saskatchewan. Departments shall make clear their understanding of this impact.

For any research contribution involving more than one author or investigator, the contributions of each should be stated explicitly.

Receipt of external funding may be considered as evidence of meritorious contribution in this category. Factors which may be considered will include impact, significance, and prestige of the award, competitiveness for the award, and whether holding external funding is standard practice in the discipline.

Practice of Professional Skills:

Meritorious effort in this category will be determined using as a base line the standards for tenure in the rank, and taking into account University and relevant Department Standards for special increases.

Extra University Work and Public Service:

Criteria for evaluation in this category will be determined according to Department Standards for special increases.

Administrative Work:

For merit in this category, consideration will be given to such factors as leadership role and the volume, scope, and difficulty of the work.

Administrative Service as a Department Head or Assistant Dean:

The College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Dean will determine the criteria for awarding merit under this category.

Improvement in Academic Qualifications:

For merit in this category, the improvement in qualification must be related to the candidate's assigned duties at the University.

Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution:

N/A

Performance of a Full Range of Assigned Duties:

Meritorious effort under this category will be determined by superior performance across a combination of the duties of a faculty member, where performance in just one area —while above the standard expected — may not reach the level of being deemed meritorious.

Improvement and Development:

Activities deemed meritorious in this category may involve the pursuit of an area of scholarship markedly new to the faculty member and/or to the discipline. It may also include a significant role in activities not typically highlighted in annual curriculum vitae updates.

DEPARTMENT HEADS AND ASSISTANT DEANS**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES
June 22, 2011****1. SALARY COMMITTEE.**

In accordance with Article 17.3.3 of the USFA Collective Agreement, each departmentalized College shall establish annually a College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans chaired by the Dean. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three Department Heads and/or Assistant Deans. One Department Head from each of the three Divisions will be selected by secret ballot by all eligible Department Heads and Assistant Deans. The Vice Dean from each Division will be invited to provide input that would be useful to inform the committee's deliberations. When a committee member's own case is considered, that member will be excluded from the proceedings of the committee. No member of the committee shall participate in a decision in which they are in conflict of interest.

2. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

The College of Arts and Science follows section 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. Standards for the award of Special Increases shall be established in accordance with the provisions of Articles 17.2 and 17.3. The award of merit presupposes satisfactory performance in all categories of assessment plus outstanding performance in one or more.

The College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans will use the applicable Departmental Standards for Special Increases of Salary to assess meritorious performance in these categories:

Teaching

Research and Scholarly Work

Practice of Professional Skills

Extra University Work and Public Service

Administrative Work (General)

Improvement in Academic Qualifications

Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties

Improvement and Development

Administrative Work as a Department Head or Assistant Dean will be evaluated using the following template that each eligible Department Head and Assistant Dean will be invited to submit annually:

Scale of Departmental Responsibilities:

	<u>FTE</u>
Tenure-Stream Faculty	_____
Sessional Faculty	_____
Support Staff	_____
Undergraduate Majors	_____
Graduate Students	_____
Undergraduate 3 cue activity	_____
Number of Programs	_____

Criteria for Evaluation of Administrative Work as a Department Head or Assistant Dean (personal academic activities will be evaluated according to Departmental Standards for Special Increases of Salary). Describe how your administrative leadership and administrative work have contributed to the effective management, operation or development of the department using any of these suggested topics, as appropriate, or others that may be relevant. The following categories are meant primarily for use of annual self-evaluation reports. However, they may also be used in submitting a **supplementary** self-evaluation that provides the basis for consideration of Special Increases of Salary on a cumulative basis.

1. Faculty Renewal/Recruitment
2. Faculty Development/Staff Development
3. Curriculum/Program Changes/Inter-Disciplinary Initiatives
4. Student Related Initiatives
5. Research Promotion/Grants and External Support
6. Community Outreach Activities
7. Departmental Crises/Special Challenges
8. Personal Teaching Assignment (Graduate and Undergraduate)
9. Space/Facilities Issues
10. Other

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY

**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES**

Salary Review Committee (SRC)

The 2010-13 Collective Agreement stipulates that:

Each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department. Eligible employees include those holding probationary, tenured, continuing status, or term appointments if the term of appointment is for more than one academic year and there is at least another academic year remaining in the term of appointment at the time of appointment to the committee . . . A committee member whose own case is considered shall still participate on the committee, except that when the committee member's own case is considered the committee member will be excluded from the proceedings of the committee. (Article 17.3.1).

Constitution of the Committee: The SRC will consist of the Department Head (as chair of the Committee) and three eligible Department members. Whenever possible, the SRC will represent all academic ranks in the Department (Assistant, Associate and Full professor) as well as both the Archaeology and the Anthropology programs. Whenever possible, membership on the SRC will rotate so that no one faculty member serves more than three consecutive years on the Committee.

Assignment to the Committee: The assignment of faculty to the SRC will be made by the Department Head by March 31 of each academic year as part of the Assignment of Duty procedures (Article 11.1). The work of the SRC will commence in September and conclude in November of each year.

Conflict of Interest: Any member of the Committee who is of the immediate family of a candidate for a Special Salary Increase shall be disqualified from attending the deliberations of the Committee concerning the case and from voting on the question (Article 17.5.3iv).

Principles for the Award of Special Salary Increases

The SRC will adjudicate the annual salary review materials submitted by faculty in keeping with the following principles:

1. Relevant Categories of Performance – The award of a special increase to salary is to recognize meritorious achievement in one or more of the categories of performance stipulated in Article 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. The categories to be considered by the SRC are below; descriptions of these categories appear in the Collective Agreement and should be reviewed by all faculty:

- 17.2.1 Teaching
- 17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work (Publication, Unpublished Work, Artistic Work)
- 17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills
- 17.2.4 Extra University Work and Public Service
- 17.2.5 Administrative Work (other than duties associated with a Department Head or Assistant Dean)
- 17.2.7 Improvements in Academic Qualifications
- 17.2.9 Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties
- 17.2.10 Improvement and Development

2. Excellence in Quality (Not Only Quantity) – The award of a Special Increase is based on demonstrated excellence in one or more of the performance categories. Excellent performance must demonstrate quality, not only quantity, in activities undertaken, and it must exceed expected standards of good performance. Guidelines for what constitutes excellence in the categories of Teaching, Research and Scholarly Activity, and Administration are below.

- 17.2.1 *Teaching* – Teaching duties in the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology include formal instruction of undergraduate and graduate courses as well as the supervision of research by undergraduate and graduate students. All faculty are expected to carry out these duties to a high standard adhering to University, College, and Departmental policies. Demonstrated excellence that exceeds the expected standard of performance could include the following:
- a) Competitive, peer-reviewed teaching awards (such as the College of Arts and Science Teaching Excellence Award, the Provost’s Award for Outstanding Teaching, The University of Saskatchewan’s Master Teacher Award, etc). Other awards, such as the USSU Teaching Excellence Award will be considered as part of an overall profile.
 - b) Leadership in the successful implementation of new instructional methods, the development of new courses, etc.
 - c) The successful completion of three or more graduate students (whose duration in the program does not exceed the departmental average) within one academic year. In keeping with the standards set forth by the College of Graduate Studies and Research, only students whose work is of sufficient quality are able to complete our graduate program successfully. Providing the supervisory guidance to allow three or more students to complete their programs and successfully defend theses of sufficient quality therefore represents excellence in supervision.
- 17.2.2 *Research and Scholarly Work* – Faculty members are expected: (i) to maintain an active research program that results in regular peer-reviewed publication in appropriate outlets; (ii) to engage in regular professional development by attending conferences, presenting research papers or posters, and organizing sessions; (iii) to apply for funding appropriate to their area of research; and (iv) to supervise and mentor graduate and, when applicable, undergraduate students undertaking research. Demonstrated excellence that exceeds the expected standard of performance could include the following:
- a) The publication or acceptance of two or more peer reviewed articles or chapters per year in reputable outlets. (For multiple authored works, the faculty member should have contributed 50% or more to the publication).
 - b) The publication or acceptance of a book manuscript.

- c) The award of one or more peer-reviewed grants from competitive funding bodies (such as SSHRC, CIHR, NSERC, Wenner Gren Foundation, Fulbright Program).
- d) The award of one or more grants from corporate and/or non-governmental funding sources.
- e) Non-refereed research may be considered if it has a demonstrably important and positive impact on a community, organization, or to a body of literature.
- f) The receipt of a competitive and peer-reviewed award for research distinction (such as the University's Distinguished Researcher Award).

17.2.5 *Administrative Work* – Faculty members are expected to contribute constructively to the administration of the Department. Faculty are also expected to participate in the governance of the Division of Social Sciences, the College of Arts & Science, College of Graduate Studies and Research, and/or at the University-wide level. Demonstrated excellence in service and leadership above and beyond what is expected should, as in all categories, reflect quality not only quantity of activities. This could include the following:

- a) Chairing a Committee that undertakes a major development task (such as administrative restructuring, program review and revision, long-term planning, preparing planning documents or guidelines for governance, etc);
- b) Election to an administrative post in a national or international professional association;
- c) Consecutive service on a grant adjudication committee for a major funding body.

3. Consideration of Tenure-Status – Standards for excellence in all of the performance categories shall be higher for tenured than untenured faculty.
4. Substantiation of Excellence – Because the award of a Special Increase is based on demonstrated excellence in one or more of the categories of performance, substantiating evidence of excellence must be included in each faculty's submission to the SRC. Faculty members are expected to take full responsibility for gathering this substantiating evidence.
5. Comprehensive Excellence – Although the award of a Special Increase can and in all likelihood will be granted on the basis of demonstrated excellence in a singular category of performance, priority will be given to those individuals who provide evidence of excellence in one or more categories while also demonstrating strong to excellent performance in at least one additional category.
6. Alignment with Assignment of Duties – Faculty performance must be in alignment with the assignment of duties established through the Assignment of Duty procedures (Article 11.1). When considering recommendations for merit, the relative weighting of the performance categories shall take into account their relative weighting in each faculty member's Assignment of Duty.
7. Review Period Parity – As permitted by Article 17.1.3, cases for a Special Increase in salary may be based on accumulated performance over a specified period of years which, when regarded together, demonstrate excellence. These cases may only be considered when a Special Increase has not previously been awarded for the items listed on the CV Update (Form 1). Cases for accumulated performance will be considered on par with cases that are restricted to the regular review period (July 1 to June 30 of any given academic year).

Procedures of the Departmental Salary Committee

The Procedures of the SRC will adhere to Article 17 of the Collective Agreement, with particular attention to Sections 17.4 (Powers of the Committee) and 17.5 (Rules of Procedure). The entirety of the Article is not

replicated here but the following procedures are of particular note:

1. The SRC shall receive, review, and rank the submissions of each faculty member who is eligible to be considered (except the Department Head) and, according to the departmental standards of performance, award one-half, one full, or no Special Increase.
(17.4.1)
2. The SRC is only required to consider material submitted by faculty for review by September 1 of each year.
(17.5.6)
3. Except in cases of a conflict of interest, each member of the SRC, including the Chair, will have one vote on each case for a Special Increase considered. The vote shall be taken in response to a specific salary recommendation for each employee. A tie vote means the recommendation is rejected.
(17.5.3)
4. The SRC will submit to the College Review Committee the Department's decisions and justification regarding each faculty member's salary review.
(17.4.1)
5. The SRC will recommend to the College Review Committee (i) those faculty members, except the Head, who have been awarded Special Increases by the SRC and who merit an additional award; and (ii) those faculty members, except the Head, to whom the SRC would have awarded Special Increases except the funds were insufficient to make the award.
(17.4.1)
6. Within one week of the SRC's decision, faculty members must be informed of the following: (i) the Committee's rankings; (ii) decisions for the award of Special Increases; (iii) recommendations to the College Review Committee; and (iv) justifications for the awards and recommendations.
(17.4.1 and 17.5.8)



UNIVERSITY OF
SASKATCHEWAN
College of
Arts and Science

Approved by the College Review Committee
- June 30, 2011

DEPARTMENT OF ART AND ART HISTORY

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

April 2011

PROCEDURES FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

I. SALARY COMMITTEE. In accordance with Article 17.3.1 of the Collective Agreement, the members of each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department; when possible, this will include representation from all areas (Studio Art, Art History and Art Education).

II. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

The Department of Art and Art History follows section 17.2 and 17.3 of the Collective Agreement.

It is important to note that the Department of Art and Art History consists of three closely interconnected disciplines. It has faculty in the disciplines of Studio Art, Art History and Art Education. Each discipline is submitting its own standards for Special Increases *in the area of Research* (see below).

Meritorious performance requires excellence in a category, or in more than one category when considered together. Establishing excellence requires clear evidence of the performance of assigned duties at a level beyond the standard expected for a faculty member given their rank, or performance of meritorious duties beyond those assigned. *We expect more of those in higher professional ranks. Recommendations for Cumulative performance are considered when that seems appropriate. We encourage faculty to attach a memo to their yearly CV update to explain and document for the Committee the importance of any accomplishment they wish to have considered for a Special Increase.*

Teaching

Performance of assigned teaching duties at a satisfactory level will not be grounds for the award of or recommendation for a special increase. The standard assignment of duties, including number of preps, new preps and numbers of students taught, varies between disciplines in our Department (Studio Art faculty typically teach 18 cu annually; Art History and Art Education faculty typically teach 15 cu annually). Aside

from College-supported course releases for New Faculty, faculty at all ranks are assigned this baseline teaching commitment.*

Awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in teaching will be made on the basis of the CV update, a statement of teaching activities, and evidence of excellence in the performance of teaching duties drawn from the following sources: peer evaluations, signed letters from undergraduate and graduate students, statistically validated student evaluations, teaching awards, extraordinary overload, additional or exemplary non-standard teaching contributions (e.g. curriculum or program development), graduate student completions, supervision, advising, or performance of external examiner role. The above list is not exhaustive and aims to include, not exclude, all possible forms of teaching activity.

*for specific details, see Department of Art and Art History Guidelines on the Assignment of Duties.

Practice of Professional Skills

Practice of Professional Skills is an applicable category only for Art Education Faculty and includes the following:

- any activity which involves the faculty member in intensive work with a school, school system, educational or community settings which usually involves working over an extended period of time, several months or longer, and may include a report or curricular materials that is not paid more than a nominal fee. The candidate will include an explanation of the work undertaken in his/her file.

Extra University Work and Public Service

Awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in extra university work and public service will be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the cv update, letters from appropriate bodies or parties, and substantive evidence of excellence in contributions to professional bodies, such as invited jury and advising work, contributions to editorial boards, ethics boards, publishers, other universities, conference and workshop organization, media engagement, or other outreach and engagement activities. Awards of and recommendations for special increases in this category will only be made if (i) The work is outside of the assigned duties of the employee, as specified in the employee's letter of appointment or by past practice, and (ii) The work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee.

Administrative Work

Excellence in administrative performance is judged relative to a faculty member's rank. Probationary faculty and Assistant Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable administrative contribution to the Department. Term and probationary faculty shall not normally be expected to take on any major Departmental administrative role. Associate Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable contribution to the administration of the Department and College or University. Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable administrative contribution to the Department, College and University.

Faculty members are expected to carry their share of the administrative work of the Department; performance of assigned administrative duties at a satisfactory level will not be grounds for the award of or recommendation for a special increase.

Awards and recommendations for special increases for excellence in administrative work will be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the cv update, letters from Department Heads, Deans or Committee Chairs, and substantive evidence of excellence in the contributions to the administrative work of, first, the Department, and, second, the College or University. Aspects to be evaluated include quality and impact of the faculty member's contribution and the amount of time and/or effort involved.

Administrative Service as a Department Head or Assistant Dean

Standards for awards of and recommendations for special increases in this category are set by the Dean of Arts and Science and/or Heads' Salary Committee. A Department Head or Assistant Dean may be awarded a special increase for excellence in serving the Department or College.

Improvement in Academic Qualifications

People who have improved their academic qualifications by completing a degree, course of study, or similar program may be considered for a special increase.

Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

A faculty member who receives an offer of employment from a comparable institution may be considered for a special increase. Such an offer shall be in writing.

Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties

A special increase may be awarded to a faculty member when excellence in performance of assigned duties has been demonstrated through the combination of two or more categories. Awards of and recommendations for special increases shall be made on the basis of evidence as described in all categories.

Improvement and Development

Award of and recommendation for a special increase may in exceptional circumstances be made to a faculty member who demonstrates significant improvement in the category of teaching, research or administration. Awards of and recommendations for special increases shall be made on the basis of evidence as described in the relevant categories.

Research and Scholarly and Artistic Work

The expected level of research and scholarly activity is a function of a faculty member's rank. In all cases, awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in research and scholarly activity will be made on the basis of the cv update, evidence of publication/exhibition or acceptance for publication/exhibition of finished work (in the form of a letter). We recognize the significance of collaborative and interdisciplinary work, and understand that multi-authored research and publications can often be as labour-intensive as single-authored productions. Faculty in each of the three departmental areas (Studio, Art History, Art Education) may engage in research

production across these disciplines and can be considered for special increases based on a wide variety of research outcomes.

Each Discipline in Art and Art History lists below those items to be considered for special merit increases. Special merit increases can be awarded for any significant combination of these research activities. The size of the special increase should reflect the merit of the work as judged by the Salary Committee, by referees, and by any reviews and citations, as well as by the time and effort necessary to produce the exhibition, publication, presentation or research output. Indication of the quantity of artworks (new or previously exhibited), type of publication (number of pages of text) and importance of the gallery venue and publication should be included by the candidate in the CV update and/or attached support material. A greater number and quality of exhibitions, publications and/or other appropriate activity is expected of faculty at higher ranks. The following lists are not exhaustive and aim to include, not exclude, all possible forms of research activity.

1. STUDIO

In the Studio Area research takes place across a range of local, national and international venues and may include, among others: participation in exhibitions/artists' performances: solo, two person, group; essays or images in scholarly books, chapters in books, edited anthologies; curatorial publications: catalogue essays and/or entries; refereed journal articles, interviews and essays in contemporary art magazines; successful grant applications to Canada Council, Saskatchewan Arts, SSHRC and other local, national and international funding agencies for the Humanities and Visual Arts; invited lectures, conference presentations, and participation in dialogues, panels, workshops and symposia; community outreach and engagement with arts organizations and cultural groups; public art commissions; work acquired for public collections; web projects.

Reputable gallery venues may include artist-run or public galleries supported by external, public peer-reviewed funding or top-tier commercial galleries such as those which are members of the Art Dealers Association of Canada. Merit increases can be awarded for any significant combination of research activities listed above.

2. ART HISTORY

In the Art History Area, research takes place across a range of local, national and international venues and may include, among others: scholarly books, chapters in books, edited anthologies; refereed journal articles, interviews and essays in contemporary art magazines; curatorial publications: catalogue essays and/or entries; curated exhibitions (both contemporary and historical); invited lectures, conference publications and participation in dialogues, panels and symposiums; community outreach and engagement with arts organizations and cultural groups; cultural programming (ie. creation of conferences, panels, symposium); successful grant applications to Canada Council, SSHRC, and other local, national and international

funding agencies for the Humanities and Visual Arts; professional and technical reports; web projects.

Reputable forms of publication include peer-reviewed books and journals as well as publications in contemporary art magazines, public gallery exhibition catalogues and curatorial and/or exhibition projects (the latter all receive external, public peer-reviewed funding). Merit increases can be awarded for any significant combination of research activities listed above.

3. ART EDUCATION

In the Art Education area, research takes place across a range of local, national and international venues and may include, among others: scholarly books, chapters in books, edited anthologies; refereed journal articles, interviews and essays in contemporary art magazines; curatorial publications: catalogue essays and/or entries; editorial work; curated exhibitions (both contemporary and historical); professional and technical reports; invited lectures, conference publications and participation in dialogues, panels and symposiums; cultural programming (ie. creation of conferences, panels, symposium); successful grant applications to Canada Council, SSHRC, and other local, national and international funding agencies for the Humanities and Visual Arts; community outreach and engagement with arts organizations or cultural groups; web projects.

Reputable forms of publication include peer-reviewed books and journals as well as publications in contemporary art magazines, public gallery exhibition catalogues and curatorial and/or exhibition projects (the latter all receive external, public peer-reviewed funding). Merit increases can be awarded for any significant combination of research activities listed above.



DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

Department of Biology Guidelines for the Establishment of an Annual Department Salary Committee (approved by the Department of Biology on February 1, 2011)

This document should be read in conjunction with Articles 17.2 and 17.3 of the USFA Collective Agreement.

Background. According to Article 17.3.1, each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee, chaired by the Department Head, that shall consist of the Chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department. Given the large size of the Department of Biology and the variation in research programs undertaken by our faculty, the department shall normally have a committee that exceeds the minimum required by the collective agreement. Normally, the Salary Committee shall include the Chair and 5 or 6 other faculty.

Participation on the Salary Committee. Participation on the Department of Biology Salary Committee shall be in accordance with Article 11.1 of the Collective Agreement. Individual faculty will be assigned to serve on the Salary Committee by the Department Head, following consultation and discussion with faculty at a meeting of the departmental faculty, subject to approval by the Dean. In assigning individuals to serve on the Salary Committee, the Department Head shall endeavour to uphold two principles:

- 1) The Salary Committee structure shall fairly represent the make-up of the department with respect to gender, rank and field of research.
- 2) There will be both continuity and regular turnover of individuals on the Salary Committee. Normally individuals should serve a two-year term as a member of the committee, with half of the committee turning over each year. There should be regular turnover of the committee, such that each faculty member shall have the opportunity to be a regular participant on the committee.

A committee member whose own case is considered shall still participate on the committee, except that when the committee member's own case is considered the committee member will be excluded from the proceedings of the committee.

Role of the Department Head and Committee. Given recent changes to the Collective Agreement that allows the award of special increases based on the Full Range of Assigned Duties (Article 17.2.9), the Department of Biology acknowledges that the Head is often in the best position to assess contributions by individual faculty members. Often, she/he will also be in the best position to make

an initial judgement about whether a special increase should be granted based on accumulated performance over a period of years (see Article 17.3.1.2). For this reason, the Department Head shall make an initial ranking of individuals for special increases and will present the Salary Committee with her/his recommendations one day prior to the meeting of the Salary Committee. The initial recommendations of the Department Head will form the basis of the initial discussion for special increases. However, final authority for awarding merit and making recommendations to the College Review Committee will lie with the Department Salary Committee. Evaluation for special increases will be based on information provided by each employee as documented in a current CV update and in accordance with applicable standards for the award of Special Increases (Article 17.2), the Department Guidelines for the Award of Special Increase, and any other information the candidate wishes to introduce in support of his/her own case (Article 17.5.6 (ii)). Members of the Salary Committee should be given a minimum of 1 week to review all material that is submitted to the committee for consideration. They shall review all information prior to a meeting of the Salary Committee and come prepared to discuss their views. They should review the rankings of the Department Head, but should have determined their own rankings prior to considering the rankings of the Department Head. It is important that all committee members can evaluate the performance of all individuals based on the criteria outlined in Article 17.2.

**Operating Procedures for the Department of Biology Salary Committee
(approved by the Department of Biology on February 1, 2011)**

The powers of the Department Salary Committee are outlined in Article 17.4.1. of the USFA Collective Agreement. This document will serve to clarify certain issues outlined in that article, with the intention that there will be a consistent application of operational procedures from year to year. This document should be read in conjunction with Article 17.2 and Department of Biology Guidelines for the Award of Special Increases. The Department Salary Committee has the right to determine its own operating procedures on a yearly basis; however, these procedures need to be open and transparent to the members of the Department. Consequently, any deviations from what is outlined below needs to be communicated to the Department for information.

Each year the Department Salary Committee will receive, review and rank the submission of each individual who is eligible for a special increase and award either one-half or one full special increase where appropriate. The Salary Committee will inform the College Review Committee of its decisions.

The Salary Committee will also make recommendations to the College Review Committee for additional special increases for: 1) those employees that have been awarded a special increase by the Department and who may merit an additional award, and 2) those employees that would have been awarded a special increase except that the Salary Committee had insufficient funds to make available such awards. Recommendations to the College Review Committee for special increases (SIs) shall be either 0.5 or 1.0 SI's. In all cases the Salary Committee will justify its recommendations to the College Review Committee. It is imperative that members of the Department Salary Committee understand that half of the funds for special increases are not awarded by the Department, consequently, the Salary Committee should normally consider making recommendations that equal or exceed the number of awards given by the Department.

The Salary Committee will also submit to the College Review Committee the names of those individuals not awarded or recommended for a special increase along with the reasons for its decision.

Article 17.4.1 (viii) provides that the Department Salary Committee shall inform employees in the Department of the Committee's decisions for the award of special increases and recommendations to the College Review Committee, as well as the reasons for such awards and recommendations. Consequently, the Department Salary Committee will provide a brief summary outlining the achievements of each individual that was awarded or recommended for a special increase. This summary will be provided to each member of the Department by November 30. It is expected that the summary will provide individuals with enough information that they can judge their accomplishments against others when considering an appeal to the President's Review Committee. Normally, this summary will include several sentences of information about each individual, but may be more extensive if the Salary Committee sees fit.

Role of the Department Head and Committee. Given recent changes to the Collective Agreement that allows the award of special increases based on the Full Range of Assigned Duties (Article 17.2.9), the Department of Biology acknowledges that the Head is often in the best position to assess contributions of individual faculty members. For this reason, the Department Head shall make an initial ranking of individuals for special increases and will present the Salary Committee with her/his recommendations one day prior to the scheduled meeting of the Salary Committee. The initial recommendations of the Department Head will form the basis of the initial discussion for special increases. However, final authority for awarding merit and making recommendations to the College Review Committee will lie with the Department Salary Committee.

Members of the Salary Committee should be given a minimum of 1 week to review all material that is submitted to the committee for consideration. They shall review all information prior to a meeting of the Salary Committee and come prepared to discuss their views. They should review the rankings of the Department Head, but should have determined their own rankings prior to considering the rankings of the Department Head. It is important that all committee members can evaluate the performance of all individuals based on the criteria outlined in Article 17.2.

Evaluation for special increases will be based on information provided by each employee as documented in a current CV update and in accordance with applicable standards for the award of Special Increases (Article 17.2), the Department of Biology Guidelines for the Award of Special Increases and any other information the candidate wishes to introduce in support of his/her own case (Article 17.5.6 (ii)). It is important that members of the Department Salary Committee understand that a special increase can be granted on the basis of cumulative performance over a period of years (see Article 17.3.1.2). Normally the committee will only consider the current year and the previous two years when assessing an accumulated case. It is also important that members of the Department Salary Committee understand that neither the award of a special increase(s) in the past nor the individual's salary shall be the basis for differential treatment in the salary review process.

**Department of Biology Guidelines for the Award of Special Increases
(approved by the Department of Biology on February 1, 2011)**

This document should be read in conjunction with Article 17 of the USFA Collective Agreement.

The powers of the Department Salary Committee are described in Article 17.4.1. It is important to distinguish that the award of special increases by the Department Salary Committee is distinct from making recommendations for the award of special increases. Given that there are a limited number of awards that can be made each year, Committee members need to understand their dual role of recommending and awarding special increases.

Evaluation for special increases will be based on information provided by each employee as documented in a current CV update and in accordance with applicable standards for the award of Special Increases (Article 17.2). In the absence of a CV update, the Salary Committee will not consider individuals for special increases. Individuals that do not wish to be considered for a special increase, for any reason, may choose to submit their CV update and self declare that they wish not to be considered for a special increase.

In addition to a CV update, Article 17.5.6(ii) provides that the candidate may supply any information she/he wishes to introduce in support of his/her own case for a special increase. The Department encourages individuals to write a letter that explains what activities they undertook that may merit consideration for a special increase. In doing so, they should identify the category or categories for which they wish to be considered for a special increase (eg. Teaching, Research and Scholarly Work, Administrative Work, etc). They should also indicate whether they would like the Department Salary Committee to consider past work when making a case for a special increase based on accumulated performance over a period of years. Normally the committee will only consider the current year and the previous two years when assessing an accumulated case. Individuals that elected not to be considered for a special increase in any year shall in no way prejudice themselves from making an accumulated case for a special increase in the future.

Neither the award of (a) special increase(s) in the past nor the individual's salary shall be the basis for differential treatment in the salary review process.

Article 17.2 describes the basis for the award of special increases. Below are the specific criteria that the Department Salary Committee will use to assess performance as deserving of consideration for special increases in the categories of Teaching, Research and Scholarly Work, and Administrative Work. In doing so, the Department has also tried to identify what would be considered standard performance. Individuals wishing to be considered under other categories listed under Article 17.2 are advised to outline their case for a special increase in their covering letter.

In all cases individuals are encouraged to provide as much quantitative data as possible to support their case for a special increase. However, the committee will also consider qualitative accounts of activities that each individual believes support his/her claim for a special increase. The Department has identified specific activities, such as winning a teaching award, which results in the automatic *recommendation* for the award of a special increase. However, the idea of automatic recommendations for a special increase needs to be distinguished from automatic awards. Given that there is a finite amount of money for special increases and the performance of each individual needs to be ranked against others, there can be no automatic awards. In accordance with Article 18.2.4.2(iv), the Department Salary Committee will allocate a minimum of two thirds of the available special increase funds as awards with a value greater than 0.5 SI's (Special Increases). Recommendations to the College Review Committee for special increases shall be either 0.5 or 1.0 SI's.

Teaching. According to Article 17.2.1, a special increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

The Department expects a high level of commitment to excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching by all faculty at all ranks. Historically, assessing excellence in teaching has been difficult because of the absence of quantifiable measures of excellence. Therefore, individuals are encouraged to provide any quantitative information that they can to support their case. Teaching evaluations conducted by the Department's Teaching Assessment Committee are particularly encouraged. Winning a major teaching award such as the Master Teacher Award, Provost's Award for Outstanding College Teaching, or the College of Arts and Science Teaching Award, provides strong evidence of excellence in teaching. Winning such an award will result in the automatic recommendation for a special increase equal to 1.0 SI.

In determining excellence in teaching, the committee may consider the overall amount of undergraduate and graduate teaching done by each faculty member. This includes time devoted to conducting labs as well as the number of lecture hours. Particular attention should be paid to the development of new courses and to courses taught for the first time. Supervising undergraduate students in Biol 480/481 is normally not considered in the assignment of duties process, consequently supervision of these students should be given extra consideration when determining the amount of teaching done by each individual. The Department wishes to promote creative innovation in teaching. Consequently, individuals are encouraged to address this in their cover letter.

Supervision of Graduate Students is considered under the category of teaching. The Department expects a high level of commitment to supervising graduate students by all faculty at all ranks. The normal expectation is that each faculty will supervise 2 to 3 graduate students annually. However, faculty in their first three years may supervise fewer students. A substantial contribution to graduate supervision may be the basis for the award of excellence in teaching. Consideration will be given to timelines of student completion and other metrics of student success. Winning the Distinguished Graduate Supervisor Award provides strong evidence of excellence in graduate education and will result in the automatic recommendation for a special increase equal to 1.0 SI.

Research and Scholarly Work. According to Article 17.2.2, a special increase may be awarded for excellence in Research and Scholarly Work.

The Department expects a high level of commitment to excellence in Research and Scholarly Work by all faculty at all ranks. The primary evidence to demonstrate excellence in research is winning of a major local, national or international research award (e.g. Earned Doctor of Science, University of Saskatchewan Distinguished Researcher Award) and the quantity and quality of papers published in referred journals. The publication of books or textbooks may also constitute excellence in scholarly

work. In the case of multi-authored papers, individuals should clearly outline their contribution and should indicate whether the work was completed in conjunction with their graduate students. Individuals are encouraged to provide any quantitative information that they can to support the excellence of their work. This should include information on journal impact factors. Particular attention will be given to papers that are published in the top journals from a particular discipline. The normal expectation is that all faculty shall secure external research funding and publish in peer-reviewed outlets on an annual basis. Expectation for publishing shall be equivalent for all members of the Department regardless of rank or years of service, except for individuals within their first three years of appointment.

There are several other indicators that can demonstrate excellence in research and scholarly work, but **these are secondary** to winning a major research award and publishing peer reviewed papers:

- 1) securing research funding, with special emphasis on tri-council funding
- 2) invited and contributed presentations at conferences
- 3) editing a scientific journal, peer reviewed book or conference proceeding
- 4) publication of non-referred papers or technical reports
- 5) patents

Administrative Work. According to Article 17.2.5, a special increase may be awarded for administrative work.

The Department expects all faculty at all ranks to participate in the administrative work of the Department. In general, routine committee work assigned through the assignment of duties process is not considered the basis for a special increase. Administrative tasks assigned by the Department Head after the assignment of duties for the year have been made, may be considered as deserving of consideration for a special increase. There are several departmental activities that may warrant a *recommendation* for a special increase. These include serving as Assistant Head for a period of three years, chairing the Graduate Studies Committee or Undergraduate Affairs Committee for a period of 3 years or being awarded the Rawson Professorship. In assessing whether the administrative work is appropriate for the award of a special increase, the Salary Committee will consider any significant administrative achievements and the quantity of time devoted to administrative tasks, taking into consideration the individual's assigned duties.

The Department expects all faculty at the ranks of Associate and Full Professor to participate in administrative work of the College and University. Each individual should attempt to explain what activities she/he undertook and should quantify the time devoted to such activities. Substantial contributions to College or University administration may warrant a special increase.





College of
Arts and Science

Approved by the College Review Committee
- June 30, 2011

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

Proposal approved by the Department of Chemistry, University of Saskatchewan, May 16, 2011

Procedures of the Departmental Salary Committee

This is a collegial process, and as such, it relies on the reasonable judgement of a committee of peers.

Membership on the committee will be an assigned duty, by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Head. The guiding principle of selection shall be rotation of membership throughout the faculty, bearing in mind the need to have representation from all ranks whenever possible.

After discussions of all cases as described below under "Ranking Guidelines and Procedures", the committee chair will propose a ranking of eligible faculty, and a recommendation for each. The committee members will discuss the ranking, and may suggest a different order. *If it is proposed that the ranking of a member of the committee should change, that member will not be present for the specifics of that discussion.* When a ranking can be agreed upon by a majority of the committee, then recommendations will be made, and reported to the Department. The proceedings of the committee are otherwise confidential.

Recommendations

The ranked list arrived at by the committee will be divided into categories as follows:

- Awarded one full increment by the Department
- Awarded one half-increment by the Department
- Recommended to CRC for an additional full increment
- Recommended to CRC for an additional half-increment
- Recommended to CRC for a full increment
- Recommended to CRC for a half-increment

Eligible faculty not recommended for merit will be listed alphabetically, not ranked.

Ranking Guidelines and Procedures:

Research. A table will be prepared that lists each eligible faculty member's research contributions and the committee-assessed ranking of that individual based on the aggregate quality/impact of those contributions. Committee determination of the quality and impact of a faculty member's contributions will take into consideration the member's written submission documenting their significance. *Each committee member will independently rank each faculty member.*

Once complete, an aggregate rank will be obtained for each faculty member by combining all the committee members' rankings. Discussion would focus on significant variances in rankings by individual committee members and then on refining the rank order of those faculty members who would have some likelihood of receiving a special increase for research to obtain a research-only ranking.

Teaching. When a faculty member has demonstrated excellence in teaching as described in the Departmental Standards for Awarding of Special Salary Increases, that contribution will be considered on par with an outstanding contribution in research, and the faculty member ranked accordingly.

Administration and Service. When a faculty member has demonstrated excellence in administration or service as described in **1.3**, that contribution will be considered as on par with an outstanding contribution in research, and the faculty member ranked accordingly.

Final Recommendations. Aggregated meritorious contributions in all three areas of assessment will then be discussed by the salary committee. The ranks of the faculty will be considered – there is a higher expectation for higher ranks – and faculty in each rank will be listed in order of merit initially, followed by a merging of these lists. After the aggregated contributions of all faculty members in all areas have been fully discussed, the Department Head will compile a ranked list of recommendations reflecting the committee's discussion, as described above under the "Recommendations" heading, and bearing in mind the relative weight assigned to teaching, research and administration/service. It is at this point that the Department Head could make a case for a faculty member based on an accumulated record of meritorious but previously unrewarded performance. If there is committee consensus at this point, then the process ends. If not, discussions would continue until the committee is ready to vote. The final set of recommendations, together with any general observations the committee feels might be useful, is reported to the Department for information only.

STANDARDS FOR THE AWARDING OF SPECIAL SALARY INCREASES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

1. In the context of Article 17.1.3, the Department Salary Committee, as determined annually in accordance with Article 17.2, shall recommend for special salary increases those members of the Department who have demonstrated excellence in one or more of the categories specified in the Article, and who;
 - a. for lecturers, assistant professors and associate professors, are making satisfactory progress in meeting the standards for promotion,or
 - b. for full professors, are maintaining or surpassing the standards of excellence required for promotion to that rank.

The differences in standards for promotion to the various ranks thus generate different levels of expectation in judging the work of a faculty member as meritorious.

2. Recommendations for special increases shall be ranked in priority order on the basis of the degree to which the faculty member has been judged superior, according to Section 1, except that faculty being recommended on the basis of excellence in teaching or research or both shall have priority over those being recommended solely for excellence in other categories.
3. The performance of a faculty member in categories other than the one or more on which the recommendation is being based must be judged to be (at least) satisfactory.
4. The criteria in Section 1 shall be applied to the performance of the faculty member during the twelve months preceding the annual review process. This assumes no unforeseen event such as labour disruption interferes with the review process; in such a case the review period may differ. Within the constraints imposed by superior committees, the Department Salary Committee will endeavour to provide recommendations for comparable review periods in each review.
5. It is possible that the performance of a faculty member may have been judged to be excellent over a period of several years but that the priority given to the recommendation for him or her may have been insufficiently high to have an award made by the Department or College Review Committee. In such cases the performance previously judged to be meritorious will be taken into account in establishing the priority assigned in Section 2.
6. Faculty will only be considered for merit if they submit a CV update, which should adhere to a format accepted at the University of Saskatchewan, by September 1.

THE DEPARTMENTAL SALARY COMMITTEE

In accordance with Article 17.3.1, the Committee will be chaired by the Head, and will include at least three other faculty members whose primary appointment is in Chemistry, representing all ranks in the Department if possible. Members other than the Head will normally be asked to serve at least two and not more than three consecutive years on the committee. Committee members will not be present for discussion of their own cases, or others for which they are in conflict of interest as defined in Article 10.9.

CRITERIA

The Department of Chemistry embraces the teacher-scholar model, which recognizes the normal duties of a professor to be made up of approximately 40% research and scholarly work, 40% teaching and related activities, and 20% administrative duties and service to the institution. In some cases, the service component may take the form of outreach and community education. Exceptions to this normal expectation of duties may exist, such as in the case of a special appointment, Chair, or secondment, and should be stated clearly in a letter accompanying the candidate's CV Update. Other deviations from the teacher-scholar model must be agreed to by the Head, and reflected in the Assignment of Duties.

Sabbaticants will be considered for merit on the basis of research and outreach contributions, as stipulated in Article 20.10 of the Collective Agreement.

The onus is on the faculty member to document for the Departmental salary committee the case for the award of a special salary increase in any of the categories of evaluation.

Teaching excellence will be judged by consideration of peer evaluation, student evaluation and course and/or program and/or curriculum development, including laboratories. Demonstrated scholarship in teaching is considered the primary criterion. Excellence may be demonstrated in many ways, including teaching awards, particularly those judged by peers, and peer-reviewed publication of scholarly work on the topic of pedagogy and chemical education. Excellence in student supervision (distinct from research excellence) will be considered in a similar manner. Exceptional contributions to the teaching program in any form may be considered meritorious.

Research excellence will be judged primarily on the basis of peer-reviewed publications, similar scholarly works such as books and book chapters, and on patents granted and licensed or other documented forms of technology transfer. Publications will be judged by quality, as assessed by the committee members, bearing in mind measures of quality generally accepted in the international chemistry community. The onus is on the faculty member to make the case for the quality and impact of each published item in her or his area of specialization. Referees' and/or editors' comments and other such types of "hard evidence" may be used for this purpose. For each publication with more than one author, the contributions of each author should be stated explicitly. (If at all possible, all authors of a manuscript should declare their agreement to this statement of contributions, to avoid

misunderstandings or the appearance of misrepresentation.) Success in obtaining competitive research funding and research-based awards will also be considered in evaluating the research performance of faculty. Other evidence of research excellence will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Excellence in administrative duties and service to the institution, and/or outreach activities to the community will be judged based on outstanding efforts on projects or initiatives resulting in significant benefit to the Department, University, discipline, and/or community. Public service is normally defined as 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. Service to professional or related organizations may be demonstrated, for example, by active participation in committees or executives of academic or professional organizations; service on selection committees for provincial, national or international granting organizations; the organization of national or international conferences and symposia, or service on the editorial board for academic, professional or scientific journals.

Excellence in other areas described in the Collective Agreement (Section 17.2) will be considered on a case-by-case basis as they arise.

Appendix 1: Relevant Portions of the Departmental Standards For Tenure And Promotion

Teaching Ability and Performance

In the Department of Chemistry, candidates are expected to be capable of teaching both introductory and advanced level undergraduate courses as well as specialized graduate level material. Participation in the supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate research is normally expected at all ranks as is a willingness to serve on graduate student advisory committees. The candidate's role in the supervision of graduate student research and participation in graduate advisory committees will be assessed using reports from colleagues on graduate advisory committees, and thesis examination committees (e.g., the External Examiner's Report), and placement of graduates.

For tenure as an Assistant Professor: The candidate will have demonstrated their ability to effectively teach courses at various levels within the chemistry programs (e.g.: 100/200 level; 300/400 level; graduate level).

For tenure as or promotion to Associate Professor: The candidate will have demonstrated their ability to effectively teach courses at various levels within the chemistry programs (e.g.: 100/200 level; 300/400 level; graduate level). Successful participation in significant course revision(s) and/or new course development is expected.

For tenure as or promotion to Professor: The candidate will have demonstrated their ability to effectively teach courses at various levels within the chemistry programs including graduate courses. Significant participation in the ongoing revision and development of course and laboratory curricula is expected. Graduation of at least one doctoral student under the candidate's supervision would normally be expected.

Research and Scholarly Work

In the College of Arts & Science, research, scholarly and artistic work is also defined as contributions to knowledge and dissemination of that knowledge through appropriate peer reviewed outlets or venues. In the Department of Chemistry, primary and essential evidence will include externally peer-reviewed contributions (e.g., articles in refereed publications, refereed conference proceedings, monographs, book chapters, etc.) and information on research/equipment grants/contracts awarded. Further supporting evidence can include, among other things, nonrefereed contributions (e.g., conference presentations, book chapters, review articles, etc.), contributions to industrially relevant research and development (e.g., research related patents and copyrighted materials, technical reports, etc.), research/equipment grants/contracts applied for, referee reports on publications and/or grant applications, etc.

In the Department of Chemistry, evidence of the ability to obtain and sustain adequate external research funding to support the research program is required at all levels.

Appendix 2: Relevant portions of the USFA Collective Agreement 2010 – 2013

- 17.1.3 Awarding of Special Increases. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee who has demonstrated excellence in one or more of the categories described in Article 17.2. A Special Increase may be based on accumulated performance over a period of years which, when regarded altogether, may merit a Special Increase.
- 17.1.3.1 Evaluation will be based on information provided by each employee as documented in a current CV update and in accordance with applicable standards for the award of Special Increases and Article 17.5.6 (ii).
- 17.1.3.2 Consideration for promotion shall not prejudice consideration for a Special Increase.
- 17.2 Basis for the Award of Special Increases. It is accepted that the criteria for the award of special increases may differ from Department to Department and from College to College as a result of unique aspects or expectations of the discipline that may be internal and/or external to the University. Standards for the award of Special Increases shall be established in accordance with the following provisions and the provisions of Article 17.3.
- 17.2.1 Teaching. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in teaching.
- 17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the following types of research and scholarly work:
- (i) Publication. Publication, or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication, are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase. The size of the Special Increase should reflect the amount of time necessary to produce the publication, as well as the academic merit of the work.
 - (ii) Unpublished Work. Unpublished research or scholarly work are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase if it is established that the work has academic merit and that there is no appropriate publication outlet for a particular subject matter, or that the work is of a kind that does not normally lead to publication, such as engineering design and patentable inventions.
 - (iii) Artistic Work. Artistic creations and performances are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase, where this is appropriate to a discipline.
- 17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the practice of professional skills.
- 17.2.4 Extra University Work and Public Service. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in outreach and engagement, clinical service, committee work, or public service, provided the following criteria are met:
- (i) the work is outside of the assigned duties of the employee, as specified in the employee's letter of appointment or by past practice. Employees in clinical departments would not merit a Special Increase for their assigned extension or clinical work within this category;
 - (ii) the work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee. An employee who is paid more than a nominal fee to do extra work by government or a public agency would not normally satisfy this criterion.
- 17.2.5 Administrative Work. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee with administrative duties, other than duties associated with a Department Head or Assistant Dean.
- 17.2.6 Administrative Service as a Department Head or Assistant Dean. A Special Increase may be awarded to a Department Head or Assistant Dean for administrative service as a reward for excellence in serving the department, or College.
- 17.2.7 Improvement in Academic Qualifications. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee who has improved their academic qualifications by completing a degree, course of study, or similar program.

- 17.2.8 Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee who has received an offer of employment from a comparable institution. Such an offer normally would be in writing.
- 17.2.9 Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee when excellence in performance of assigned duties has been demonstrated through the combination of two or more categories listed above.
- 17.2.10 Improvement and Development. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee demonstrating significant improvement or development in the categories listed above for reasons acceptable to the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee.
- 17.3.1 Department Salary Committee. Each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department. Eligible employees include those holding probationary, tenured, continuing status, or term appointments if the term of appointment is for more than one academic year and there is at least another academic year remaining in the term of appointment at the time of appointment to the committee. In the event that the Department is unable to constitute a committee with the minimum number of members, the committee shall consist of all eligible employees of the department. A committee member whose own case is considered shall still participate on the committee, except that when the committee member's own case is considered the committee member will be excluded from the proceedings of the committee.
- 17.4 Powers of the Committee.
- 17.4.1 Department Salary Committee. The Department Salary Committee shall:
- (i) propose standards of performance for the award of Special Increases;
 - (ii) communicate these standards, in writing, to the College Review Committee and, on approval, to all employees in the department;
 - (iii) receive, review and rank the submissions of each employee who is eligible to be considered except the head, and award either one-half or one full Special Increase where appropriate;
 - (iv) submit the Department's decisions for the award of Special Increases to the College Review Committee;
 - (v) recommend to the College Review Committee for additional Special Increases those eligible employees, except the head, who have been awarded a Special Increase by the department and who may merit an additional award;
 - (vi) recommend to the College Review Committee for Special Increases those eligible employees in the department, except the head, to whom the Department Salary Committee would have awarded Special Increases except that the Committee had insufficient funds available to make such awards;
 - (vii) submit to the College Review Committee those employees not awarded or recommended for a special increase and the justification for the salary action;
 - (viii) inform employees in the department of the Committee's rankings, decisions for the award of Special Increases and recommendations to the College Review Committee, as well as the Committee's reasons for such awards and recommendations;
- 17.5 Rules of Procedure.
- 17.5.1 Salary History Forms. Each academic year, the Department Heads (or Deans of nondepartmentalized Colleges) shall provide each employee with a Salary History Form, prepared by the Employer and approved by the Association, showing the salary for each of the last five years of employment at the University and the detailed elements of salary showing the change from one year to the next.

- 17.5.2 Advising Faculty. Each academic year, employees shall be provided with a copy of applicable Standards for the award of Special Increases for their Department and College. In addition to the detailed information provided by the relevant salary review committee, the Department Head (or Dean of a non-departmentalized College) shall meet with each employee and provide the employee with a written copy of the department's or College's recommendation including the priority ranking, if any, for the recommendation on the employee's salary. The salary review form used for this purpose shall be approved by the Joint Committee for the Management of the Agreement. Following examination of the department's or College's recommendation (or decision), the salary review form shall be signed by the employee, but such signature shall not be nor be deemed to be an acceptance by the employee of any matter of fact or opinion set out in the form, and the form shall then be returned to the employee's Department Head (or Dean). Where an employee has a joint appointment or associate membership, the Department Head or Dean in the primary unit shall consult with the Department Head or Dean in the secondary unit and shall convey information received in that consultation to the employee and in the written statement.
- 17.5.3 Voting Procedures. The following voting procedures shall be used by members of the President's, College or department committees that consider salary cases:
- (i) each member of the committee, including the chair, shall have one vote. Members may vote on a particular candidate only if they have taken part in the committee's deliberations on that candidate;
 - (ii) a quorum shall be two-thirds of the members of a salary committee taken to the nearest integer;
 - (iii) the decision on salary recommendations shall be by simple majority vote of those voting. The vote of any member abstaining shall not be counted in support of either the affirmative or negative view. A tie vote means that the motion is lost. The vote shall be taken in response to a specific salary recommendation for each employee;
 - (iv) any member of a committee who is of the immediate family of a candidate for a Special Salary Increase shall be disqualified from attending the deliberations of the committee concerning the case and from voting on the question;
 - (v) each salary committee shall have the right to rule a member ineligible to vote or to require a member to withdraw from the deliberations of the committee if it considers a serious conflict of interest to exist.
- 17.5.4 Right to Appear. The Department Head shall appear before the College Review Committee to discuss the departmental recommendations for Special Increases for each eligible employee in the department. When the College, or its Dean, applies for a Special Increase on behalf of an employee in the College, the Dean and the Department Head shall be entitled to appear before the President's Review Committee in the case of a departmentalized College; and the Dean and a member of the College Salary Committee, selected by the College Salary Committee, shall be entitled to appear before the President's Review Committee in the case of a non-departmentalized College. When individual employees appeal to the President's Review Committee in their own right, each employee shall be entitled to ask a colleague to appear on the employee's behalf before the President's Review Committee. Whenever an individual employee appeals to the President's Review Committee, the relevant Salary Committees shall be given an opportunity to state the reasons for its earlier decision. A copy of the statement of reasons by the Department Salary Committee, College Salary Committee or College Review Committee shall be sent to the individual appellant, who shall be entitled to respond to the President's Review Committee.
- 17.5.5 Right of Appeal. An employee, or the employee's Dean in support of the employee, is entitled to appeal the employee's salary award only to the President's Review Committee, and only in writing.
- 17.5.6 Dates. The following dates for completion of the work of the committees shall apply, unless the Joint Committee for the Management of the Agreement directs otherwise:
- (i) the period under review ends on June 30 of the academic year prior to the one in which the review takes place;

(ii) by June 30, the Department Head (or Dean of a non-departmentalized College) shall have advised the candidate to provide such information as the candidate wishes to introduce in support of the candidate's own case. The information should refer to the categories in Article 17.2;

(iii) by September 1, the candidate shall have provided to the Department Head (or Dean of a nondepartmentalized College) such information as the candidate wishes to introduce in support of the candidate's case;

(iv) by November 30, the Department Head shall have met with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation as described in Article 17.5.2 and the department committees shall have considered all salary reviews, made awards where appropriate, submitted their recommendations to the College, and informed employees in the department of rankings, awards and recommendations, as well as the reasons for awards and recommendations;

(v) by January 31, College Review Committees in departmentalized colleges shall have considered all salary reviews, made awards where appropriate, submitted their recommendations to the President's Review Committee, informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations, and submitted decisions to the President for the information of the Board;

(vi) by January 31, the Dean of non-departmentalized colleges shall have met with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation as described in Article 17.5.2 and the College Salary Committee shall have considered all salary reviews, made awards where appropriate, submitted their recommendations to the President's Review Committee, informed employees in the College of rankings, awards and recommendations, as well as the reasons for awards and recommendations, and submitted its decisions to the President for the information of the Board;

(vii) by February 28, any employee wishing to appeal a decisions of a Salary Committee or College Review Committee shall have submitted the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee;

(viii) by March 31, the President's Review Committee shall have considered all cases before it and submitted its decisions to the President for the information of the Board.

- 17.5.7 Expedited Procedures. Notwithstanding Article 17.5.6, in the case of an emergency, a salary anomaly arising out of placement on the salary grid at the time of appointment, or a demonstrable risk of losing a faculty member because of higher salaries at comparable institutions, salary adjustments can be made by adding a combination of Special Increases and/or Career Development Increases. The Career Development Increases added will reduce the remaining Career Development Increases available under Article 18.3. This adjustment may be granted at any time and can be awarded permanently or for a specified time period, provided the appropriate Department Salary Committee, the College Review Committee (or College Salary Committee) and the President's Review Committee have recommended such an increase, and the Joint Committee for the Management of the Agreement has approved such action. The limitations of Article 18.2.4.1 do not apply to awards made in accordance with the provisions of this section.
- 17.5.8 Employees to be Informed. All employees are to be informed within one week after a decision is made in their case by the Department or College Salary Committee and the College Review Committee. All employees considered by the President's Review Committee are to be informed within ten days after the decision is made in their case.
- 17.5.9 Operating Procedures. Each Salary Committee shall determine its operating procedures provided that they are consistent with these general procedures. It is the responsibility of the Committee chair to gather information and documentation which the Committee shall use when considering salary recommendations for employees.
- 17.6 Interpretation. Any dispute arising from the interpretation of the above regulations and procedures on salary reviews in an individual case shall be resolved by agreement between the Employer and the

Association.

- 17.7 Grievance in Salary Review Cases. A grievance in the case of salary review shall be subject to the same limitations as in the case of tenure.
- 20.10 Eligibility for Promotion and Special Increases. An individual on sabbatical leave shall be eligible for promotion or a Special Increase on the same basis as any other employee.



DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

Criteria For Special Increases

The Computer Science Standards for Special Increases shall follow Article 17 of the 2010-2013 Collective Agreement. The Computer Science standards categories for promotion and tenure are used to evaluate faculty cases for special increases (half or full). The categories that are considered are: (2) Teaching, (4) Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work, (5) Practice of Professional Skills (including scholarly work), (6) Administrative work, and (7) Public Service and Service to Professional Bodies, as well as other applicable categories described in Article 17.2. Faculty whose performance exceeds the standard for their rank for the year under considerations in one or more of these categories are recommended for merit consideration.

Two or three years of CV information may be considered for candidates that are meritorious for the year under consideration, but did not receive a merit in the previous year or the previous two years.

The Department of Computer Science believes in recognizing and rewarding contributions to all parts of the university. The Department prioritizes the distribution of the award of special increases as follows:

1. 40% of special increases shall be awarded for research and/or practice of professional skills, and service to professional bodies, including conference chairing and editorial boards,
2. 20% shall be awarded for excellence in teaching and outreach,
3. 10% shall be awarded for administrative work.

The remaining special increases will be distributed amongst these three categories as judged by the Salary Advisory Committee. In the event that there are no candidates for special increases in any category, special increases in those categories will also be distributed as judged by the Department Salary Committee.

Administrative work refers specifically to assigned administrative duties in the department, college and university. In the Department, this includes the Graduate Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, the Executive Committee, the Awards Committee, the Research Committee, or such committees and positions as exist in the Department. Faculty members are expected to participate in departmental

meetings, search, renewal, tenure and promotion committee meetings as a minimum.

At the College and University levels, administrative work refers to collegial committees defined by Council or by the Collective Agreement.

The ranking of the candidates will reflect the degree to which the candidates exceed the standards for their rank and will take into account multi-year cases.

A faculty member cannot receive merit in one category when the contributions in other categories are not at an acceptable level.

Composition of the Department Salary Committee

The Department Salary Committee shall be selected by the Department Head to conform with Article 17.3.1 and shall be approved by the Department. The minimum size of the Committee shall be four members, including the Department Head, but may be larger. Membership will staggered to ensure continuity, and rotated to ensure representation of all members of the Department.

DEPARTMENT OF DRAMA

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

I. SALARY COMMITTEE. In accordance with Article 17.3.1 of the Collective Agreement, the members of each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department.

II. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

The Department of Drama follows section 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. Standards for the award of Special Increases shall be established in accordance with the provisions of Articles 17.2 and 17.3.

Meritorious performance requires excellence in a category, or in more than one category when considered together. Establishing excellence requires clear evidence of the performance of assigned duties at a level beyond the standard expected for a faculty member given their rank, or performance of meritorious duties beyond those assigned.

Teaching

Performance of assigned teaching duties at a satisfactory level will not be grounds for the award of or recommendation for a special increase. The current standard teaching load is 15 cus of undergraduate teaching.

Awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in teaching will be made on the basis of the cv update, a statement of teaching activities, and evidence of excellence in the performance of teaching duties drawn from the following sources: peer evaluations, signed letters from undergraduate and graduate students, statistically validated student evaluations, teaching awards, extraordinary overload, additional or exemplary non-standard teaching contributions (e.g. curriculum or program development), graduate student teaching and supervision, advising, or performance of external examiner role. International development and teaching may strengthen the case for meritorious performance at any rank provided the faculty member is not otherwise remunerated for such work.

Research, Scholarly and/or Artistic Work

Academic Stream:

Assistant Professors are expected to be developing and establishing their research program in incremental ways. At this level they should be presenting research results to colleagues locally, regional and/or at national conferences. Artistic and/or Creative Work performed or produced in a recognized public venue will be deemed meritorious by assessing the contribution and the scope of the candidate's involvement with the project. Teacher/scholar contributions, too, represent an expression of RSAW and where appropriate will help to develop the case for a merit award. At the Assistant Professor rank, work that furthers the pedagogical impact of the profession is particularly worthy of a special increment. Generally, cumulative cases for merit will result from the emergence of some major contribution(s) to RSAW that appears as the culmination of an ongoing and extensive project—such as (but not limited to) a monograph—where measurable results are notable as the project takes shape, but are best rewarded upon completion.

Associate Professors are expected to have an established research program, and should be presenting additional research contributions over the Assistant Professor level to colleagues locally, regionally, and nationally. Regular publication in the form of peer-reviewed articles, books, or edited volumes is expected. Publication or acceptance of a peer-reviewed book or edited volume, or of multiple peer-reviewed articles or book chapters in reputable venues—those widely recognized in the profession—will make a strong case for merit. Publication of book reviews, articles in non-peer-reviewed venues, or presentations at conferences and scholarly meetings will strengthen a case for merit. Artistic and/or Creative Work performed or produced in a recognized public venue will be deemed meritorious by assessing the contribution and the scope of the candidate's involvement with the project and will be scrutinized at a higher standard than that of the Assistant Professor rank. Teacher/scholar contributions, too, represent an expression of RSAW and where appropriate will help to develop the case for a merit award. At the Associate Professor rank, such work is expected to have an impact on the pedagogy of the profession and/or an impact within the larger teaching community in broad-ranging terms. Cumulative cases for merit will result from the emergence of some major contribution(s) to RSAW that appears as the culmination of an ongoing and extensive project—such as (but not limited to) a monograph—where measurable results are notable as the project takes shape, but are best rewarded upon completion. Cumulative cases for merit at the Associate Professor rank are to be more rigorously vetted than at the Assistant Professor rank.

Professors are expected to have an established scholarly reputation, and are to be presenting strong, discipline relevant research results nationally and internationally and at a level beyond that of Associate Professors. Regular publication in the form of peer-reviewed articles, books, or edited volumes is expected. Publication or acceptance of a peer-reviewed book or edited volume, or of multiple peer-reviewed articles or book chapters in reputable venues—those widely recognized in the profession—will make a strong case for merit. Publication of book reviews, articles in non-peer-reviewed venues, or presentations at conferences and scholarly meetings will strengthen a case for merit. Artistic and/or Creative Work performed or produced

in a recognized public venue will be deemed meritorious by assessing the contribution and the scope of the candidate's involvement with the project and will be scrutinized at a higher standard than that of the Associate Professor rank. Teacher/scholar contributions, too, represent an expression of RSAW and where appropriate will help to develop the case for a merit award. At the full Professor rank, such work is expected to have a substantial impact on the pedagogy of the profession and/or a substantial impact within the larger teaching community in broad-ranging terms. Cumulative cases for merit will result from the emergence of some major contribution(s) to RSAW that appears as the culmination of an ongoing and extensive project—such as (but not limited to) a monograph—where measurable results are notable as the project takes shape, but are best rewarded upon completion. Cumulative cases for merit at the full Professor rank are to be more rigorously vetted than at the Associate Professor rank.

Performance Stream:

Assistant Professors with an active creative/artistic programme, with work either accepted for publication and/or presented in public production or performance will strengthen a case for merit. Teacher/scholar contributions, too, represent an expression of RSAW and where appropriate will help to develop the case for a merit award. At the Assistant Professor rank, work that furthers the pedagogical impact of the profession is particularly worthy of a special increment. Generally, cumulative cases for merit will result from the emergence of some major contribution(s) to RSAW that appears as the culmination of an ongoing and extensive project—such as (but not limited to) an original production—where measurable results are notable as the project takes shape, but are best rewarded upon completion.

Associate Professors accumulating a national creative/artistic profile and reputation with productions in venues that define the profession—such as, but not restricted to equity coops, and, of a higher order, full equity theatres—will make a strong case for merit. The scope of involvement in the project is a critical factor in assessing the case for merit. Associate Professors will be scrutinized at a higher standard than Assistant Professors. Teacher/scholar contributions, too, represent an expression of RSAW and where appropriate will help to develop the case for a merit award. At the Associate Professor rank, such work is expected to have an impact on the pedagogy of the profession and/or an impact within the larger teaching community in broad-ranging terms. Cumulative cases for merit will result from the emergence of some major contribution(s) to RSAW that appears as the culmination of an ongoing and extensive project—such as (but not limited to) an original production that receives favorable critical review—where measurable results are notable as the project takes shape, but are best rewarded upon completion. Cumulative cases for merit at the Associate Professor rank are to be more rigorously vetted than at the Assistant Professor rank.

Professors must be firmly established as a scholar/artist with a national and increasingly an international reputation. Strong, ongoing and active research relevant to their artistic profile in venues that define the profession—such as, but not restricted to equity coops, and, of a higher order full equity theatres—will make a strong case for merit. The scope of involvement in the project is a critical factor in

assessing the case for merit. Full Professors will be scrutinized at a higher standard than Associate Professors. Teacher/scholar contributions, too, represent an expression of RSAW and where appropriate will help to develop the case for a merit award. At the full Professor rank, such work is expected to have a substantial impact on the pedagogy of the profession and/or a substantial impact within the larger teaching community in broad-ranging terms. Cumulative cases for merit will result from the emergence of some major contribution(s) to RSAW that appears as the culmination of an ongoing and extensive project—such as (but not limited to) an original production that receives critical acclaim, and especially at the national and/or the international level—where measurable results are notable as the project takes shape, but are best rewarded upon completion. Cumulative cases for merit at the full Professor rank are to be more rigorously vetted than at the Associate Professor rank.

Practice of Professional Skills

Practice of Professional Skills is not an applicable category in the Department of Drama for the Academic and Performance Streams at all levels, unless clearly designated in the Faculty member's initial letter of appointment or subsequent revision(s) to it.

Any activities in this area may build a case for merit.

Extra University Work, Public Service, and Outreach and Engagement

Awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in extra university work and public service will be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the cv update, letters from appropriate bodies or parties, and substantive evidence of excellence in contributions to professional bodies, editorial boards, arts related boards, publishers, other universities, conference and workshop organization, media engagement, or other outreach and engagement activities.

Awards of and recommendations for special increases in this category will only be made if: (i) the extent of the work has a lasting impact on the community, the region, or the country; (ii) the work is outside of the assigned duties of the employee, as specified in the employee's letter of appointment or by past practice; and (iii) the work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee.

Administrative Work

Excellence in administrative performance is judged relative to a faculty member's rank. Probationary faculty and Assistant Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable administrative contribution to the Department. Term and probationary faculty shall not normally be expected to take on any major Departmental administrative role. Associate Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable contribution to the administration of the Department and College or University. Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable administrative contribution to the Department, College and University.

Faculty members are expected to carry their share of the administrative work of the

Department; performance of assigned administrative duties at a satisfactory level will not be grounds for the award of or recommendation for a special increase.

Awards and recommendations for special increases for excellence in administrative work will be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the cv update, letters from Department Heads, Deans or Committee Chairs, and substantive evidence of excellence in the contributions to the administrative work of, first, the Department, and, second, the College or University. Aspects to be evaluated include quality and impact of the faculty member's contribution and the amount of time and/or effort involved.

Administrative Service as a Department Head or Assistant Dean

Standards for awards of and recommendations for special increases in this category are set by the Dean of Arts and Science and/or Heads' Salary Committee. A Department Head or Assistant Dean may be awarded a special increase for excellence in serving the Department or College.

Improvement in Academic Qualifications

Faculty who have improved their academic qualifications by completing a degree, a course of study, or similar program may be considered for a special increase. This will be especially true when the improvement aligns with a current and/or a new direction for the faculty member in terms of its intersection with teaching and/or RSAW.

Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

A faculty member who receives an offer of employment from a comparable institution may be considered for a special increase. Such an offer shall be in writing.

Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties

A special increase may be awarded to a faculty member when excellence in performance of assigned duties has been demonstrated through the combination of two or more categories listed above. Awards of and recommendations for special increases shall be made on the basis of evidence as described in the above categories.

Improvement and Development

Award of and recommendation for a special increase may in exceptional circumstances be made to a faculty member who demonstrates significant improvement in the category of teaching, RSAW or administration.





College of
Arts and Science

Approved by the College Review Committee
- June 30, 2011

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

Approved at Department of Economics Meeting of June 6, 2011

Preamble

In accordance with Article 17 of the Collective Agreement, special salary increases may be awarded for exceptional performance in one or more of teaching, research, scholarship, University work, public service or administrative work. The standard for exceptional performance shall be judged in light of all the duties assigned to the candidate. Candidates are encouraged to compile their own case for merit utilizing the criteria of Part 1. A cumulative case over more than one year is possible.

The publication of an article, a book, or a chapter in a book that has been subject to peer review may constitute a basis for a special increase. A work is considered published if the candidate has received a letter of acceptance for the manuscript.

A special salary increase for teaching, University work, public service, or administrative work requires a properly documented evaluation of the candidate's performance demonstrating that the candidate has performed these duties in an exceptional manner. Awards and honours may indicate the quality of a candidate's performance in the aforementioned categories and so may constitute a basis for a special increase.

Special increases shall be awarded and recommended to the College Review Committee by the Department Salary Committee defined in Part 2 applying the criteria specified in Part 1.

1. Bases for the award of special increases

The criteria utilized by the Department of Economics are:

1.1. Teaching excellence

The evaluation of teaching ability and performance shall be based on a report on the candidate that includes a properly documented assessment of teaching performance in the classroom, the quality of course material and examinations and, where applicable, supervision of graduate students.

The evaluation of teaching ability and performance shall be based on both student and peer evaluation. Student evaluation shall be based on an objective questionnaire that has been approved by the Department for evaluating teaching in general.

Peer evaluations shall be conducted by eligible members of the Department and reported to the committee in writing.

Teaching awards may be a basis for special increases.

1.2. Research and scholarly work

The evaluation of research and scholarship shall be based on original work in the form of published books or monographs, chapters in books, articles, or other publications, all of which shall have been subjected to peer review.

Published work will be evaluated by its quantity and its quality. The quantity of published work will be judged by the number of publications and their subject matter, frequency, continuity, and length. Joint authors will be given credit for an equal share of a publication, unless there is evidence to the contrary.

The quality of published work will be judged by its originality, its contribution to the discipline, the journal in which it appears or the publisher of it, and other evidence of excellence. The benchmark is single-author-equivalent articles in the *Canadian Journal of Economics*.

Other evidence of research productivity such as research grants and conference presentations will be considered.

Research productivity and scholarship will be considered within the overall framework of the assigned duties of the individual.

Recent performance shall be weighted more heavily than earlier performance.

1.3. Practice of professional skills

This category is not used by the Department of Economics.

1.4. Extra-university work and public service

A special increase may be awarded for excellence in outreach and engagement, committee work, or public service provided that the work is outside the assigned duties and it is not paid work.

Examples include contributions to academic and professional bodies in accordance with the traditions of the discipline and public service in accordance with the traditions of the University. Contributions to academic and professional bodies include service as a referee or editor of a scholarly journal, as well as service on boards, committees, review panels and advisory groups.

1.5. Contributions to administration

Faculty members are expected to participate in the collegial process according to their rank and seniority. They are expected, in addition, to share in the administrative and committee work of the Department. Exceptional contributions may be a basis for a special increase.

1.6. Administrative service as a department head or assistant dean

Not applicable.

1.7. Improvement in academic qualifications

Not applicable.

1.8. Offer of employment from a comparable institution

A special increase may be awarded if an offer of employment has been received from a comparable institution. Such an offer will be in writing.

1.9. Performance of the full range of assigned duties

A special increase may be awarded when excellence in performance has been demonstrated through the combination of two or more of the above categories.

1.10. Improvement and development

A special increase may be awarded on the demonstration of significant improvement or development in the above categories for reasons acceptable to the committee.

2. Salary Review Committee

2.1. Committee composition

The committee will consist of the head as chair and four elected members. Eligible members of the department are defined in the Collective Agreement (sec. 17.3.1). It is expected that the composition of the elected membership will be reasonably representative of the composition of the department.

2.2. Appointment to the committee

The head will distribute nomination ballots on which each eligible member of the department will indicate as many of the eligible members (including themselves) as are acceptable to them.

The head will then propose a committee of four elected members, with allowance for representativeness, from the members receiving broad support. The proposed committee will normally include at least one member and at most two members from the prior year committee,

with the objective of ensuring a smooth transition of experience to the new committee. The eligible members of the department will then vote to approve the proposed committee by simple majority vote.



College of
Arts and Science

Approved by the College Review Committee
- June 30, 2011

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

June, 2011

Preamble

This document supersedes the departmental standards approved on April 10, 2003. It will be used in all collegial processes (Search, Renewal of Probation, Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Review), with the exception of tenure cases for probationary faculty hired prior to July 1, 2011, in which case the 2003 standards will still be used. The standards outlined in this document represent a consensus that recognizes the diversity of academic work in our discipline, values work that bridges disciplines, and accommodates both traditional and non-traditional forms of academic work. The document will support the department as it explores new fields, develops innovative programming, and articulates new relationships with its cognate disciplines and public communities. The document will also support the career development of individual faculty, while ensuring that their work is judged by a rigorous standard.

As outlined below in Sections 8.4 and 8.5, the department affirms the importance of all the dimensions of academic work. It will award merit wherever merit is due, whether in research, in teaching, in administrative, or in public service, and will also find flexible ways of acknowledging meritorious work that bridges categories.

This is an organic document and is meant to be responsive to ongoing change in the discipline. The department will review the document at least once every five years, and revise as needed.

1. Academic Credentials

1.1 – For full-time academic appointments, a PhD in English is the standard qualification. A PhD from an interdisciplinary program would be considered, especially if the training involved was pertinent to the specialized field identified with the position.

1.2 – A completed PhD is preferred, but a candidate who is ABD will be considered, provided there is compelling evidence furnished by the candidate's graduate program that the dissertation work is virtually complete and that the defence is imminent.

1.3 – In the case of position in Creative Writing, an MFA is an acceptable alternative to the PhD. Where an MFA is deemed acceptable at the time of appointment, the candidate shall not be expected to complete a PhD as a condition of tenure.

1.4 – Given the Department's commitment to increasing the presence of Aboriginal

programming, Aboriginal students, and Aboriginal faculty, the Department will be prepared to make the case that an Aboriginal candidate with an M.A. and alternative qualifications will be considered to be comparably qualified to a scholar with a PhD.

1.5 – For appointment as a Sessional Lecturer, an M.A. in English is the standard qualification for teaching 100-level classes. To teach an upper-level class in a particular field, a PhD in that field is required.

1.6 – The provisions of 1.4 will apply to the appointment of Sessional Lecturers as well.

2. Teaching Ability and Performance

2.1 – All faculty are expected not only to be active teachers, but to grow and develop as teachers, constantly making efforts to improve the quality of their teaching. Faculty also must work

collectively to design and deliver successful teaching programs, participating in curricular review and reform, offering their services as evaluators of their colleagues' teaching, and working on teaching-related committees. The evaluation of teaching is thus not only summative, in judging whether a candidate's teaching meets the standard for tenure or promotion, but also formative, in supporting the teacher's development.

2.2 – The Department recognizes that teaching takes many forms, but principally recognizes the following activities as fundamental:

- teaching courses at all levels of the curriculum, from large introductory classes to specialized seminars
- developing new courses and programs
- supervising graduate students
- serving on graduate examining committees
- mentoring beginning teachers
- supervising graduate teaching assistants
- doing student advising
- publishing on teaching-related matters
- working on pedagogical development, whether in programs run by the Gwenna Moss Centre, or at conferences devoted to teaching

2.3 – In judging teaching performance, the Department will not unduly privilege any one of these teaching activities, but will examine the candidate's record holistically, acknowledging the full range of teaching activities. The Department commits to assigning teaching duties as equitably as possible, following its own guidelines for the Assignment of Duties.

2.4 – Student evaluation of teaching shall be conducted in all undergraduate classes every year, using a standard questionnaire (see Appendix A) as validated in the 2009-2010 academic year. For a particular career point decision (i.e. Renewal of Probation, Tenure, Promotion) all the questionnaire results obtained since the last career point decision shall be used.

2.4.1 – The questionnaire generates scores in six categories (Student Perception of

Instructor Knowledge, Course Organization, Course Presentation, Student-Instructor Interaction, Grading Feedback, and Learning). An individual teacher's score is related to a departmental mean in that category and is also given a percentile ranking. A low percentile ranking (such as 10th percentile) can be seen as evidence of substandard teaching, though a single such score could not be used to judge someone had not met the standard for tenure or promotion. A low score should be used formatively in the first instance, and only a persistent pattern of low scores could contribute to such a judgement.

2.4.2 – All student comments made on the questionnaire can be used formatively by the candidate, mentor, and the Head in helping to improve the candidate's teaching, but only signed student comments can be included in the file to be considered in formal collegial processes.

2.5 – The Department uses a peer evaluation method that is comprehensive, thorough, and designed to minimize biased or subjective assessments. For each peer review we assemble a team of three peer evaluators:

- i) the first evaluator is a specialist in the faculty member's field;
- ii) the second evaluator is the faculty member's choice;
- iii) the third evaluator's name is taken from a rota, which helps ensure that the work of evaluation is shared among all the faculty.

Both a junior and a senior class will be evaluated. Normally, two evaluators, including the specialist, will visit the senior class, and the other evaluator will visit the junior class. Each evaluator will write one report on classroom performance, based on a visit to two successive classes. Each evaluator also produces a report on the faculty member's teaching materials, including exams and marked essays. The faculty member receives all of these reports and then can meet with the evaluators to discuss the reports. Each peer evaluation, then, generates six reports. For a particular career point decision (i.e. Renewal of Probation, Tenure, Promotion) all such results obtained since the last career point decision shall be used.

2.6 – Peer evaluation shall be conducted in the first and second year of probation, and thus inform the Renewal of Probation decision. Peer evaluation shall be conducted in the fourth and fifth year of probation, and thus inform the Tenure decision. For faculty members eligible for promotion, peer evaluation shall be conducted once every two years, and will always be conducted in the year preceding a Promotion decision. Additional peer evaluations can also be conducted at any time, either at the discretion of the Head, or at the request of the candidate.

2.7 – Further evidence of teaching performance should be considered when it is available, such as teaching awards, signed letters from students and alumni, and other forms of public recognition. If a candidate has performed some teaching outside the Department, the Head shall solicit a letter from the Head or Program Chair of the other unit.

3. Knowledge of Discipline and Field of Specialization

3.1 – University standards require faculty to have developed a field of specialization with demonstrated value to the discipline. In judging this category, the Department looks primarily at the following evidence:

- research activity in the field, as summarized in the c.v.
- participation in academic conferences in the field, as summarized in the c.v.
- development of specialized courses in the field, especially Honours and Graduate seminars
- graduate supervision in the field

4. Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work

4.1 – **Disciplinary values.** These standards are based on the understanding that disciplinary values in English studies are considerably different from those outside the humanities, and in some cases subtly different even from other disciplines in the humanities. In assessing the research we publish in the Department of English we value both the style and craft of writing and the quality of scholarship. To publish in our field, scholars must generate original research and write well.

4.2 – **Peer-reviewed vs. non-peer-reviewed publication.** Peer review forms the primary basis of our evaluation of research, artistic, and scholarly work, but we recognize also the importance of various forms of publication and dissemination that are not peer reviewed.

4.3 – Digital Humanities Work

4.3.1 – Research results published in electronic form may bypass traditional peer-review processes. Digital projects require and involve two areas of expertise: a traditional humanities discipline, and the development of digital tools and methods. The work of scholars in the development of these tools and methods is essential if the resources are to be of use and benefit in academic research, and assessment of this work (for which there is no equivalent in the print world) should also form part of the candidate's case.

4.3.2 – Digital projects will be assessed under the rubric for publications in section V on the basis of equivalency. It will be up to the candidate to make a case for generic equivalency for his or her publication.

4.3.3 – If the digital project is published by a third party, peer-reviewed venue, the work will be assessed as any other peer-reviewed work, but the candidate may supplement the case with additional evidence provided for in 4.4 below. In cases where publication is in electronic form but the research and publication venue otherwise follow the traditional patterns described above, the publication will be assessed under the appropriate generic rubric. For cases where the digital work is an integral aspect of the research itself and/or publication does not follow these standard peer-review processes, the candidate can make a case for post-publication peer review.

4.4 – **Post-publication Peer Review.** For publications that do not follow the traditional models of print publications, in lieu of formal pre-publication vetting and peer review, the candidate may

make a case based on an accumulation of peer review mechanisms that will include letters of assessment, and some combination of such indicators as: award of a competitive grant for the project, appropriate consultation with experts, institutional sponsorship or association, an invited board of directors to advise on the project's development and implementation, results of usability studies, published papers about the project, presentation at conferences, published reviews, invitations resulting from the attention the project has received, on-line citations, linkages, endorsements, usage statistics, and inclusion in scholarly WWW gateways or portals.

4.5 – Description of Genres of Peer-Reviewed Publication in our Discipline

4.5.1 – Monograph – A scholarly monograph is a peer-reviewed, detailed study on a specialized topic, usually written by one author, and published by a scholarly academic publisher. The monograph aims to advance specialized knowledge in the field through original scholarship and detailed analysis of its subject, and thus is more sophisticated than a textbook. According to the National Research Council, “The value of monographs lies in the coherence and comprehensiveness of the information and knowledge they contain, which is important to the specialized researchers to whom they are directed.” A monograph represents the culmination of a research program that is typically conducted over a number of years, sometimes comprising a major portion of a scholar's career. Once submitted to a press for publication, the manuscript is subjected to intensive vetting by two recognized experts in the field, and is then approved by the press's editorial board. Further vetting occurs for the vast majority of monographs when a publishing subvention is sought through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Program (ASPP) of the Canadian Federation of the Humanities and Social Sciences. The manuscript is evaluated on the basis of the strength and originality of its argument and its promise to make a major contribution to scholarship in its field. A “monograph equivalent” is a study of comparable substance and depth of analysis that might take a form quite different from the conventional codex. It might be in digital form, distributed on CD or DVD or online in a variety of forms including blogs, static websites, or dynamically-generated pages from a database, and might incorporate scholarly tools, images, visualizations, sound, animation, movies, markup and interactive features.

4.5.2 – Journal Article – The publication of an article in a scholarly journal is considered a significant accomplishment in our discipline. Usually a single-authored work, it is often the result of months, and sometimes years, of painstaking, time-consuming, and extensive research, sometimes involving travel to libraries to secure documents essential to its scholarship. Once offered for submission to a scholarly journal, it is typically subjected to a double-blind vetting process and then submitted for approval to the journal's editorial board, consisting of recognized experts in the field. The article is evaluated on the strength of its argument, the thoroughness of its research, its originality, and its contribution to its field of study.

4.5.3 – Edited Collection – Like the monograph, the edited collection is a volume on a defined topic; however, its chapters are contributed by a number of different experts with different specialized perspectives on the topic. The editor solicits, selects, and edits contributed chapters, and may suggest and oversee substantial revisions. The editor customarily contributes substantially to paratextual material, such as a preface, introduction, or bibliography, and may also contribute a chapter. An edited collection is usually subjected to the same vetting process

as is the scholarly monograph and is often undertaken as a first foray into a new or fledgling area of research. Edited collections often gather ground-breaking contributions in emerging areas of scholarly inquiry, and as such can play an important role in defining a field.

4.5.4 – Book Chapter in an Edited Collection – A book chapter has the same value as a refereed journal article. Both are the result of original research potentially stretching over a few years. Contributions to an edited collection are usually subjected to even more rigorous editing than journal articles, in that the contribution must first satisfy the book’s editor(s), and then the press’s reviewers and editorial board and often ASPP vetters (as described above).

4.5.5 – Scholarly Edition – A scholarly edition presents an authoritative text of a literary work or historical document. What makes this text authoritative is its editor’s principled, detailed consideration of the “witnesses”—the forms in which the piece of writing first appeared—and of the relationships between these witnesses, together with an account of the reasoning and documentation that informed the editorial process. This reasoning is usually carried out in an introduction, but the textual evidence is also presented in an “apparatus,” a register of the specific places in which the witnesses vary significantly. Other kinds of research also go into the scholarly edition: its introduction generally provides biographical, historical, and literary contexts; its explanatory notes give attention to difficult points of interpretation; and, where the language of the piece of writing calls for further study, a glossary provides lexical information about the vocabulary. Finally, a scholarly edition provides a bibliography in which the textual sources and relevant published studies are identified.

A digital or electronic edition has all of the qualities and features of a print edition with some additions. Whereas the preparation of a print manuscript is handled by the publisher, the editor of an electronic edition usually oversees and in some cases does some of the encoding or tagging that enables it to be rendered for publication in an electronic environment. Typically the editor also tags the text to enable and enhance retrieval and analysis of the textual data. The selection and development of an appropriate tag set typically involves scholarly analysis and interpretation of the text and decisions about how that information will be used and accessed by the user. In these cases, the computational work is similar to that of researching and writing the commentary and annotations for the edition. A digital edition may include, besides the text and editorial apparatus that would appear in a scholarly print edition, features specific to the digital medium: facsimile or other images, navigation tools, analysis tools, links to internet resources, databases, etc. A digital edition may be published on CD-ROM or similar storage medium, or made available on the Web, freely or by subscription.

4.5.6 – Special Issue of a Journal – A special issue of a journal begins at the initiative of an individual scholar or group of scholars convinced that a new approach or area of study warrants special attention by a scholarly community. The editor drafts and sends out a call for papers, vets all submissions, and communicates with all contributors about how their articles can be strengthened. The editor of the special issue works closely with the journal’s managing or general editor. Sometimes the issue’s editor will help arrange for external reviewers and will usually write an introduction for the issue.

4.5.7 – Reference Work or Scholarly Resource

i) Bibliographies of primary sources (the original literary texts) and secondary sources (scholarly writing about these original texts) are essential tools of literary study and are typically the result of considerable research, often in archives and special collections. They range from article length to multi-volume sets. Some are enumerative (locating and listing items with basic bibliographic information), and others are more fully descriptive, either of the intellectual content in the case of secondary materials (often called annotated bibliography), or of the material qualities or production of the artifact in the case of primary materials (often called analytic or critical bibliography). A bibliography that becomes a standard resource can have very significant impact in a field of research.

ii) The scholarly database is the reference tool of the electronic age. A database (sometimes referred to as knowledge base) is a computerized collection of organized units of information, in some ways resembling an encyclopedia, but typically providing more robust metadata for retrieval and analysis. A database can include a wide variety of primary materials (literary texts, historical documents, images, sound and video files, etc.) that are collected, processed, annotated, and commented upon in a scholarly manner. The database's interface is designed to enable sophisticated scholarly search and analysis.

iii) A digital archive is in some ways like a scholarly edition except that all the primary materials are presented in full and typically with some diversity of form including, for example, plain text transcriptions, tagged documents, and facsimiles. A digital archive is typically rich in metadata and often includes annotation and other secondary material (such as commentary, bibliography, scholarly articles), and linkages between these materials.

4.5.8 – Research Leadership – In most cases, the scholarly productivity of a faculty member is expressed directly in the outputs described above; however, a scholar's impact might also be seen in his/her ability to inspire and enable the research of other scholars. Such research leadership could take many forms: as the principal investigator in a large collaborative funded project; as the director of a research centre or group; as the pathbreaker of a new field of research which many others have subsequently explored; or as an organizer of an academic conference. A candidate's case for research leadership would have to show both the value of the work done by others, and evidence of the critical contribution made by the candidate in making that work of others possible. A faculty member can claim leadership contribution in a project only at meaningful intervals or milestones in the life of a project. This is not understood to be annual recognition for ongoing leadership.

4.6 – Description of Genres of non-Peer-Reviewed Work in our Discipline – A case for tenure, promotion, or merit increase cannot be built entirely on items in this category, but such publications can contribute to a case. If an item categorized as “Non-Refereed Work” has, in a particular instance, been peer reviewed, it should be noted in a memo attached to the cv or cv update, and this fact will be a factor in determining its valuation in the range provided.

4.6.1 – Student Edition – A student edition is designed to provide students with the primary text and explanatory materials that will help make that text understandable to students. Such an edition normally includes an introduction, a glossary explaining archaic language or obscure references, and supporting material (i.e. reviews, scholarly articles, historical documents, illustrations) relevant to the text. It may also include a list of questions for discussion or essay topics. Often the text and apparatus of a student edition are derived from existing scholarship,

but sometimes (especially if the text has never been edited before) such an edition can require extensive original research. Scholars who have prepared a student edition are therefore asked to provide a brief statement about the level of research necessary to the preparation of the edition.

4.6.2 – Student Anthology – The editor of a student anthology must have a comprehensive knowledge of the field of texts being anthologized so as to make a judicious selection of texts, i.e. a selection that represents key figures and texts and the variety of work in the field. The work of preparing such an anthology typically involves multi-stage consultation with other scholars in the field, selection of texts, preparation of headnotes offering bio-bibliographical and sometimes critical contextualizing information, provision of footnotes, and the writing of a preface and/or introduction.

4.6.3 – Student Textbook – The editors and/or compilers of a student text book always synthesize received knowledge, formulated in such a way as to be accessible to students. However, the editors may also invite submissions that entail original contributions to knowledge in a particular aspect of the field, and thus the editors may be involved in substantial editing.

4.6.4 – Introduction to a Literary Work – An introduction to a literary work can range from a few pages to forty pages and more. A scholarly introduction places the work in the contexts of the author’s body of writing, its historical period, and the history of ideas and of literary production. While introductions draw on established scholarship, they also re-interpret and re-evaluate the literary work in the light of current knowledge, attitudes, and tastes and may be accompanied by a glossary, explanatory notes, or a list of selected further reading.

4.6.5 – Essay in Conference Proceedings – Publication of conference proceedings is not common practice in English studies, in which mature scholarship is more important than quick dissemination of results. Nonetheless, a place exists for them in the broad field of academic dissemination, although their quality and significance are generally held to be more variable than scholarship that finds its way into print through less “occasional” routes. Acceptance of a paper for a conference typically does not guarantee publication in the proceedings: usually papers are slightly revised after presentation and then, upon submission, subject to some form of peer-review before being accepted for publication. Proceedings that are not peer reviewed or published in-house are considered less significant than those that are peer-reviewed and/or published by an academic press. If the compilation and publication of these proceedings are the same as for a collection of essays (e.g. substantial revision of contributions and expansion to article length, peer review, vetting, and publishing with an academic press), the publication should be considered an edited collection as defined in 4.5.3 above.

4.6.6 – Scholarly Interview – The scholarly interview provides unique insights into the work of an author, critic, or theorist in the field. It is more substantial than a review, but less substantial than an article or book chapter. Its primary contribution to knowledge lies in the thoughtful and often novel responses elicited by the interviewer’s well-researched questions.

4.6.7 – Entry in an Encyclopedia or other reference work – An entry in a reference work (companion, dictionary, encyclopedia, glossary, guide, handbook, wordlist, etc.) typically surveys and distils existing scholarship on the named topic, but it may also offer new insights

and original research. Such entries vary in length from short dictionary entries of a few hundred words to substantial essays of several thousand words. In the case of an extensive encyclopedia or reference work entry that makes an original argument or presents substantial new research, and is peer-reviewed, the candidate may request that it be considered in the “Journal Article” category.

4.6.8 – **Book Review** – Scholars in literary studies may review both scholarly books and, if working in contemporary literatures, new works of literature. Book reviews are considered part of scholarly work in English studies, but they do not carry as much weight as review essays.

4.6.9 – **Review Essay** – A review essay is a substantial critical assessment of a recent publication or publications or of a body of work in a particular area of study. The essay is longer and more complex than a book review, since it draws on the author’s knowledge of the field in a detailed way and makes use of other theoretical or critical sources.

4.6.10 – **Editing a Journal** – The editor of a scholarly journal is responsible for soliciting, receiving, and vetting manuscripts; planning special issues; arranging peer review of submissions, and sometimes book reviews and reviewers; establishing and regularly renewing an editorial board; conducting all correspondence, especially with contributors, the editorial board, and subscribers; printing, proof-reading, and distribution; securing funding; and financial accounting and subscriptions. The work is persistent, demanding, and time-consuming, but it provides an essential intellectual apparatus for the dissemination of scholarship.

4.6.11 – **Conference Paper** – Scholars working in the area of English studies are expected to contribute to scholarly discourse by regularly sharing their research results at conferences where proposals are vetted.

4.6.12 – **Keynote Address** – Being invited to give a keynote address is a form of recognition of outstanding contributions to the field and working at one of the cutting edges of the discipline. The keynote address will normally exceed by approximately 50% the length and detail of the argument in a conference paper.

4.6.13 – **Named Lecture** – Like an invitation to give a keynote address, being asked to give a named lecture signals distinguished contributions to the field or particular area of study, but is generally a higher order of recognition than being asked to give a keynote address.

4.6.14 – **Post-Publication Recognition** – Post-publication recognition could be in the form of awards, reprints, etc.

4.6.15 – **External Grant** – In a field of study in which one third or less of applications for research funding are successful, obtaining a research grant recognizes both the quality of past research work and the promising formulation of new projects.

4.7 – **Creative Work** – The term “creative writing” applies to novels, stories, poetry, plays, and prose genres such as *belles lettres* and autobiography. These genres, often taken under the general category of literature, have traditionally formed the basis of what is studied in English, just as art works and musical compositions form the basis of study in art history and musicology. Historically, it has been common for some faculty members in English to produce both scholarly

work and creative work, a combination anticipated in the title of Category 4: “Research, Scholarly, and Artistic Work.” Publication of several short stories, a significant group of poems, or a short play may be considered equivalent to a journal article, and venue of publication is considered when assessing merit. Creative works such as novels, a full-length play, and books of poetry can take as long to write as scholarly monographs do, representing years of writing and revision, and sometimes substantial research. When such books are submitted for publication, they undergo vetting by an editorial board or external referees before a contract is offered. Submissions are assigned an editor and are usually required to undergo further revisions, thus receiving the same level of scrutiny and evaluation that a scholarly monograph or article receives. Like scholarly monographs, creative books are submitted for review in relevant publications (usually journals, magazines and newspapers). Finally, just as university artists show their work in galleries, authors give readings and talks in order to publicize new work. As with scholarly work, we recognize equivalency in digital and multi-media forms of creative writing. The common genres are: novel, collection of short stories, collection of poems, book of creative non-fiction, play professionally produced, play published, single short story, and single short poem. Between the single poem and the collection of poems is the poetry chapbook, a small book of new material, some of which may then re-appear in the author’s next major collection. Creative work also includes translations of literary works from other languages into English, work that requires not only close knowledge of the other language, but considerable technical skill, especially in translating poetry.

4.8 – Knowledge Transfer – In addition to the standard avenues of publication listed above, we recognized that alternative forms exist for communicating research, and that these spheres of publication often extend beyond the academy. A case for tenure or promotion may include, in combination with items in the refereed category above, other forms of publication where scholarly knowledge is communicated outside the academy, such as:

- i) reports commissioned by governments, professional bodies, or non-government agencies
- ii) articles, editorials, or essays in popular journals or newspapers
- iii) professional blogs and websites
- iv) published software
- v) public exhibitions
- vi) public dissemination of research results
- vii) film or radio documentaries

4.9 – Collaborative Work – Traditionally, research in English studies has been conducted by solitary scholars, sometimes but not usually with the aid of research assistants; however, collaborative research is becoming more common, often resulting in multi-authored publications. The Department of English recognizes the value of collaborative work both as a way of involving graduate students in professional practice and as a means of expanding the scope of a program of research. In applications for tenure and promotion, as well as for salary review, candidates should explain the nature and degree of their contributions to collaborative work and multi-authored publications.

4.10 – Point System for Publications – Each genre of publication is assigned a point range. The median point in the range represents a publication of standard quality and substance for that

genre. The upper and lower ranges allow for adjustment based on the substance, quality, and status of the publication. In fixing a point value for a particular publications, such factors as the following would be considered:

- i) for book publication: the stature of the press, the number and quality of post-publication reviews, post-publication awards, and the appropriateness of the venue.
- ii) for journal publication: the stature of the journal, acceptance rate, circulation, length and scope of the article, and the appropriateness of the venue.
- iii) for edited collections and special issues of journals: the stature of the press/journal, the stature of the editors, and the stature of the other contributors.

Type of Publication	Value Range
Refereed Work	
Monograph or monograph equivalent	80 - 120 (100 median)
Journal article	12 - 20 (16 median)
Edited collection	35 - 55 (45 median)
Book chapter in edited collection	12 - 20 (16 median)
Scholarly edition – book publication – journal publication	50 - 100 12 - 20
Special issue of journal	12 - 30
Reference work or scholarly resource(bibliography, database, archive) – book publication – journal publication	20 - 60 12 - 20
Non-Refereed Work	
Student edition	10 - 15
Student anthology	25 - 45
Introduction to a literary work	4 - 8
Essay in an encyclopedia or other reference work	1 - 3
Review essay	5 - 9
Book review	1 - 3
Editing a journal	6 - 20
Conference paper	3 - 5
Keynote address	6 - 8
Named lecture	8 - 10
Post-publication recognition	2 - 10
Research Leadership	20 - 40
Grants	
Refereed grant	3 - 20
Non-Refereed grant	1 - 3

Creative Writing	
Novel or book of creative non-fiction	40 - 60
Collection of short stories or novella	30 - 40
Collection of poems	30 - 40
Full-length play professionally produced	15 - 25
Full-length play published	10 - 15
One-act play produced	8 - 10
One-act play published	4 - 15
Single short story	4 - 15
Single poem	2 - 15
Poetry chapbook	10 - 12
Book-length translation of a literary work	50 - 100
Translation of a short literary work	2 - 15

4.11 – Point Thresholds for Career Point Decisions in the Category of Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work

For Tenure as Assistant Professor:

30 points based entirely on refereed work done since appointment.

OR

40 points based on both refereed and non-refereed work, of which at least 25 points must be based on refereed work, all of it done since appointment.

For Tenure as or Promotion to Associate professor

60 points based entirely on refereed work done since appointment.

OR

80 points based on both refereed and non-refereed work, of which at least 50 points must be based on refereed work, all of it done since appointment.

For Tenure as or Promotion to Professor

100 points based entirely on refereed work done since appointment as Associate Professor.

OR

140 points based on both refereed and non-refereed work, of which at least 90 points must be based on refereed work, all of it done since appointment as Associate Professor.

4.12 – Point Thresholds for Merit in the Category of Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work –The following thresholds should be reached for a merit recommendation based solely on Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work to be considered. The thresholds are no guarantee of merit, as the award of merit is determined by a competitive process each year. Note that a case

for merit may also be based both on Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work and other categories, as outlined in section 8.5. When making a combined case, the point total for Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work need not necessarily reach the point thresholds listed below.

Rank	0.5 Increment	1.0 Increment	1.5 Increment
Assistant Professor	20 points, of which at least 15 points must be refereed	40 points, of which at least 30 points must be refereed	60 points, of which at least 45 must be refereed
Associate Professor	30 points, of which at least 25 must be refereed	50 points, of which at least 40 must be refereed	70 points, of which at least 55 must be refereed
Professor	50 points, of which at least 40 must be refereed	70 points, of which at least 55 must be refereed	90 points, of which at least 70 must be refereed

5. Practice of Professional Skills

Faculty in English are not judged in this category.

6. Contributions to the Administrative or Extension Responsibilities of the Department, College, University

6.1 – Administrative work is part of every faculty member’s assigned duties, though the level of work expected reflects the faculty member’s rank and seniority.

6.2 – Probationary faculty members are assigned minimal administrative work, and this work is usually limited to committee work within the Department. They are expected to attend meetings of the Faculty Committee, Search Committee, and will take a turn serving on the Salary Committee. They are not normally assigned to either the Graduate or the Undergraduate Committees. An individual probationary faculty member may request to be assigned to one of these two committees, so long as s/he and the Head are satisfied the committee work will not impede progress toward tenure.

6.3 – Probationary faculty members are generally discouraged from serving on time-consuming committees at the College or University level.

6.4 – Should a probationary faculty member perform more administrative service than is expected, such service will be viewed positively when tenure is considered, and will be duly taken into account during the salary review process.

6.5 – Once tenured, and especially after promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member is expected to become more involved administratively, and may serve, and even chair, the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees, and will be encouraged to serve on College and University committees as well.

6.6 – A faculty member at the rank of Professor is expected to be assuming a leadership role in administrative work, working on the more challenging committees, and chairing committees when the opportunity arises.

6.7 – In judging a candidate's administrative work, Tenure and Promotion committees will take into account not just the number of committees served on, but also the scope and the difficulty of the work performed. Letters from committee chairs should be solicited wherever possible to help clarify the nature of the administrative service performed.

7. Public Service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies

7.1 – Probationary faculty are encouraged to be involved in the outside academic community, especially in attending academic conferences, but extensive formal service is not required. Similarly, community work is encouraged, especially if it forms an integral part of a faculty member's pedagogy (say, in an internship program, or with community-service learning) or a faculty member's research program. Again, though, there is no strict requirement in this area for tenure.

7.2 – Tenured faculty, especially after promotion to Associate Professor, are expected to broaden their involvement in the outside academic community, in organizing conferences, vetting for journals and presses, serving on adjudication committees, assuming roles in the Executive of scholarly associations, and acting as external referees and examiners. Faculty members at the rank of Professor are expected to continue the forms of involvement detailed above, and to have assumed leadership roles whenever possible.

7.3 – Community involvement, such as volunteer work for community organizations, public advocacy, served on Boards of community and arts organizations, is strongly encouraged, and should be duly noted when Promotion cases are considered, and during the Salary review process.

8. Department of English Standards for Salary Review

8.1 – **Principles** – The following principles shall inform the Salary Review process:

8.1.1 – The allocation of merit shall be as inclusive as possible, respecting the diversity of forms of academic activity performed by our faculty. No work is invisible.

8.1.2 – Though the Salary Committee is small, all faculty members should expect to serve on the committee at some point.

8.1.2 – All assigned duties are potentially meritorious. This principle is integral to the Department's practices in assigning duties.

8.1.3 – Both quantity and quality shall be considered in measuring the value of work.

8.1.4 – Merit may be awarded on the basis of one year's work, or a cumulative case may be made based on more than one year's work. Normally, a cumulative case would be made if the candidate had been recommended for merit in a previous year and had not received it. All years included in the case should be equally strong.

8.1.5 – The Salary Review process shall comply with all the requirements of the Collective Agreement.

8.2 – Salary Committee – The Salary Committee shall consist of the Head, who will chair the committee, and four faculty members appointed by the Head, chosen by the following guidelines:

8.1.1 – Two members shall be Professors, one shall be an Associate Professor, and one shall be an Assistant Professor.

8.1.2 – No member shall serve for more than two consecutive years. For continuity, in any given year, at least one member should have served on the committee in the previous year.

8.1.3 – A faculty member on leave in the Fall Term shall not be called upon to serve on this committee.

8.1.4 – A faculty member on probation may serve on this committee.

8.1.5 – Service on the Salary Committee is important and time-consuming; in making appointments to this committee the Head shall take into account the other assigned duties individual faculty members are performing.

8.1.6 – Conflict of interest shall not prevent any faculty member from serving on this committee. A faculty member will be excused from the room when his or her case is being considered by the committee.

8.3 – Salary Review Process – Respecting the deadlines set by the Collective Agreement, the following steps shall be followed:

8.3.1 – By September 1, all faculty members shall have submitted their cv updates electronically to the department secretary. They shall also submit to the Head a covering memo which shall include any information that will be of use to the Salary Committee, such as:

- information about the stature of publication outlets;
- in the case of collaborative work, a statement from the collaborator describing the nature of the collaboration;
- in the case of work accepted for publication, evidence of acceptance;
- in cases where the refereed status of the work may be in doubt, evidence of peer-review;
- letters of support as appropriate (including, say, letters from committee chairs, signed letters from students, etc.).

8.3.2 – By mid-September the Head shall have staffed the Salary Committee.

8.3.3 – By mid-October the Head shall have reviewed the material submitted by faculty, and shall have requested any further information s/he feels is necessary.

8.3.4 – The Head shall call a Salary Committee meeting for no later than the third week of November, and shall have distributed the cv updates, and supporting information, by the end of October.

8.3.5 – Following the Salary Committee meeting(s), the Head shall complete Salary Review forms for each faculty member, and arrange meetings with each faculty member. Completed forms shall be submitted to the Dean's office by November 30.

8.4 – **Basis for Merit** – The Salary Committee shall look at each case holistically, being mindful of the full range of duties performed by the faculty member. Particular work may be judged as meritorious insofar as it exceeds, either in quantity or quality, or both, what could reasonably be expected of a faculty member at that rank and stage of career. The committee will also take account of any time-release that may have been awarded to support certain duties.

8.4.1 – in judging teaching, the committee may consider the following:

- both the number of courses taught and the enrollments in each course;
- evidence from peer and student evaluations;
- teaching awards;
- signed letters from students;
- evidence of new course and curriculum design;
- evidence of instructional development work undertaken;
- publications in the scholarship of teaching;
- involvement in graduate supervision;
- any other information submitted by the faculty member in support of the case.

8.4.2 – in judging research, scholarly, and artistic work, the committee will assign a point value to each reported item, using the point system outlined in 4.10, and noting the thresholds for merit specified in 4.12.

8.4.3 – in judging administrative work, the committee may consider the following:
– all committee work, whether at the departmental, college, or university level.
The extent and the difficulty of the work should be attested to by a letter from the chair;
– work performed as chair of a committee;
– any other information submitted by the faculty member in support of the case.

8.4.4 – in judging public service work performed for academic organizations and for the community, the committee may consider the following:
– service to academic and professional organizations;
– work as a vetter and academic reviewer;
– conference organization;
– service to community organizations;
– any other information submitted by the faculty member in support of the case.

8.4.5 – in addition to recognition in any of the categories noted above, the committee should be prepared to assign merit for work in a number of categories, and even for overall performance in all categories in a given year.

8.5 – **Allocation of Merit Money** – The Department will not prescribe exactly how many merit increases the Salary Committee shall allocate to work in different categories, but the following proportion will act as a guideline:

Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work	40%
Teaching Ability and Performance	20%
Administrative Service	20%
Public Service	10%
Overall Performance	10%

Depending on the quality of the cases presented in a given year, the committee may judge it appropriate to alter these proportions slightly, while remaining committed to the principle of rewarding meritorious performance in all dimensions of a faculty member's work. In a normal year, the committee would be expected to expend all of the funds allocated to it. The committee will also need to bear in mind that Collective Agreement article 18.2.4.2 (iv) advises that 2/3 of the awards should be a full increment or higher. The committee will identify those cases it judges to be worthy and merit, and will then rank them. It will then award merit until the funds allocated to the committee are fully committed. The remaining cases will then be recommended to the College Review Committee.

8.6 – **Records** – The Head will keep orderly records of all merit decisions, including subsequent awards made by the College Review Committee and the President's Review Committee. This will provide a basis on which cumulative cases can be made. In addition, the Head will keep a record of the point values assigned by the committee to all items reported in the category of Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work. These point values, once assigned by the Salary Committee, will accumulate and will inform Tenure and Promotion decisions, as indicated in 4.11.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND PLANNING

**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES**

REVISED AND APPROVED DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND PLANNING - APRIL 1, 2011

INTRODUCTION

Standards for the award of salary increases within the Department of Geography and Planning are based on an affirmation of the value of the teacher-scholar model and interdisciplinarity. The teacher-scholar model builds on the principle that universities acquire their distinctive character through their capacity to unite scholarship and teaching. Interdisciplinary research and teaching highlights the integration of the four scholarships of teaching, discovery, integration, and application. Therefore, both the teacher-scholar model and interdisciplinarity will be valued in the context of tenure, promotion and special salary consideration.

This document defines the levels of performance expected of faculty members at each rank in the Department of Geography and Planning. It will be used by the Department in evaluating faculty for salary increases. It should be considered in conjunction with the documents outlining the criteria and standards established by the College of Arts and Science and by the University, and with the relevant sections of the Collective Agreement.

The Department Head will advise faculty members of their eligibility and pending consideration for salary increases in accordance with the provisions of the Collective Agreement. However, it is the responsibility of individual faculty members to ensure that materials to be considered in evaluating their case are submitted to the Department Head or designate by the relevant deadlines.

CATEGORIES AND METHODS OF EVALUATION

University standards require that a candidate for renewal of probation, tenure, or promotion be evaluated under the seven categories discussed below. The candidate's performance in each category shall be rated in accordance with the University Standards as "does not meet the standard", "meets the standard", or "meets the standard at a superior level".

1. Academic Credentials

The standard academic qualification for appointment to the professorial ranks is a Ph.D. degree. Only in special situations, defined at the time of appointment, will the Ph.D. requirement be waived or a case for Ph.D. equivalency be considered.

2. Teaching Ability and Performance

Faculty in the Department of Geography and Planning are expected to teach at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The standard teaching load for a faculty member is the equivalent of 12 credit units of courses (combined undergraduate and graduate) not including special topics or reading classes, although this may be adjusted to reflect additional assigned duties. Both the undergraduate and graduate teaching activities of the candidate will be assessed with regard to the quality and presentation of course material. Graduate student supervision is evaluated in this category through consideration of a variety of aspects including student progress in program, time to completion, number of conference presentations and refereed publications, meeting with students, number of students currently supervised, and service as a member of research advisory committees or committee chair.

Teaching ability and performance of a faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of assessments by both students and peers. The objective of the evaluation is to determine if, on the basis of a variety of documentary evidence, the overall content and delivery of the courses taught by the candidate are acceptable to the Department. The evaluation should consider teaching over several years whenever possible. The Department uses the Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) course evaluation instrument which is the University of Saskatchewan's approved instrument for conducting instructor and course evaluations and assessing student course satisfaction. The Department also uses the standard Peer Teaching Evaluation form developed by the College of Arts and Science for reporting peer review of teaching. It is desirable that all faculty, including those not being considered for promotion, tenure or probationary review, have an opportunity to have their teaching evaluated on an ongoing basis. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to ensure that all faculty, especially candidates for renewal of probation, award of tenure, and promotion, have an opportunity to have at least one undergraduate and one graduate course evaluated using these methods. Candidates are also required to submit for consideration a teaching portfolio with additional materials which are acceptable under the University Standards.

3. Knowledge of Discipline and Field of Specialization

Evaluation in this category is based on the material considered under categories 2 and 4.

4. Research and Scholarly Work

Faculty in the Department of Geography and Planning are expected to engage in original research and scholarly work, and to communicate the results of that work to other members of the academic community in their area of specialization. Evidence of research and scholarly work must include published materials (as defined in the College of Arts and Science Standards) which have been subjected to external peer review. In evaluating the importance and significance of published material, such factors as authorship, format, length, rigour of review, audience, and distribution of the publication will be considered. Other evidence of research and scholarly work will include the presentation of papers at conferences, invited lectures, prizes and awards, and the award of research grants. In addition to an up-to-date curriculum vitae, faculty members being evaluated are expected to submit a research dossier that includes materials described in the University Standards.

While the difficulties inherent to the evaluation of the quality of research and scholarly work are recognized, the Department of Geography and Planning uses the following as a guide to the standard level of productivity expected of faculty in this category. In general, an Assistant Professor is expected to publish the equivalent of one article per year in a refereed journal, an Associate Professor is expected to publish the equivalent of 1.5 articles per year, while a Full Professor is expected to publish two articles per year in refereed journals.

5. Practice of Professional Skills

This category is not used in the Department of Geography and Planning at this time.

6a. Contribution to Administration

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the administration of the Department as requested by the Head. It is recognized that in some instances faculty will not be asked to undertake departmental administrative duties because of their involvement in other activities. All faculty are normally expected to attend faculty meetings, and to serve as a member on at least one departmental administrative committee. Associate Professors and Professors are expected to serve periodically as the chairperson of an administrative committee. Contributions to College and University administration will also be considered in any evaluation of a faculty member. Evaluation of the contribution of a faculty member to administrative duties will be based on a letter of assessment from the Department Head, and any other materials the candidate wishes to submit.

6b. Contribution to Extension Responsibilities

Faculty members in the Department of Geography and Planning are not usually assigned extension duties. In special cases where extension duties might be assigned, these should be communicated to the faculty member in a letter from the Department Head. In such cases, the evaluation of extension duties would be based on a letter of assessment from the Department Head, and any other materials the candidate wishes to submit.

7. Contribution to Academic and Professional Bodies and Public Service

Faculty members are expected to contribute to academic and professional bodies in accordance with the traditions of the Department. They must be a member of a national or international professional body concerned with their area of specialization. Faculty members are encouraged to attend at least one conference of an academic or professional body each year.

In accordance with the traditions of the University, faculty members are expected to respond to reasonable requests from the public for advice and information in the area of expertise associated with their position at the University. If a faculty member wishes to be evaluated on the basis of these activities, it is essential that the activities are properly documented.

CRITERIA FOR SALARY INCREASES

1. Career Development Increases

Career development increases are granted in accordance with the terms of the Collective Agreement in recognition of added experience, ability and scope of responsibilities.

2. Special Salary Increases

In recognition of performance which is superior to that normally expected at each rank, full and partial special salary increases are awarded and recommended by the Department. The general procedures and criteria for the award of and recommendations for special salary increases are outlined in the Collective Agreement.

The Department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the Department. Eligible employees include those holding probationary, tenured and term appointments if the term of appointment is for more than one academic year, the term appointee has served at least one academic year in the appointment, and there is at least another academic year remaining in the term of appointment at the time of appointment to the committee.

The following is intended to provide guidance as to the levels of performance in selected categories which would be considered superior in the Department of Geography and Planning. Consideration for a special salary increase requires well documented records of a faculty member's activities during the period under review covering the entire scope of the faculty member's activities in all categories.

Teaching ability and performance: A special salary increase for teaching would normally be recommended for substantive work beyond that usually expected. These might include such activities as the development and teaching of a new course, production of laboratory manual, development of educational computer software or the award of College or University teaching award. A documented and sustained record of superior classroom teaching over a period of several years may also be considered grounds for the recommendation of a special salary increase.

Research and scholarly work: A special salary increase may be recommended in this category if the candidate's performance exceeds the standard for their rank as defined previously in section 4 Research and Scholarly Work. The publication of a major scholarly book or monograph would also be considered grounds for the recommendation of a special salary increase.

Contribution to administration: A special salary may be recommended if the performance of duties in this category can be shown to be meritorious. This would normally require that the candidate had successfully undertaken a major task such as heading a special project committee or directing comprehensive academic program revisions, or had executed their duties in an exceptionally superior manner. In considering recommendations for special salary increases in this category, any adjustment to the faculty member's duties that may have been associated with the administrative work will be taken into account.

Contributions to academic or professional bodies and public service: A special salary increase in this category may be recommended for well documented, major contributions to the public or the discipline. This might include such activities as serving on the executive of a national or international academic body, organization of a conference, editing an academic journal, or extraordinary public service.

Special salary increases may also be recommended in cases where the performance of a faculty member in a number of categories is particularly effective, and the overall performance of the faculty member is considered to be superior. Superior accumulated performance over a number of years may also be considered grounds for the recommendation of a special salary increase, provided the accumulated performance exceeds the standards expected for the period under consideration.

Members of the Department Salary Committee will be excused from deliberations when in a conflict of interest. Members of the Department Salary Committee are expected to disclose any potential conflict of interest to the committee, and the committee has the right to exclude members from the deliberations of specific cases due to perceived conflict of interest. Conflict of interest includes, but is not limited to, deliberation of the member's own case and cases of a family member and faculty members with whom the member of the Department Salary Committee has an active collaboration. When individuals are excused from Department Salary Committee's deliberations due to conflict of interest, the remaining committee members will conduct the deliberations relevant to the case at hand.



DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES**

April 2011

I. SALARY COMMITTEE.

The department will annually establish a Salary Review Committee, consisting of the head and at least three eligible members. The head will appoint the committee annually and will attempt to achieve a balance in representation from all sub-disciplines and appointment categories. The head will advise the department of the membership of the committee in advance of the first meeting.

II. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

Standards for the award of Special Increases are established in accordance with the provisions of Articles 17.2 and 17.3 of the Collective Agreement.

In general terms, Special Increases (SI) are awarded for performance judged to be extraordinary, typically over a one-year period, but also for longer periods. The department standards for promotion to associate professor and professor will define the expected level of performance at the associate professor and professor level respectively. The standards for the award of tenure as an assistant professor will define the expected level of performance at the assistant professor level.

The department salary review committee awards special Increases as: one-half SI or one SI and may recommend an additional SI to the College Review Committee (CRC). The College Review Committee (CRC) can award one-half SI, one SI, one and one-half SI or two SI, and may make recommendation to the President's Review Committee (PRC) for higher value awards for those faculty who have been awarded one full SI or more.

Normally, consideration for SI is done as part of the annual evaluation of faculty, although the PRC will consider an award for certain emergency situations. Also, individual faculty can make application directly to the PRC, in their own right.

The categories in which faculty are to be evaluated are defined in the Collective Agreement. An award, or recommendation for an award, can be based on exceptional performance in one category, or as an aggregate in two or more, but satisfactory performance in all assigned duties is required. The department will recognize the cumulative performance of individual faculty over a number of years. The department will respect disciplinary standards.

The majority of awards will be based on research and teaching, although that does not preclude an award based on any one of the categories defined in the Collective Agreement. The department shares the university commitment to outreach and engagement articulated in the Integrated Plan. Our commitment will be expressed by rewarding exceptional performance in the practice of professional skills and in extra university work and public service.

National or international awards associated with any of the categories will receive strong support from the department for merit.

III. AWARD CATEGORIES

Research, scholarly work and teaching are of primary importance in assessing merit.

Research and Scholarly Work

The department places high value on research. Publication of papers in quality, peer reviewed, journals and chapters in edited books will be the primary evidence to be considered. Publication of monographs or books will be given high importance. It is the responsibility of every faculty member to communicate the level of their input to each publication under consideration. They should demonstrate the impact their work has had by communicating citation rates and impact factors for journals. The successful completion of a M.Sc. or Ph.D. program by a graduate student under direct supervision will also be considered. It is expected that all faculty will be successful in attracting funding to support their research.

Teaching

The department values good teaching and will reward those who demonstrate a high level of performance, in teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in the department as well as in the broader university community. The evidence to be considered will include (but not be limited to);

- teaching awards at the university and national level,
- the development of new courses,
- a portfolio of teaching material,
- the publication of a text book,
- student and peer evaluations,
- and evidence of innovative delivery.

Practice of Professional Skills

The evidence to be considered will include (but not be limited to);

- service to professional bodies, as an editor of a journal, or as a board member,

- organizing a conference,
- recognition by a journal for outstanding work as a reviewer.

Extra University Work and Public Service

Outreach activities are encouraged by the department because they help to inspire young scientists and to bridge the gap between the academic environment and the broader public. They also publicize activities of the department, college and university. Activities may include talks at elementary and high schools, participation in formal outreach programs, organization of science fairs and workshops, publication of popular science articles, and delivery of public lectures.

Administrative Work

The department recognizes the responsibility of faculty to contribute to administrative work at all levels. An award in this category alone would be rare, but some administrative work is required of all faculty.





UNIVERSITY OF
SASKATCHEWAN
College of
Arts and Science

Approved by the College Review Committee
- June 30, 2011

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

April 6, 2011

I. SALARY COMMITTEE.

In accordance with Article 17.3.1 and Article 17.4.1 of the Collective Agreement, the members of each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Review Committee (SRC) chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department. Ideally, members of the SRC shall be drawn from all three ranks (Assistant, Associate, Full). When a committee member's own case is considered, that member will be excluded from the proceedings of the committee. No member of the SRC shall participate in a decision in which they are in conflict of interest.

II. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY.

The Department of History follows section 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. Standards for the award of Special Increases shall be established in accordance with the provisions of Articles 17.2 and 17.3.

Meritorious performance requires excellence either in a category, or in more than one category when considered together, while maintaining the expected performance in other categories of assigned duties. Establishing excellence requires clear evidence of the performance of assigned duties at a level beyond the standard expected for a faculty member given his or her rank. The majority of cases will involve annual considerations but a case for a cumulative award over two or three years is also permissible.

Principles that shall guide the deliberations, procedures and decisions of the SRC draw on the *Department of History's Standards for Renewal of Probation, Tenure, Promotion and Special Salary Increases*, past practice and recognition of the expanded categories available for special increases under the 2010-2013 Collective Agreement:

- a. The Department values the teacher/scholar model and we wish to maximize the number of faculty recognized for their accomplishments within the categories enumerated below.
- b. Excellence pertains to quality, and not only to quantity of one's contributions in a particular area(s).
- c. The levels of merit increments recommended are: .5 of a full increment, a full increment, 1 full increment, 1.5, 2, 2.5 or 3 full merit increments.
- d. Standards for excellence in performance shall differ by rank and according to assigned duties (for example, in the case of Canada Research Chairs, Graduate Director, Undergraduate Director and CMRS Director).

- e. The Department encourages and rewards both disciplinary and interdisciplinary teaching, scholarship and administrative contributions.
- f. The award of a special increase requires that evidence be available to substantiate the quality of the faculty member's performance. Faculty members are expected to take an active role in gathering such information. If they wish the Head to assist in gathering information, they must notify the Head by the end of the review period (June 30).
- g. In keeping with the spirit of the Collective Agreement, the SRC will consider the contributions made by faculty in all of the relevant categories.
- h. Members of the SRC will make their decisions on the principles of fairness and consistency. Faculty members have the right to appeal these decisions to the PRC, according to the guidelines established in the USFA Collective Agreement 17.5.5.

Teaching:

Good teaching is an expectation of all faculty. The standard Departmental teaching assignment is 15 cu's of undergraduate and MA-level graduate teaching. Faculty who hold administrative appointments, or Canada Research Chairs (or equivalents), or who have earned Departmental box top credits (for graduate teaching or external research grants) will have their teaching assignments reduced.

Awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in teaching will be made on the basis of the c.v. update and evidence of excellence in the performance of teaching duties drawn from one or more of the following sources: statement of teaching activities and innovations; teaching awards, peer evaluations; signed letters from students, statistically validated student evaluations, curriculum or program development, and exemplary graduate student instruction (e.g. completed MA and PhD students, PhD field courses, and thesis supervisions). The faculty member's rank shall be taken into account in these deliberations.

Assistant Professors: At this level faculty are often honing their teaching skills and concentrating on creating a range of courses across the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Participation in the graduate program, as thesis committee members, PhD field supervisors and MA supervisors is expected when opportunities arise.

Associate Professors: At this middle-rank it is expected that faculty will have established courses. Thus they will have the opportunity to extend their knowledge of their fields or disciplines, and be engaged in curricular innovations (new courses, methodologies). Participation in all facets of graduate teaching is expected when opportunities arise: as thesis committee members, PhD field supervisors and MA and PhD supervisors.

Full Professors: At this senior level, faculty should demonstrate mastery in their subject areas and this should be evident in their classes. Stimulating, current classes that highlight the field and discipline should be the expectation. Leadership in graduate teaching is expected, including: in the recruitment of graduate students, and as thesis committee members, PhD field supervisors, and MA and PhD supervisors.

Research and Scholarly Work:

Research and scholarship is expected of all faculty holding tenure-track or tenured appointments. Merit recognizes excellence in research and scholarly work. Rank should be factored into expectations of

achievement in research and scholarly work.

In all cases, awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in research and scholarly activity will be made on the basis of the c.v. update, evidence of publication or acceptance for publication of a finished manuscript (letter or e-mail from publisher) and may also include a statement from the faculty member outlining their research achievements for the year. Items considered may include:

- Scholarly publications in the form of peer-reviewed monographs, peer-reviewed journal articles, peer-reviewed edited books, peer-reviewed book chapters and online peer-reviewed articles.
- In History the publication of a scholarly monograph represents the gold standard of research achievement, and thus should be calibrated accordingly in the salary process. In the past this was often recognized with two special increases, under the new system it should be recommended for between 2-3 special increases.
- Peer and non-peer reviewed scholarly outputs such as, but not limited to, exhibits and digital projects.
- Research Awards
- Non peer-reviewed monographs, journal articles, edited books, and book chapters.

The award of an external research grant will strengthen a case for merit. Faculty with supporting evidence of research engagement and scholarly excellence (invited national and international conference presentations; public lectures; or other evidence of national or international scholarly recognition) may have their case for merit strengthened.

The size of the special increase shall reflect the academic merit of the work, as judged by the SRC, by awards or evaluations of such work (referees, book reviews, etc.). Caliber of academic journal or publisher, and the time necessary to produce the work shall also be factors in these decisions. The specifications below are intended to differentiate scholarly and research expectations by rank.

Assistant Professors: At this stage faculty are expected to be establishing their research programs, including: applications for external research funding, conference presentations, scholarly publications and book reviews. A case for meritorious achievement would include the publication of 1 or more peer-reviewed journal articles (or equivalent).

Associate Professors: Faculty are expected to have an established program of research, including: an increased pace of scholarly publications (articles or equivalents), regular scholarly conference presentations, external research grant activity, evidence of national and international engagement, etc. A case for meritorious achievement would include a scholarly monograph; or 2 or more peer reviewed articles (or equivalents).

Full Professors: Professors should demonstrate leadership in research, intensifying that demonstrated as an Associate, including: increased pace of scholarly publications, annual presentations at conferences and invited lectures/keynotes, external research grant activity, contributions as assessors/reviewers, national and international engagement, etc. A case for meritorious achievement would include a scholarly monograph, or 2 or more substantive peer reviewed articles (or equivalent).

Practice of Professional Skills

Practice of Professional Skills is not an applicable category in the Dept of History.

Extra University Work and Public Service

Awards of and recommendation for special increase for excellence in extra university work and public service will be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the c.v. update and/or other supporting documentation that the faculty member may provide in the form of letters from various organizations: editorial boards, peer-review committees, or professional organizations; conference organizing bodies; publishers; media work; or other outreach and engagement. In cases when further explanation about such work and service is warranted, a faculty member should attach a brief statement.

Awards of and recommendation of special increases in this category will only be made if:

- i) The work is outside of the assigned duties of the employee, as specified by their letter of appointment or past practice, and
- ii) The work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee.

Administrative Work

Excellence in administrative performance is judged relative to a faculty member's rank. All faculty members are expected to carry their fair share of administrative work within the Department.

Awards and recommendations for special increases for excellence in administrative work will be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the c.v. update, letters from Department Heads, Deans or Committee Chairs, and substantive evidence of excellent contributions to the Department, and/or the College and/or the University and/or the University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association.

Faculty members who hold administrative leadership positions in the Department or within the University, for example: CMRS Director, History Graduate Director, History Undergraduate Director, USFA leadership positions (Grievance Officer, Negotiating committee) or Canadian Journal of History editor may be considered for merit. To facilitate this, faculty who hold such positions may include, with their c.v. update, a brief statement to the Head and SRC, enumerating their meritorious accomplishments during the year or during their term of service (for a cumulative case).

Assistant Professors: Fair and reasonable contributions to the Department. Meritorious cases would involve more extensive administrative contributions throughout the unit or the College, and potentially, leadership in an administrative role.

Associate Professors: Contributions to the Department, and College or University. Meritorious cases would involve contributions beyond those expected at rank, extensive administrative work, administrative leadership (Departmental Directorships) and/or innovation.

Full Professors: Extensive contributions to the Department, College, University and/or Faculty Association. Meritorious cases would involve extensive administrative work within the Department (as

a Director), or leadership and/or participation on major College or University Committees (for example, College Review Committee, University Review Committee, USFA bargaining committee or leadership positions).

Administrative Service as a Department Head or Assistant Dean

The College of Arts and Science annually establishes a College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans chaired by the Dean.

Improvement in Academic Qualifications

A Ph.D. is a normal expectation for tenure track faculty at the time of hiring. In the rare event that a faculty member begins employment without such qualification, subsequent completion of the Ph.D. is not grounds for a special increase. We do not anticipate this category will be utilized in the Department of History.

Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

A faculty member who receives a written offer of employment at a higher salary from a comparable institution may be considered for a special increase in accordance with the expedited procedures as set out in the Collective Agreement.

Performance of a Full Range of Assigned Duties

Special increases for meritorious work, in a combination of two or more categories listed above, have routinely been awarded in the Department of History.

Improvement and Development

A special increase may be awarded to an employee demonstrating significant improvement or development in the categories listed above for reasons acceptable to the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee.



DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES***1. Makeup of the SRC:*

The SRC will consist of four elected department members plus the Head. All probationary and tenured departmental members are eligible for appointment to the SRC with the exception of those who have served on the committee the previous two consecutive years.

2. Nomination of SRC Members:

The Head will distribute ballot forms asking each probationary and tenured departmental member to nominate four eligible faculty members.

The individuals receiving the highest number of nominations will be appointed to the SRC. In the event that the nominated individual is unable or declines to serve on the SRC, the individual with the second highest number of nominations will be appointed, and so on. In the case of a tie, subsequent ballots will be cast to break the tie.

3. Conflict of Interest:

Members will be excused from deliberations when in a conflict of interest. SRC members are expected to disclose any potential conflict of interest to the committee, and the committee has the right to exclude members from the deliberations of specific cases due to perceived conflict of interest. Conflict of interest includes, but may not be limited to, deliberation of the SRC member's own case or that of a family member and deliberation of a faculty member's case with whom the SRC member has an active collaboration. When individuals are excused from SRC deliberations due to conflict of interest, the remaining SRC members will conduct the deliberations relevant to the case at hand.

4. Supporting documentation to be provided to the SRC:

Although faculty members may submit a cover letter highlighting the items which they wish to bring to the attention of the SRC for merit consideration, this letter will not be considered to be a supporting document.

Faculty members are expected to provide the following documents to the Salary Review Committee: the 2 CV update forms and all supporting documentation (copies of the published articles and the journal information, or preferably the journal issue in which they appeared).

The CV forms must follow the format of the Guidelines Standardized CV provided by the University of Saskatchewan. Since the SRC members need a reasonable period of time to

consult the CV update information and any additional supporting material provided by each eligible faculty member, and rank contributions, those documents will only be accepted on or prior to September 1.

To facilitate the SRC members' work, the faculty members will translate as much material as possible in case another language is used in supporting documentation.

Only published works as opposed to works accepted for publication will be considered for recommendation for merit.

SRC Procedures for Awarding and Recommending Special Increases

The following *Principles for the Award of Special Increases* will guide the deliberations, procedures and decisions of the SRC:

1. Within the guidelines set out by the Collective Agreement, the SRC will seek to maximize the number of merit recipients whose productivity and contribution fall under the categories described below in no. 6 and in the tables.
2. The award of a special increase is to recognize excellence in one or more of the categories defined by the collective agreement. Moreover, excellence pertains to the quality, and not only the quantity of one's contributions in a particular area.
3. Standards for excellence in performance shall differ by rank insofar as expectations will be higher for the more senior ranks.
4. The award of a special increase requires that evidence be presented to substantiate the quality of the faculty member's performance.
5. In keeping with the spirit of the Collective Agreement, the SRC is directed to consider the contributions made by faculty in all of the relevant categories as well as to cases where performance excels in one or more categories.
6. When considering recommendations for merit, the relative weighting in a faculty member's Assignment of Duties in the above relevant categories shall take into account their rank.
7. For cumulative cases, faculty must submit a letter requesting that their case be considered cumulatively and must specify the date of their last merit increase and the items for which it was awarded.

The Following Procedures Shall be Followed by the SRC Members:

Distribution of Information: The Head will circulate to the SRC the CV update information and all additional supporting material submitted by each eligible faculty member. These materials will be circulated to SRC members by September 8th. (See attached table of common indicators and data sources for each category). The SRC will have access to the CV updates from previous years (which will be kept on file in the department) and the record of previous merit increases.

Faculty members are encouraged to provide additional supporting evidence they deem relevant in each of the categories of research / scholarly work, creative writing / artistic work, teaching, administration / public service.

Ranking Procedure: Each SRC member will independently rank all eligible faculty (with the exception of cases in which there is a conflict of interest) based on the information provided. When the SRC convenes, each member will provide their rankings to the other committee members and the average ranking for each faculty member will be computed by the SRC.

If there is SRC agreement regarding the averaged rankings, then these will form the basis for the final determination regarding the awarding and recommendation of special increases.

If there is disagreement regarding the averaged rankings, the SRC will try to reach consensus through discussion, further deliberation and seeking further information and/or clarification from those whose cases are at issue. In the event that consensus cannot be reached on all cases following these measures, the original averaged rankings for the disputed cases will form the basis for the final determination regarding the recommendation of special increases.

Allocation Policy for the Award of Special Increases

The allocation policy for special merit increases to be awarded is based on the need to recognize all diverse work-related activities in which departmental members engage in fulfilling their obligations to their field and in answering the expectations of the university. It acknowledges the value of the diversity of professional activities in the areas of research / scholarly work, creative writing / artistic work, teaching, administration / public service, as well as university and extra-curricular service to students and communities at the various levels of local, provincial, national and international scope.

The SRC will establish an overall ranking of individuals and identify the categories for which the ranking is based (e.g., research / scholarly work, creative writing / artistic work, teaching, administration / public service). The highest ranked individuals excelling in each of the groups will be identified and recognized through the award of special increase. Individuals whose contributions span more than one of the categories shall also be considered for merit on the basis of their activities in all relevant areas.

The Collective Agreement stipulates that at least 2/3 of the available special increase monies must be in the form of full increments (i.e., in any given year, the total worth of monies distributed as half increments cannot exceed the amount of full increment awards).

In addition, the main criteria for which special increases will be awarded shall reflect the diversity of work done in the unit: research / scholarly work, creative writing / literary translation / artistic work, teaching, administration / public service. According to the Collective Agreement, the SRC is required to make the rankings and their full rationale known to all department members for the sake of transparency.

Categories Eligible for Consideration	Indicators/Data Sources
<p>Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction of classes (graduate and undergraduate); number of students and overload courses • Supervision of student research (graduate and undergraduate) • Teaching skills acquisition and classroom implementation (digital media, workshops, etc.) • Facilitating student skills acquisition (conference participation, certification, exams, performance, language attestation, study abroad programs, innovation in instruction and/or application of technology to the classroom, workshops, etc.) • Development of new courses and curricula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receipt of teaching awards (peer reviewed weighted more heavily) • Peer teaching evaluations • Student evaluations (SEEQ or equivalent) <p>Evidence of innovation in instruction, curriculum development and/or publication of technology to the classroom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course materials (course outlines, grading materials, etc.) <p>Participation in teaching development including courses, workshops and conferences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed letters of support from peers and students <p>Letters of support from community partners for skills/professional supervision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical reports stemming from skills/ professional supervision
<p>Research and Scholarly Work / Creative Writing</p> <p>The main evidence of significant scholarship and research is through peer-reviewed books published by reputable publishers, through articles and review articles in refereed journals, through editorial work, and through book reviews and other published writing. Significant creative activity can be demonstrated and evaluated through poems, short stories, novels, plays and translations.</p>	<p>A special increase in this area is based upon documented excellence in one or more of the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of peer review. Blind peer-reviewed, independently edited works published by reputable presses are considered more meritorious than self-published works. All publications listed must be authenticated by including a hard copy or active website link. • Documentation of publication of creative writing such as poetry, short stories, novels, plays and translations published by respectable journals or by reputable publishers. Evidence of excellence may be supplied by book reviews, or written appraisals from critics and scholars in the field, as well as the award of literary prizes for a particular book. • Additional evidence for research and scholarly work includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Receipt of Research Grants and Awards – Conference presentations
<p>University Work and Public Service</p> <p>Many activities fall within this category and those activities must be related to the faculty member's academic qualifications or area of expertise. Common examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal reviews; Grant reviews • Editorial activities • Contributions to Professional or Community Organizations (e.g.: time commitment, rank within the organization, etc.) • Outreach and Engagement Activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of activities relevant to practice of professional skills • Letters of support from community/clients/co-professionals • Evidence of significance of the contribution • Listing of each relevant activity including name of organization, type and extent of contribution, estimate of time commitment • Evidence of the significance of the contribution • Letters of support from colleagues, community members and/or clients

Point system chart

The following tables are meant to serve as a guideline of the approximate value of items relevant to the Department of Languages and Linguistics.

Type of Publication	Value Range
Refereed Work	
Monograph or monograph equivalent	80 - 120 (100 median)
Journal article	20 - 40 (30 median)
Edited collection	45 - 65 (55 median)
Book chapter in edited collection	15 - 25 (20 median)
Scholarly edition – book publication – journal publication	50 - 100 12 - 20
Special issue of a journal	12 - 30
Reference work or scholarly resource (bibliography, database, archive) – book publication – journal publication – language database (corpora) – dictionary	20 - 60 12 - 20 10 - 20 open to discretion of committee
Peer-reviewed conference papers	6 - 10
Research Grants and Awards	1 pt for every \$1000 up to a maximum of 50 pts (total points to be divided by the number of co-applicants)
Non-Refereed Work	
Student edition / student-teacher manual (publ)	10 - 15
Student anthology	25 - 45
Introduction to a literary work	4 - 8
Essay in an encyclopedia or other reference work	3 - 5
Review essay	5 - 9
Book review	1 - 3
Editing a journal	10 - 20
Conference presentation	3 - 5
Non peered-reviewed published conference paper	3 - 5
Keynote address	6 - 8
Named lecture	8 - 10
Post-publication recognition	2 - 10
Conference – organizing a conference or colloquia – organizing a conference panel	5 - 10 1 - 3

CREATIVE WRITING AND TRANSLATION OF LITERARY WORKS	
Novel or book of creative non-fiction	40 - 60
Collection of short stories or novella	30 - 40
Collection of poems	30 - 40
Full-length play professionally produced	15 - 25
Full-length play published	10 - 15
One-act play produced	8 - 10
One-act play published	4 - 15
Single short story	4 - 15
Single poem	2 - 15
Poetry chapbook	10 - 12
** Translations follow the same scale as the corresponding	creative writing

TEACHING	
Receipt of Teaching Award: a) USSU b) College Award c) 3M Award or a nationally recognized award	10 - 20 25 - 30 30 - 40
Supervision of student research - undergraduate - graduate	15 - 30 20 - 40
Writing a textbook - published (refereed) - non-published (non-refereed)	10 - 50 10 - 15
Teaching skills acquisition and classroom implementation - Participating in workshops / conferences or taking courses	5- 10 ea
Facilitating student skills acquisition - Conference participation - Development of new courses and curricula - Certification, exams, language attestation - Development or coordinating a Study Abroad Program - Innovation in instruction (including application of technology in the classroom)	5 - 10 10 - 20 5 - 10 ea 5 - 10 ea 5 - 10 ea
Overload teaching (3 cus)	10 - 30

UNIVERSITY WORK & PUBLIC SERVICE	
Peer Review of Journal articles	1- 2 ea
Grant Application Review	5 - 7 ea
Chairing a Department, College, or University Committee or other administrative work.	3 - 10
Serving as President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer of a Learned Organization	4-8 ea
Serving as President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer of a community organization as part of extension work	4 - 8
Outreach and Engagement Activities	10 - 15

When making a combined case, the point total for Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work need not necessarily reach the point thresholds listed below.

Rank	0.5 Increment	1.0 Increment	1.5 Increment
Assistant Professor	20 points, of which at least 15 must be refereed	40 points, of which at least 30 must be refereed	60 points, of which at least 45 must be refereed
Associate Professor	30 points, of which at least 25 must be refereed	50 points, of which at least 40 must be refereed	70 points, of which at least 55 must be refereed
Professor	40 points, of which at least 35 must be refereed	60 points, of which at least 45 must be refereed	80 points, of which at least 65 must be refereed



DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES**

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The criteria discussed here are to be read alongside the appropriate passages in the following documents: Article 17 of the Collective Agreement between the University of Saskatchewan (U of S) and the University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association (USFA).

In accordance with Article 17.3.1, the department shall annually establish a Departmental Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the Chair and a minimum of three eligible faculty. One faculty from each of the research groups - Pure Mathematics, Applied Mathematics and Statistics will be nominated by the research group to serve on the committee on a rotating basis. The slate of candidates nominated will be approved by the department. A committee member whose own case is considered shall still participate on the committee, except that when the committee member's own case is considered the committee member will be excluded from the proceedings of the committee.

The Departmental Salary Committee is responsible for developing standards for the award of special increases and communicating the approved standards in writing to the College Review Committee (CRC), and on approval to all employees in the department.

The committee is also responsible for making awards of up to one special increase, recommending faculty members to the CRC for the award of additional special increases, and recommending faculty members to the CRC for the award of special increases if the department does not have sufficient funds to make such awards.

The Department Salary committee may award half or full special increases to a faculty member. However, at least two-thirds of special increase must be awarded as full increments. For example, if the department has 3 full increments to award, then either 2 full increments and 2 half increments or 3 full increments must be awarded. An individual may receive up to a maximum of 3 special increases per year.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

In general terms, Special Increases (SI) are usually awarded for performance judged to

be extraordinary, typically over a one-year period, but also for longer periods.

Normally, consideration for SI is done as part of the annual evaluation of faculty, although the PRC will consider an award for certain emergency situations. Also, individual faculty can make application directly to the PRC, in their own right.

Special salary increases will be recommended for faculty members whose performance in a given year, or cumulatively for two or more years, is *higher than that expected as normal* for a person in that rank, especially *if the performance is judged to have been superior*.

The categories to be evaluated in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics include all those duties for which the faculty member was responsible. There are nine categories for the award of special increases. They are:

1. Teaching

The University is a centre of scholarly activity with a mission to educate the next generation of highly qualified members of society. It not only exposes students to the current state of knowledge in various disciplines, but also aims to stimulate intellectual curiosity, develop problem solving skills, impart scholarly attitudes, and cultivate the critical abilities necessary to evaluate ideas, arguments and systems. Thus teaching effectiveness is closely linked to research and scholarly activity.

Assessment of the quality of contributions to teaching will be based on the full range of a faculty member's teaching responsibilities, including:

- teaching performance in undergraduate and graduate courses and seminars.
- contributions to the revision of courses, and to the development and implementation of new courses.
- supervision of students and post-doctoral fellows, and service on student advisory and examination committees.
- organizing and coaching teams for mathematical competitions;
- other contributions to mathematical pedagogy, such as the writing of textbooks.

Teaching performance will be judged for adequacy of preparation, clarity of communication, interaction with students, and appropriateness of the material presented; other criteria may also be considered as appropriate. Evaluation of teaching performance will be based on the material in the teaching case file, including:

- written reports from peer visitations of regular classroom lectures.
- course outlines, assignments, and examinations, assessed by the committee.
- approved departmental student questionnaires.
- written, signed comments from students.
- teaching awards received by the candidate.

2. Research and Scholarly Work

Research and scholarly work mainly involves contributions by the candidate to new knowledge and dissemination of that knowledge through appropriate peer-reviewed venues. Assessment of research and scholarly work will be based on the following criteria:

Primarily,

- original work in the mathematical sciences published (or accepted for publication) in prestigious peer-reviewed venues, such as internationally recognized journals.
- monographs published by scholarly presses of international standing.
- full papers in proceedings of conferences with an international reputation.

Secondarily, other published peer-reviewed work, such as:

- original research or an original synthesis of known work at an advanced level.
- editing special thematic books or issues of journals (including full-paper conference proceedings) published by scholarly presses of international standing.

Tertiarily, other scholarly work will be considered, such as:

- mathematical presentations at conferences, colloquia, and seminars;
- technical reports, reviews, referee reports, and non-refereed publications;
- leading seminars;
- serving on editorial boards, grant selection committees, and thesis examining committees;
- development and publication of computer software, and obtaining patents;
- collaboration with researchers in other departments, universities, industry, and government.

Peer group recognition, such as awards for excellence in scholarly work, selection to scholarly societies, and invitations to consult or to evaluate or review the work of others, will be given appropriate weight.

The Department strongly encourages and expects all of its faculty to apply for research funding, especially from external granting agencies such as NSERC. The presence of research funding will be viewed as additional evidence of quality in the candidate's scholarly activity.

However, the quality and excellence of the candidate's research and scholarly work as demonstrated under the above criteria is more important than the securing of external research support.

For co-authored papers in the mathematical sciences, an equally important contribution by each co-author will be assumed, regardless of the order in which the names appear in a paper, unless specific mention is made about the contributions of

individual authors.

3. Administrative Work

Assessment of administrative work will be based on contributions to:

- Departmental committees and administration, and activities supported by the Department.
- College or University committees.
- Activities of the U. of S. Faculty Association.

Assessment of public service will be based on contributions to:

- promotion of the mathematical sciences through writings, lectures, consultations, contests, interviews, etc.
- service on boards or committees of educational institutions, government bodies, or research organizations in the capacity of an expert in the mathematical sciences.
- administrative work in learned societies or other professional bodies.
- organization of conferences, workshops, or symposia in the mathematical sciences.
- editorial work on scientific journals.
- membership in selection committees for grants, scholarships, or awards.
- outreach activities.

4. Practice of Professional Skills

5. Extra University Work and Public Service

6. Improvement in Academic Qualifications

7. Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

8. Performance in the Full Range of Assigned Duties

9. Improvement and Development

Traditionally, categories 1 (Teaching) and 2 (Research and Scholarly Work) have carried the most weight. However, it was always difficult to make case under category 1, i.e. teaching. Historically, assessing excellence in teaching has been difficult because of the absence of quantifiable measures of excellence. The onus is on the individual faculty to provide any quantitative information that support their case for merit increment in this category. That although other categories may be evaluated for special increases, in which case they provide supporting evidence taken along side evaluation of work done in categories 1 and 2.

Faculty members are to document for the Departmental salary committee the case of the award of a special increase in any of the following categories of evaluation.

The Department will use the 40:40:20 rule in distributing the funds. For example, the Committee may award 40% of the unit special increases to category 1 (Teaching), and 40% to category 2 (Research and Scholarly Work), and 20% to the rest of the categories, and with the understanding that any unused awards in the designated category can be used in any other category. Any unused funds at the departmental level get moved to the CRC.



DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

Proposal approved by the Department of Music, University of Saskatchewan, April 8, 2011

PROCEDURES FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

I. Salary Committee: In accordance with Article 17.3.1 of the Collective Agreement, the members of each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and three eligible representatives of the department including the areas of performance, academic, and music education. Ideally, these three representatives shall be rotated annually.

II. Criteria for the Award of Special Increases of Salary: The Department of Music follows section 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. Standards for the award of Special Increases shall be established in accordance with the provisions of Articles 17.2 and 17.3.

Meritorious performance requires excellence in at least one category. Establishing excellence requires clear evidence of the performance of assigned duties at a level beyond the standard expected for a faculty member given their rank, or performance of meritorious duties beyond those assigned. In the event of *equal* meritorious performance between faculty members at different ranks, the priority will be given to the member holding the lower rank.

The Salary Review Committee requests all faculty to consider carefully clarifying their cv updates (forms 1 and/or form 2) from one year to the next. Below are a set of guidelines established by the department:

- **Publications/conference presentation material:** Faculty are encouraged to provide the actual publication/conference presentation material. Each submission should include a word count.
- **Music Compositions:**
 - Include the composition's date of completion.
 - In the event that the composition has been re-titled, include the name(s) of the composition's previous title(s).
 - The prior status of a composition must be made clear to the committee if the work has already been submitted in previous years within the cv update process via either form 1 and/or form 2. (i.e., commissioned one year, composed a subsequent year, performed a subsequent year, recorded a subsequent year; sheet music published a subsequent year, premiere and repeat performances, etc.). This request is made in an effort to avoid duplicate merit recognition from faculty who compose music.
- **Grants/commissions:** Faculty are encouraged to provide the monetary amount for all awarded grants and/or commissions (even if the commission amount is zero). The candidate must declare the source of the grant.

- **Artistic performances:** Faculty are encouraged to identify venue, performance medium, and broadcast date(s). Faculty are also encouraged to provide a complete list of repertoire performed and collaborative artists; faculty are encouraged to indicate what repertoire is being performed for the first time and what repertoire has been repeated from previous concerts.

- **Teaching:** Faculty are encouraged to state in their annual cv updates if duties beyond those assigned are remunerated.

1. Teaching:

A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in teaching. Performance of assigned teaching duties at a satisfactory level will not be grounds for the award of or recommendation for a special increase. The standard teaching load is that which is agreed upon by consultation with individual faculty and the head, and subsequently ratified through the collegial process in a regular faculty meeting.

Awards of, and recommendations for, special increases for excellence in teaching may include, but not be limited to, the cv update, a statement of teaching activities, and evidence of excellence in the performance of teaching duties drawn from the following sources: peer evaluations, statistically validated student evaluations, teaching awards, exemplary student success, course outlines and syllabi, extraordinary overload, additional or exemplary non-standard teaching contributions (e.g., curriculum or program development), graduate student completions, supervision, or advising.

2. Research, Scholarly, and Artistic Work (RSAW):

As per Departmental Standards, each faculty member is expected to participate in RSAW, with a higher standard expected at higher ranks. Composers are expected to compose and to disseminate the outcome via numerous means commensurate with their RSAW profile. Academic faculty are expected to produce research and to disseminate the outcome via numerous means. Performers are expected to perform and to disseminate the outcome via numerous means commensurate with their RSAW profile. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the following types of research, scholarly, and artistic work commensurate with their RSAW profile:

(i) Publication:

Publication, or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication, are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase. The size of the Special Increase should reflect the scope of the publication. Faculty are encouraged to declare whether the publication is double-blind refereed, blind refereed, editorial refereed, or non-refereed.

(ii) Unpublished Work:

Unpublished research or scholarly work are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase if it is established that the work has academic merit—including, but not limited to, invited or refereed participation in various professional settings commensurate with the faculty member's RSAW profile.

(iii) Artistic Work:

Artistic creations and performances are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase, where this is appropriate to a discipline. Consideration for a Special Increase should reflect many issues, including but not limited to, the faculty member's rank and the stature of the performance venue from the standpoint of the profession.

3. Practice of Professional Skills:

A Special Increase may be awarded to a faculty member for excellence in the practice of professional skills, where this is appropriate to a discipline.

4. Extra University Work and Public Service:

A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in outreach and engagement, non-University committee work, or public service, provided that the following criteria are met:

- (i) The work is outside of the assigned duties of the employee, as specified in the employee's letter of appointment or by past practice.
- (ii) The work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee. An employee who is paid more than a nominal fee to do extra work by government or a public agency would not normally satisfy this criterion.

5. Administrative Work:

A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee with administrative duties, beyond those assigned in consultation with the Department Head. In exceptional circumstances, committee work assigned by the Department Head may be considered for Special Increase. Higher standards are expected of faculty members at higher ranks.

6. Administrative Service as a Department Head:

A Special Increase may be awarded to a Department Head for administrative service as a reward for excellence in serving the department, or College. Standards are set by a College Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans (Collective Agreement 17.3.3), which proposes standards and recommends awards to the CRC (17.4.3).

7. Improvement in Academic Qualifications:

A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee who has improved their academic qualifications by completing a degree, course of study, or similar program; especially when such an improvement impacts positively upon the faculty member's teaching ability and/or RSAW profile. Documentation is required.

8. Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution:

A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee who has received an offer of employment from a comparable institution. Such an offer normally would be in writing.

9. Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties:

A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee demonstrating significant improvement or development in the categories listed above for reasons acceptable to the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee.

10. Improvement and Development:

Award of and recommendation for a special increase may in exceptional circumstances be made to a faculty member who demonstrates significant improvement in the category of teaching, research, or administration.



DEPARTMENT OF NATIVE STUDIES**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES**

(June 29, 2011)

VISION

The Department of Native Studies faculty members are active leaders in innovative and transformative teaching and research with community partners on and off campus at the local, regional, national, and international levels. We are recognized internationally for our dedication and commitment to the development of healthy communities; dynamic networks; applied community-engaged research; a leading-edge, relevant and comparative academic program grounded in Indigenous perspectives; and the scholarly excellence of our students and faculty. The Native Studies Department is central to the life and vitality of the University of Saskatchewan and upholds the pillars—innovation, Aboriginal engagement, research and internationalization.

MISSION

The Department of Native Studies serves and engages with Indigenous communities and societies at large, at the local, regional, national and international levels. Indigenous Studies is committed to:

- Indigenous perspectives grounded in Indigenous knowledge, experience, ways of knowing, and geographies.
- Capacity building by enhancing healthy and sustainable Indigenous communities, knowledge systems, and environments.
- Graduating Indigenous Studies Students with relevant and innovative skills, insight, and commitment to social justice and transformation.
- Excellence in the scholarly activities of teaching, critical analysis, applied and community-based research.
- Knowledge translation that results in the betterment of relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples
- Transformative applied, comparative, and innovative research, community service, and teaching that impacts policy and practice, and preserves and creates Indigenous knowledge.

VALUES

The Department of Native Studies values the traditional values of our ancestors: honesty, courage, generosity, humility, respect, wisdom and truth. The Department of Native

Studies values universal education: community engagement, open mindedness, knowledge translation, innovation, scholarly excellence, local and global concerns, capacity building, social justice, and the betterment of society. The Department of Native Studies also values: balance, humour, hard work, and relationship building.

I. SALARY COMMITTEE.

In accordance with Article 17.3.1 of the Collective Agreement, the members of each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department, namely: one member from each academic rank, tenured, untenured and term appointments. Committee membership will be determined by ballot vote and no member can serve on the committee for more than two out of three years.

The Department of Native Studies Salary Review Committee adheres to the Conflict of Interest provisions of the University of Saskatchewan Collective Bargaining Agreement, Section 10 which stipulates: "The parties recognize that scrupulous avoidance of conflicts of interest on collegial committees is essential to the preservation of the integrity and credibility of the peer review process." Faculty members on the Salary Review Committee will remove themselves from committee proceedings when their merit nomination or application is being reviewed.

II. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

In accordance with Article 17.1.3 the Department of Native Studies follows section 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. Standards for the award of Special Increases are established in accordance with the provisions of Articles 17.2 and 17.3.1 (Department Salary Review Committee).

17.1.3 Awarding of Special Increases. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee who has demonstrated excellence in one or more of the categories described in Article 17.2. A Special Increase may be based on accumulated performance over a period of years which, when regarded altogether, may merit a Special Increase.

17.1.3.1 Evaluation will be based on information provided by each employee as documented in a current CV update and in accordance with applicable standards for the award of Special Increases and Article 17.5.6 (ii).

17.2 Basis for the Award of Special Increases. It is accepted that the criteria for the award of special increases may differ from Department to Department and from College to College as a result of unique aspects or expectations of the discipline that may be internal and/or external to the University. Standards for the award of Special Increases shall be established in accordance with the following provisions and the provisions of Article 17.3.

The Department of Native Studies has not completed its Standards for Rank Promotion and Tenure. For present purposes the departmental expectation and norm consists of the following categories and allocations:¹

- Teaching 35%
- Research & Scholarly Work 35%
- Service to Department, Division, College and/or University 15%
- Community & Professional Service 15%

Thus, a “good year” or baseline would consist of the following:

- 9-15 cu’s of teaching (depending on course relief granted for administrative roles and large scale research grants, and taught across a range of classes—100, 200, 300, 400/800 & graduate supervision)
- 1 peer reviewed article or a successful grant application
- 1 academic conference paper presentation
- Administrative contributions and committee work at the departmental level and actively serve on at least one Divisional, College and/or University committee.
- Gratis contributions to community in the form of active committee work (with outputs), capacity building, and/or professional practice, as well as active committee work in professional association(s).
- Attendance and active participation in department unit meetings and working groups, as well as divisional, college and university level faculty councils.

A “meritorious” year would consist of all of the above **plus** excellent performance in one or more of the above categories (as described below). The Department of Native Studies adheres to the principals of equity and will take into consideration progressive development expectations at the different ranks (Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor) as outlined in the College of Arts and Science Standards for Promotion and Tenure.

While the department acknowledges the valuable contributions members make in the category of community and professional service, a recommendation will not be made for a special salary increase on the basis of this category alone. Rather, performance in this category will be evaluated in terms of how these activities not only contribute to community and our professional associations but also contribute to teaching and research. The evidence provided in this category may be used to support a recommendation for a special salary increase on the basis of high quality teaching and/or research.

The following are examples of meritorious work (covering one academic year) for each of the evaluation categories:

Category	Activities
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards (external) • Awards (U of S) • Exceptional Achievement • Successful completion of two or more graduate students
Research & Scholarly Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Book or research awards (external or internal); • Single authored peer reviewed book that makes a significant contribution to the discipline of Native Studies or marks mastery over a specific area of research or marks entry into a new research area. • Successful Tri-Council grant <p>Evidence of significant scholarship and research will be apparent in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • critical, theoretical, instructional or scholarly writing in

	<p>published books or monographs, chapters in books, articles published in refereed and other appropriate journals, exhibition catalogues, an edited collection of essays.</p> <p>Evidence of significant scholarship and research will also be apparent in a combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited lectures and conference presentations, conference and exhibit organization, full paper conference proceedings, reviews of books and exhibits A successful Non-Tri-council research grants over \$20,000.² • In respect of progressive development: 2 or more peer reviewed scholarly articles or peer reviewed book chapters at the Assistant level, 3 or more at the Associate level and above; 2 or more guest editorships of peer reviewed journal special editions; 2 or more invited keynote or conference presentations at the Assistant level, 3 or more at the Associate level and above (invited = formal invitation with all expenses paid)
<p>Service to Department, Division, College & University</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University service award (e.g. Outreach and Public Service Award, J. W. George Ivany Internationalization Award) <p>Combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two or more regular administrative offices in the Department (Undergraduate Chair, Graduate Chair, First Year Coordinator, NSR Editor, Webmaster) • Active committee membership on two or more Divisional, College &/or University permanent committees at the Assistant level, three or more at the Associate level and above • Active membership on five or more short term working groups at the Assistant level, eight or more at the Associate level
<p>Community & Professional Service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official service award (e.g. Saskatchewan Order of Merit, Community Service Awards) <p>Combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research & consulting reports, workshops, conference presentations • publications in community newsletters and other non-peer reviewed publications reflecting expertise • Active participation/membership in two or more community-based, regional, national, &/or international committee short-term &/or goal specific committees membership (planning conferences, cultural events, policy development, grant agencies, & other short-term working

	<p>groups) at the level of Assistant and three or more at the level of Associate or higher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation & membership in two or more permanent community-based, regional, national &/or international committees at the Assistant level, three or more at the Associate level and higher • Active executive membership in two or more permanent professional or community-based associations at the Assistant level, three or more at the Associate level or higher
--	---

As per the Collective Agreement, the onus is on the faculty to provide appropriate supporting evidence to accompany their application for merit or special salary increases.

¹ The first order of the NS Salary Review Committee is to define and establish measurable criteria for the following: “Community Service,” “Professional Service” and “Exceptional Achievement” in teaching.

² Non-Tri-Council grants include Canada Heritage, Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation and other governmental and private/industry research grants.



DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

I. SALARY COMMITTEE. In accordance with Article 17.3.1 of the Collective Agreement, the Department of Philosophy shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department.

II. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

The Department of Philosophy follows section 17.2 of the Collective Agreement.

Meritorious performance requires excellence in a category, or in more than one category when considered together. Establishing excellence requires clear evidence of the performance of assigned duties at a level beyond the standard expected for a faculty member given their rank, or performance of meritorious duties beyond those assigned.

Teaching

Performance of assigned teaching duties at a satisfactory level will not be grounds for the award of or recommendation for a special increase. The standard teaching load is 12 cus of undergraduate teaching each year plus 3 cus of graduate teaching at least every second year. Faculty teaching loads will be equitable from year to year in terms of number of preps, new preps, and numbers of students taught. Fair participation in graduate supervision and committee work is expected. Faculty at higher ranks are expected to make greater contributions to curricular development and the graduate teaching, supervision and committee work of the Department.

Awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in teaching will be made on the basis of the cv update, a statement of teaching activities, and evidence of excellence in the performance of teaching duties drawn from the following sources: peer evaluations, signed letters from undergraduate and graduate students, statistically validated student evaluations, teaching awards, extraordinary overload, additional or exemplary non-standard teaching contributions (e.g. curriculum or program development), graduate student completions, supervision, advising, or performance of external examiner role.

*See Department of Philosophy Guidelines for policies on the assignment of duties. Faculty will be assigned duties such that they have the opportunity to establish excellence in any applicable category.

Research and Scholarly Work

The expected level of research and scholarly activity is a function of a faculty member's rank.

Lecturers and Assistant Professors are expected to be developing and establishing their research program. At this level they should be presenting research results to colleagues locally, and at regional and national conferences. The publication of peer-reviewed journal articles, books, edited volumes, or book chapters in reputable venues at this rank will make a strong case for merit. Receipt as a principal investigator of a major research grant will significantly strengthen a case for merit. Publication of book reviews, articles in non-peer-reviewed venues, or presentations at conferences and scholarly meetings will strengthen a case for merit.

Associate Professors are expected to have an established research program, and should be presenting research results to colleagues locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. Regular publication in the form of peer-reviewed articles, books, or edited volumes is expected. Publication or acceptance of a peer-reviewed book or edited volume, or of multiple peer-reviewed articles or book chapters in reputable venues will make a strong case for merit. Receipt as a principal investigator of a major research grant will significantly strengthen a case for merit. Publication of book reviews, articles in non-peer-reviewed venues, or presentations at conferences and scholarly meetings will strengthen a case for merit.

Professors are expected to have an established research program, and should be presenting their research results to colleagues locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. Regular publication of research results in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles, books, or edited volumes is expected. The publication or acceptance of a peer-reviewed book, edited volume, or more than two peer-reviewed journal articles in reputable venues will make a strong case for merit. Receipt as a principal investigator of a major research grant will significantly strengthen a case for merit. Publication of book reviews, articles in non-peer-reviewed venues, or presentations at conferences and scholarly meetings will strengthen a case for merit.

Artistic work is not normally an applicable category in the Department of Philosophy.

In all cases, awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in research and scholarly activity will be made on the basis of the cv update, evidence of publication or acceptance for publication of a finished manuscript (in the form of a letter), and referee reports on accepted work or grants applications. Items considered (in rough order of importance) include peer-reviewed books, journal articles, edited books, book chapters, book reviews, peer-reviewed and invited conference presentations, conference commentaries, and public lectures. Non-peer-reviewed publications and presentations will strengthen a case for merit.

Practice of Professional Skills

Practice of Professional Skills is not an applicable category in the Department of Philosophy

Extra University Work and Public Service

Awards of and recommendations for special increases for excellence in extra university work and public service will be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the cv update, letters from appropriate bodies or parties, and substantive evidence of excellence in contributions to professional bodies, editorial boards, ethics boards, publishers, other universities, conference and workshop organization, media engagement, or other outreach and engagement activities.

Awards of and recommendations for special increases in this category will only be made if (i) The work is outside of the assigned duties of the employee, as specified in the employee's letter of appointment or by past practice, and (ii) The work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee.

Administrative Work

Excellence in administrative performance is judged relative to a faculty member's rank. Probationary faculty and Assistant Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable administrative contribution to the Department. Term and probationary faculty shall not normally be expected to take on any major Departmental administrative role. Associate Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable contribution to the administration of the Department and College or University. Professors are expected to make a fair and reasonable administrative contribution to the Department, College and University.

Faculty members are expected to carry their share of the administrative work of the Department; performance of assigned administrative duties at a satisfactory level will not be grounds for the award of or recommendation for a special increase.

Major administrative roles in the Department include Head, Graduate Chair, Undergraduate Director, and Curriculum coordinator. Medium administrative roles include membership on the Salary committee, the Undergraduate curriculum and advising committee, or the Graduate Program committee, coordinating teaching evaluations, coordinating Philosophy in the Community, Philosophy Web editor and developer, coordinating the Philosophy Colloquium and Visiting Speaker. All regular faculty members take on either a major administrative role or a combination of medium roles in addition to several other more minor duties such as library liaison and equity officer.

Awards and recommendations for special increases for excellence in administrative work will be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the cv update, letters from Department Heads, Deans or Committee Chairs, and substantive evidence of excellence in the contributions to the administrative work of, first, the Department, and, second, the College or University. Aspects to be evaluated include quality and impact of the faculty member's contribution and the amount of time and/or effort involved.

Administrative Service as a Department Head or Assistant Dean

Standards for awards of and recommendations for special increases in this category are set by the College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans. A Department Head or Assistant Dean may be awarded a special increase for excellence in serving the Department or College.

Improvement in Academic Qualifications

People who have improved their academic qualifications by completing a degree, course of study, or similar program may be considered for a special increase.

Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

A faculty member who receives an offer of employment from a comparable institution may be

considered for a special increase. Such an offer shall be in writing.

Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties

A special increase may be awarded to a faculty member when excellence in performance of assigned duties has been demonstrated through the combination of two or more categories listed above. Awards of and recommendations for special increases shall be made on the basis of evidence as described in the above categories.

Improvement and Development

Award of and recommendation for a special increase may in exceptional circumstances be made to a faculty member who demonstrates significant improvement in the category of teaching, research or administration.

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS AND ENGINEERING PHYSICS (P&EP)**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES**

(March 2011)

Salary Review Procedures

The P&EP is committed to encourage and recognize the excellence and outstanding contributions of its faculty in all three areas of activity, viz., teaching, research and administration. The P&EP salary committee (The committee) will attempt to award special increases roughly in proportions of 3:6:1 for teaching, research and administrative works in recognition of the contributions of the faculty to sustain a vibrant teaching and research atmosphere engaging the students and faculty.

1. The committee will comprise of a minimum of four eligible faculty members and the Head. The Head is the chair of the committee.
2. The P&EP proposes to retire two members of the committee every year to maintain some continuity and to spread the experience and responsibility among the faculty
3. The committee proposes the standards and brings them to the department for their endorsement before they are communicated to the College Review Committee (CRC). The version as approved by the CRC will be communicated to all employees (faculty) in the department

The Committee Procedures:

- i) The committee enforces September 1 as the deadline for faculty to submit their CV updates to the Head's secretary. Late submissions, if any, will automatically disqualify for special increase considerations.
- ii) The CV updates will be appended with a one-page written statement of significant achievements during the evaluation period to be taken into account for special increase considerations. Due date September 1.
- iii) The committee will have a meeting soon after September 1.
- iv) At the first meeting, the committee will discuss general guidelines, procedures etc. of the salary recommendations. This will help the committee to bring the new members up to speed.
- v) The general merit criteria are articulated in the two attached documents:

P&EPSpecialSalaryIncrease.pdf and P&EP_standards.pdf (approved by the College Review Committee on April 7, 2003 and reviewed by the P&EP department in March 2011). These documents are intended to serve as guide to the committee.

- vi) In subsequent meetings, the committee will openly discuss each of the department members highlighting their accomplishments and quantizing only things that are quantifiable. These include: number of graduate students supervised, number of classes taught (graduate and undergraduate), number of committees served on with an indicator of effort required, etc....
- vii) After the first round of discussions, each committee member submits, by email to the Head, a preliminary ranking of each Department member. The Head consolidates this and makes the results available to the committee.
- viii) If necessary, the committee will meet to let the members who disagree with the consolidated results to voice their opinions. After a final meeting the committee submits, also by email to the Head, their final rankings. The Head consolidates these results again and calls another meeting to carry out the voting in compliance of the CA.
- ix) The Head (with the help of the committee) writes a freely available document justifying the contributions that were considered significant for those faculty who were awarded Departmental merit increases and for those faculty who were recommended for merit increase at upper level committees.
- x) The Head will communicate the results of these deliberations and voting to the CRC.

College of Arts and Science
Department of Physics and Engineering Physics
Criteria and Standards for Special Salary Increase

Approved by the Department of Physics & Engineering Physics – October 24, 2006
Revised by the Department of Physics & Engineering Physics – March 2011

This document supersedes section 6 (Criteria for Special Salary Increase) of the department's "Criteria and Standards" document, which was approved by the Department on December 7, 2000 and by the College Review Committee on April 10, 2003.

1. Preamble

Special Salary Increases or Merit Increases are recommended for faculty members whose service in a year, or cumulatively for a number of years, is of a standard above what is normally to be expected for a person in that rank.

The normal expectation in a rank is at the Department's "Meets the Standard" level for, promotion to that rank for the case of an Associate Professor or Professor, or attainment of Tenure for the case of an Assistant Professor. Please see the Department's "Criteria and Standards" for these standards; indeed, this "Criteria and Standards for Special Salary Increase" document is better read in conjunction with the "Criteria and Standards" document. In places below, for the reader's convenience, extracts from the "Criteria and Standards" document are included.

The standards for Canada Research Chairs also involve activities in the 3 areas below. There are different and lesser expectations for quantities of teaching, but strong activity and excellence in both Research and Administration are expected.

Consistently excellent performance in one or more areas for an accumulated period is highly regarded by the Department.

2. Teaching

From Section 1.2 of the Department's "Criteria and Standards": "Satisfactory performance in teaching will be established if the Department obtains information that affirms that:

- The candidate's lectures are well prepared and delivered at an appropriate level,
- The lecture material follows the approved course outline and calendar description,
- The candidate is available to students for questions and discussion, and
- The examinations and/or other assessments are fair and equitable."

Beyond that, evidence that may be considered for merit in teaching includes (but is not limited to):

1. Consistently high ranking in Department student teaching evaluations.
2. Receipt of a Department Teacher of the Year Award.
3. Receipt of a USSU, College, or University teaching award.
4. Receipt of a National teaching award.
5. Publication of papers on teaching pedagogy.
6. Publication of a text book.
7. Creation of innovative course materials or delivery methods.
8. Significant activity in graduate student supervision, teaching and advisory committees.

3. Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work

The General Criteria listed in Section 1.4 of the Department's "Criteria and Standards" are repeated here: "Performance in research will be judged with reference to the candidate's activities in the following areas:

- Refereed publications in recognized journals.
- Research support in the form of grants or contracts.
- Presentation of papers at conferences, in particular invited papers.
- Invited seminars at other institutions.
- Participation with national and/or international committees or associations involved with the promotion or practice of research in the candidate's field of specialization.
- Publication of internal reports that are solicited by external researchers.
- Book publication.
- Letters from external referees where required."

In addition there are differences in expectations according to rank, and these, as outlined in the preamble (Section 1 in this document), define the normal expectation at each rank.

For an Assistant Professor: "Candidates must have a serious commitment to research and provide evidence that their research is sufficiently sound. Such evidence is provided by the information outlined in section 1.4 of the Department's "Criteria and Standards" but should at least include publications of research work in recognized refereed journals and evidence of research support."

For an Associate Professor: "Evidence of an on-going active research program is required. This is judged by the information outlined in section 1.4 of the Department's "Criteria and Standards." The evidence should show that the candidate has a mature research program that will be maintained into the future."

For a Professor: "A candidate must have a record demonstrating active, mature, independent research and scholarly activity, which has contributed substantially to the development of the candidate's field. The quality and innovative nature of this work will be considered, not just quantity of publications."

Some additional comments are now provided.

- The publication of research in internationally recognized refereed journals is one of the main criteria used in the evaluation of a faculty member's performance in research. Factors such as the length of the article, the journal in which it is published, and citations are all points that may be considered. A list of recognized physics journals (that is not exhaustive) is appended to the Department's "Criteria and Standards" document. It should not be misconstrued that a short paper is necessarily unimportant. For example a short paper in Physical Review Letters (which has a 4 page limit), Nature or Science may be extremely important because of the nature of the journal. In the case of multi-authors of a paper, the candidate is asked to signify the contribution made by the candidate.
- The numbers of papers published each year by a faculty member who is "meeting the standard" at a particular rank, vary widely within the Department. This is due to the multi-disciplinary nature of the research, and whether the paper is dominated by theoretical or observational approaches. The candidate, and/or the Head, will comment on this aspect of any recommendation to the College Review Committee.
- Significant contributions, above normal expectations, to the training of "highly qualified personnel" as defined by NSERC, particularly post-doctoral fellows, graduate students and

- undergraduate students that are involved in research, is valued highly by the Department.
- Refereeing of articles for well-recognized journals is taken as an indication of the individual's stature in the field, although not all refereeing requests are accepted by Professors, due to workload.
 - The publication of a book, whether at an undergraduate, graduate or specialized level is an important accomplishment. The amount of effort going into such a project is certainly equivalent to the publication of a number of papers. Few physicists publish books; this is because of the competitiveness within the research communities. E.g. the need to satisfy granting agencies regarding the support of programs and students, and the need to quickly communicate new ideas in the literature. Hence the publication of a book in addition to research papers is especially meritorious.
 - When a faculty member is asked to serve on the executive of, or to chair, a nationally or internationally recognized institution or committee, it is because the member has become recognized as a scientist of stature in their field.
 - Significant development of the research area in which the professor is involved, nationally or internationally, and the associated acquisition of grants or contracts in this area, is also highly valued in the department. (Some of such activity could also be considered under scientific administration, which is discussed in the next section.)

4. Administration (Academic and Scientific)

Faculty members are expected to serve on Departmental committees as well as College and University committees. The amount of work entailed in serving on a committee varies considerably, and generally increases with rank. Therefore, it will be important for the candidate to signify the workload of the committee and to indicate the level of his/her contribution to the committee.

The level of Administration at all levels, and including academic and scientific, continues to increase. It is vital that this work be accomplished at the highest standard, for both the Department and for the University. The Department therefore values this work very highly.

- It is recognized that chairing a Department committee can in some cases be a time consuming and challenging task. It is also recognized that the chairs of the three major standing committees in the Department, the Undergraduate Affairs Committee, the Graduate Affairs Committee and Engineering Physics Committee, each have special challenges.
- In addition the Department recognizes the additional administrative load associated with the following two positions: The Chairman of the Institute of Space and Atmospheric Studies (ISAS); Director, Plasma Physics Laboratory (PPL). As well, the chairing or co-chairing of other important local, national and international committees and boards also take a significant amount of time and effort.
- Recognition of the substantial load associated with the positions mentioned in the above paragraphs may be partially accounted for in the assignment of duties, but that is often not enough to offset the extra work involved, especially in certain critical years (e.g. major review or grant application years).
- Significant efforts in the initiation, organization and execution of outreach and public service events and activities are highly valued by the Department. These can be very time consuming and they provide very significant benefits to the Department and the University.

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS AND ENGINEERING PHYSICS
CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

1. General Criteria and Evaluation Methods

The following are the general departmental criteria and evaluation methods that are used for evaluating candidates in each of the recognized categories appropriate in this department. The department's expectations of the candidate in each category are outlined in: Section 2 "Renewal of Probation", Section 3 "Tenure at the Assistant Professor Level", Section 4 "Promotion to Associate Professor or Tenure at the Associate Professor Level", Section 5 "Promotion to Full Professor or Tenure at the Full Professor Level", and Section 6 "Criteria for Special Salary Increase".

1.1. Academic Credentials

The normal academic requirements for an appointment in the Department of Physics and Engineering Physics are a Ph.D. (or equivalent) in physics or closely related field from a recognized university in addition to some experience in research and (possibly) teaching. Appointments to tenure-track positions are made at the Assistant Professor level or higher. This condition would normally be met at appointment.

Some positions in the Department of Physics and Engineering Physics stipulate at the time of hiring that the candidate be eligible for accreditation as a Professional Engineer. For such positions the candidate must show significant progress towards achieving P. Eng. Accreditation at the time of their tenure decision.

1.2. Teaching Ability and Performance

Satisfactory performance in teaching will be established if the Department obtains information that affirms that:

- the candidate's lectures are well prepared and delivered at an appropriate level,
- the lecture material follows the approved course outline and calendar description,
- the candidate is available to students for questions and discussion, and
- the examinations and/or other assessments are fair and equitable.

Such information may be provided through the various channels outlined below.

- Students complete a standard course/professor evaluation. This includes a College approved questionnaire and the submission of signed comments from the students. The questionnaire results, including relative ranking within the department, and the student comments (without the students names) are given to the instructor.
- As part of peer teaching evaluation, the candidate's classroom performance will be observed on several occasions by one or two senior professors (sometimes tenure candidates may be asked to team-teach a class with a senior professor for the purpose of evaluation and teaching experience). A peer evaluation report will consist of classroom visitations and review of course contents and teaching dossier.
- Candidates for tenure are required to present a seminar to Faculty and/or to give a public lecture. The Department Head solicits opinions from senior faculty concerning the candidate's performance.
- The receipt of a teaching award will also be taken as an indicator of teaching excellence.
- Spot checks on course content may occasionally be made by the Department Head.
- When appropriate, student complaints made to the Department Head, directly or indirectly through the Liaison Committee, will be discussed with the professor in charge of the class. A follow-up will be made in succeeding years to determine if adjustments have been made.
- Recognition will be given to work dedicated to teaching, such as publications or conference presentations to the candidate on physics teaching pedagogy.

1.3. Knowledge of Discipline and Field of Specialization

Candidates will be rated in this category with the same criteria as used for category 4, "Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work" since it is felt that these categories are not separable for Physics and Engineering Physics.

1.4. Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work

Performance in research will be judged with reference to the candidate's activities in the following areas:

- Refereed publications in recognized journals.
- Research support in the form of grants or contracts.
- Presentation of papers at conferences, in particular invited papers.
- Invited seminars at other institutions.

- Participation with national and/or international committees or associations involved with the promotion or practice of research in the candidate's field of specialization.
- Publication of internal reports that are solicited by external researchers.
- Book publication.

A few words of further explanation on some of the above areas are offered in the following paragraphs.

The publication of research in internationally recognized refereed journals is one of the main criteria used in evaluating a faculty member's performance in research. Factors such as the scope and impact of the article, and the journal in which it is published will be considered. Candidates may also use citation information to support their case.

Some physics journals that are internationally recognized and pertinent to research activities in the Department are listed in the Appendix. Acceptance of a research paper for publication in any of these journals and other recognized journals with comparable quality will be considered as a noteworthy contribution to the subject. Although publication is of prime importance, the Department shall not overlook the stimulation and leadership that a faculty member may provide in fostering competent and noteworthy on-going research. This may be vital to the securing of research grants and attracting researchers and students from other countries and institutions.

In the case of multiple-authors of a paper, the candidate will be asked to signify his/her contribution to the work. It is recognized that physics research, whether experimental or theoretical, is often a team effort. Publications resulting from such team-efforts naturally bear the names of all members of the team.

Refereeing and editorship: Articles sent from well-recognized journals to a faculty member for refereeing will be taken as recognition of the individual's stature. Invitations to serve as an external referee for a Ph.D. thesis and faculty promotion attests to the candidate's recognition in their field. Serving as editor or on editorial board of a major physics journal also reflects the person's reputation in the field.

Publication of a book whether at undergraduate, graduate or specialized level is an important accomplishment. The amount of effort going into such a project is certainly equivalent to the publication of a number of papers.

When a faculty member is asked to serve on an executive board of a nationally or internationally recognized institution, it is because the member has become recognized as a scientist of some stature in his/her field. To serve on an executive committee of major physics or engineering associations, or to be convener of a major international symposium, all reflect the collegial respect of the individual and count as meritorious service beyond that expected of a faculty member. The same holds true for faculty serving on Grant Selection Committees of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and other national and international granting agencies.

Research awards from, and election to fellows in, professional societies constitute peer recognition of research accomplishments.

1.5. Administration

Faculty members are expected to serve on departmental committees as well as college and council committees. An attempt will be made to assess the amount of work entailed in serving on a committee although this is not always easy. It will not be assumed automatically that serving on a council or college committee is more important than serving on a departmental committee, as the latter may be the more onerous.

Considerable importance will be attached to positions that concern the administration of research groups. Currently, in the Department of Physics and Engineering Physics, there are two such positions:

Chair, Institute of Space and Atmospheric Studies (ISAS)
Director, Plasma Physics Laboratory (PPL)

It is recognized that faculty who fill these positions carry a substantial load and although efforts are made to reduce the teaching loads, it is never enough to offset the extra work involved.

1.6. Public service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies

Recognition will be given for outreach activities that publicize the understanding of physics, engineering physics and science in general to a wider audience such as the general public and those in the school system.

Recognition will also be given to faculty who serve for nationally and internationally recognized institutions as discussed in section 1.4 above.

2. Renewal of Probation

The criteria for "Tenure at the Assistant Professor Level" (Section 3), "Tenure at the Associate Professor Level" (Section 4), or "Tenure at the Full Professor Level" (section 5) are to be used here, except that the term "meeting the standard" is to be interpreted as "showing appropriate progress towards meeting the standard by the time a tenure decision is to be made" and that evaluation by external referees is not required.

3. Tenure at the Assistant Professor Level

3.1. Teaching

Our expectations are for a satisfactory performance in teaching as determined by the methods outlined in Section 1.2 above. This must include at least two peer evaluations of classes taught

by the candidate. The candidate is encouraged to assemble a teaching dossier of information that would support the case that he/she is performing satisfactorily in the classroom.

3.2. Research & Scholarly Work

Candidates for tenure must have a serious commitment to research and provide evidence that their research is sufficiently sound. Such evidence is provided by the information outlined in section 1.4 but should at least include publications of research work in recognized refereed journals and evidence of research support. The quality of research will be assessed by at least three professors at arm's length drawn from comparable Institutions. (One of the three referees may be an associate professor.)

3.3. Administration

Service in departmental, college or council committees is not required; it is generally expected that tenure candidates at the assistant professor level will devote most of their efforts to teaching and research. Candidates are expected to be involved in departmental matters through attendance and participation in departmental meetings and committee meetings.

4. Promotion to Associate Professor or Tenure at the Associate Professor Level

4.1. Teaching

The standard of teaching performance outlined under "Tenure at the Assistant Professor Level" will be applied in the present instance. In addition, an active and effective role in graduate student supervision will attest to that member's abilities in training and motivating students.

4.2. Research & Scholarly Work

Evidence of an on-going active research program is required. This is judged by the information outlined in section 1.4. The evidence should show that the candidate has a mature research program that will be maintained into the future. For tenure consideration at the Associate Professor level, letters from three external referees at arm's length, who hold full professorship at other comparable institutions, will also be required.

4.3. Administration

It is expected that the candidate will have assumed an increased responsibility in departmental and university affairs through service on committees. Lack of strong committee participation would not hold back promotion provided the research and/or teaching categories are of superior quality.

5. Promotion to Full Professor or Tenure at the Full Professor Level

5.1. Teaching

In addition to the criteria listed under "Promotion to Associate Professor", it is desirable that the

candidate will have served on the Departmental committees associated with program content and development and, thus, to have obtained an overall view of the department's course structure. Recognition will be given to work dedicated to teaching, such as the publishing of physics textbooks and monographs, the creation of internet courses and materials, or the writing of papers in refereed journals concerned with physics pedagogy.

5.2. Research & Scholarly Work

A candidate must have a record demonstrating active, mature, independent research and scholarly activity, which has contributed substantially to the development of the candidate's field. The quality and innovative nature of this work will be considered, not just quantity of publications. The publication of papers in recognized journals, or the publication of books in specialized areas of physics are all regarded as clear evidence that the candidate has met the requirement. The quality of research will be assessed by three external referees at arm's length who hold full professorship at other comparable institutions.

Other criteria that may be used to assess the candidate's research are detailed in section 1.4.

5.3. Administration

Willingness to participate effectively in departmental committees is expected. The candidate should also be willing to perform committee work at the college and university levels and to engage in public service activity if called upon to do so. Public service might include the holding of executive positions in professional societies, serving on Royal Commissions, and editorships. An outstanding contribution in administration or public service (for example, authorship of a commissioned report) might be judged as a scholarly contribution.

6. Criteria for Special Salary Increase

Special salary increases or merit increases will be recommended for faculty members whose service in a year, or cumulatively for a number of years, is of a standard above what is normally expected for a person in that rank. What is normally expected has already been indicated under the criteria for "Promotion to Associate Professor" and for "Promotion to Full Professor". It is recognized that more is expected of a professor than of an associate professor and that this extra burden usually arises from extra administrative duties.

In evaluating a faculty member for merit increase, it is recognized that more is expected of a professor than an associate professor, and more of an associate professor than of an assistant professor. Also, consistently excellent performance in one or more areas for an "accumulated period" is highly regarded in the department.

The Department Head will attempt (with help from colleagues) to judge the merit of each faculty member in light of all the factors listed above and make recommendations to the College Review Committee after serious and extended deliberations.

6.1. Teaching

The Department Head will be involved either directly or indirectly with all facets of teaching, and is given the responsibility (with selected colleagues) of judging a candidate's teaching merit. Any of the various sources of information outlined in section 1.2 may be used to make the candidate's case. The faculty member is encouraged to assemble a teaching dossier of information that would support their case for merit based on teaching.

6.2. Research and Scholarly Work

The judgment on whether a faculty member's research contribution is of a superior nature for the time period under review will be made by considering the criteria detailed in section 1.4.

6.3. Administration

Administrative work beyond that which is appropriate for a faculty member at their level will be required for consideration for a special merit increase.

Approved by the Department on December 7, 2000

Appendix

Physics Journals

General Physics Journals

Annals of Physics	Physics Essays
Applied Physics Letters	Physics Letters A
Canadian Journal of Physics	Physics Report
Europhysics Letters	Progress in Theoretical Physics
Journal of Applied Physics	Review of Scientific Instruments
Journal of Physics A, D	Reviews of Modern Physics
Nature	Science
Physical Review Letters	

Astronomy, Astrophysics, and Gravity

Astronomy and Astrophysics	Monthly Notices of Royal Astronomical Society
Astrophysical Journal	
Classical and Quantum Gravity	Astroparticle Physics
General Relativity and Gravitation	

Nuclear and Particle Physics

European Physical Journal A, C, D	Nuclear Instruments and Methods A
International Journal of Modern Physics A, D	Nuclear Physics A
Journal of High Energy Physics	Nuclear Physics B
Journal of Physics G	Physical Review C and D
Modern Physics Letters A	Physics Letters B
	Progress in Nuclear Physics

Plasma Physics

IEEE Trans. Plasma Science	Physical Review E
Journal of Plasma and Fusion Research	Physics of Plasmas
Journal of Plasma Physics	Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion
Nuclear Fusion	Plasma Sources Science and Technology

Condensed Matter Physics

Applied Physics A	Journal of Polymer Science
Applied Surface Science	Journal of Vacuum Science and Technology A & B
European Physical Journal B	Nuclear Instruments and Methods B
Journal of Chemistry and Physics of Solids	PhysChemComm
Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena	Physica C: Superconductivity
Journal of Low Temperature Physics	Physical Review B
Journal of Materials Chemistry	Solid State Communications
Journal of Materials Science	Surface Science
Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter	Surface Science Reports
	Thin Solid Films

Space, Atmospheric and Planetary Physics

Advances in Space Research	Journal of Atmospheric Science
Annales Geophysicae	Journal of Geophysical Research
Applied Optics	Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer
Geomagnetism and Aeronomy	Planetary and Space Science
Geophysical Research Letters	Radio Science
Icarus	Solar Physics
Journal of Atmospheric and Solar Terrestrial Physics	Space Science Reviews

Physics Teaching

American Journal of Physics

Physics Teacher

The above is not an exhaustive list, but all have world-wide recognition in their respective physics communities.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL STUDIES

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

1. Salary Review Committee (SRC)

The SRC will consist of a minimum of three tenured and probationary members of the Department and the Department Head, as Chair.

Conflict of Interest: SRC members will be excused from deliberations when in a conflict of interest. They are expected to disclose any potential conflict of interest to the committee, and the committee has the right to exclude members from the deliberations of specific cases due to perceived conflict of interest. Conflict of interest includes, but may not be limited to, deliberation of the SRC member's own case or that of a family member and deliberation of a faculty member's case with whom the SRC member has an active collaboration. When individuals are excused from SRC deliberations due to conflict of interest, the remaining SRC members will conduct the deliberations relevant to the case at hand.

2. Principles for the Award of Special Increases

The following principles will guide the deliberations, procedures and decisions of the SRC.

1. The award of a special increase is to recognize excellence in one or more of the categories defined by the *Collective Agreement*.

2. The award of a special increase requires that evidence be presented to substantiate the quality of the faculty member's performance. Faculty members are expected to take an active role in gathering such information; they must notify the Head by the end of the review period (June 30) if they wish the Head to assist in this task.

3. When considering recommendations for special increases, the relative weighting of the contribution in the three categories shall take into account their relative weighting in a faculty member's assignment of duties.

3. SRC Procedures for Recommending Special Increases

The following procedures shall be followed by the SRC:

Distribution of Information: The Head will circulate the CV update information and any additional supporting material provided by each eligible faculty member to the SRC. In cases where a faculty member did not receive merit in the previous year(s), the Head will also circulate the information from

the previous year(s) up to a maximum of three years total, facilitating the consideration of a cumulative case. A faculty member can initiate a cumulative case encompassing more years by request.

Recommendation Procedure: Each member of the SRC will independently evaluate all eligible faculty (with the exception of cases in which there is a conflict of interest) based on the information provided, and will forward his/her recommendations to the other committee members. The Head will call for a meeting of the SRC to discuss the recommendations.

If there is an agreement within the SRC regarding the recommendations, then this will form the basis for the final determination regarding the awarding and recommendation of special increases. If there is disagreement regarding the recommendations, the SRC will try to reach consensus through further deliberation and by seeking further information and/or clarification from those whose cases are at issue.

In the event that consensus cannot be reached on all cases following these measures, the original recommendations for the disputed cases will form the basis for the final determination regarding the awarding and recommendation of special increases.

Reporting Procedure: The *Collective Agreement* states that the Head shall “inform employees in the department of the Committee’s rankings, decisions for the award of Special Increases and recommendations to the College Review Committee, as well as the Committee’s reasons for such awards and recommendations”.

4. Criteria for Salary Increases

The following criteria shall be used by the SRC in salary review and in deciding awards of special increases;

1. Career Development Increases

Career development increases are granted in accordance with the terms of the *Collective Agreement* in recognition of added experience, ability and scope of responsibilities.

2. Special Salary Increases

In recognition of performance that is superior to that normally expected at each rank, the Department may recommend full or partial special salary increases. The general procedures and criteria for the recommendation of special salary increases are specified in the *Collective Agreement*. The table below is intended to provide guidance as to the levels of performance in selected categories that would be considered superior in the Department of Political Studies. Consideration for a special salary increase requires well-documented records of a faculty member’s activities during the period under review covering the entire scope of the faculty member’s activities in all categories.

Special salary increases may also be recommended in cases where the performance of a faculty member in a number of categories is particularly strong, and the overall performance of the faculty member is considered to be superior. Superior cumulative performance over a number of years may also be considered grounds for the recommendation of a special salary increase, provided the cumulative performance exceeds the standards expected for the period under consideration.

Table

Categories Eligible for Consideration	Possible Indicators
<p style="text-align: center;">Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior performance in the instruction of classes, both at the graduate and undergraduate level • Superior* performance in the supervision of student research, both at the graduate and undergraduate level • Innovative** classroom instruction • Curriculum/new course development or enhancement • Development of new teaching materials (e.g., textbooks; chapters in edited textbooks; laboratory manuals) • Participation in collaborative efforts to advance teaching practice • Sustained record of superior classroom teaching over a period of several years <p>*"Superior" denotes a performance that markedly exceeds the standards of supervision that are required by the College of Graduate Studies and Research.</p> <p>**"Innovative" denotes classroom teaching that, as the University's <i>Teaching and Learning Foundational Document</i> says, "captures the imagination of faculty and students, generates excitement, and taps into the realities and needs of external communities and their needs."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receipt of teaching awards (e.g., College awards; USSU awards) • Nomination for teaching awards (e.g., University, College awards; USSU awards) • Evidence of superior student supervision • Evidence of innovative classroom instruction • Publication of textbooks • Publication of chapter(s) in edited textbooks • Contributions of teaching materials to online pedagogical communities • Active participation in international, national, provincial, University or College teaching networks and communities • Peer teaching evaluations • Student evaluations (SEEQ as the department and university standard; or equivalent) • Course materials (syllabi, power-points, handouts, etc.) • Letters of support from peers and students

Research and Scholarly Work

- Published research, including:
 - Books or Monographs
 - Peer Reviewed Articles
 - Edited Books
 - Book Chapters
 - Technical Reports (including policy papers)
 - Other research publications
- Application for and receipt of research grants
- Conference and invited research presentations
- Collaborative research leadership
- Creation of new research products (e.g., datasets)
- Nominations for and receipt of research awards
- Research publications: faculty should provide full bibliographic information, evidence of peer review (if applicable), and either a copy of the published work or evidence of the work's acceptance for publication.
- Research grant applications and awards (e.g., SSHRC, CFI, CIHI, President's SSHRC, other internal and external research grants); faculty should provide grant name, project name; role (Principal Investigator, Co-investigator, Collaborator), timelines and grant value
- Research presentations (e.g., conference presentations; invited research presentations) to government departments, other universities and other forums); faculty should provide full bibliographic information and evidence of invitation (if applicable)
- Significant participation in a collaborative research initiative; faculty should describe the project and their role in the initiative
- Research products (e.g., datasets): faculty should describe the research product and their role in its creation
- Research awards: evidence of nomination

Extra University Work and Public Service

There are many activities to fall within this category; some more common examples are:

- Development of a public service program
- Significant participation in public service (e.g., board membership, board leadership, governance training; governance renewal)
- Presentations to non-academic audiences (e.g., government, non-profit sector, business groups)
- Media commentary: election analysis (television, radio, internet, press); issue commentary ; publications in the press
- Listing of each relevant activity, including name of organization, type and extent of contribution, estimate of time commitment
- Evidence of the significance of the contribution
- Letters of support from committee chairs/members, community members, etc.

Contribution to Academic or Professional bodies

Some of the more common activities within this category are:

- Serving on the executive of a regional national or international academic body (e.g. PPSA, CPSA)
- Organizing a conference or symposium
- Editing an academic journal
- Peer-reviewing of journal articles, textbooks, and research grant proposals
- Membership on funding agency committees
- Listing of each relevant activity, including name of organization, type and extent of contribution, estimate of time commitment
- Evidence of the significance of the contribution
- Letters of support from colleagues, committee chairs/members, community members, etc.



College of
Arts and Science

Approved by the College Review Committee
- June 30, 2011

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

Salary Review Committee (SRC)

The SRC consists of three departmental nominated faculty members (one of each rank), one member-at-large (selected by the procedures outlined below) and the Head. All probationary and tenured departmental members are eligible for appointment to the SRC with the exception of those who have served on the committee the previous two consecutive years. At the time of soliciting nominations for the SRC, the Head will distribute a listing of SRC membership for the previous two years in order to aid in the nomination process.

Nomination of SRC Members: The Head will distribute ballot forms asking each probationary and tenured departmental member to nominate one eligible faculty member of each rank.

The individual within each rank receiving the highest number of nominations will be appointed to the SRC. In the event that the nominated individual is unable or declines to serve on the SRC, the individual with the second highest number of nominations will be appointed, and so on. In the event of a tie, the Head will consult with each of the individuals receiving the tied vote to negotiate who will be appointed to the SRC.

Appointment of SRC Member-at-Large: The Head will select a fourth member of the SRC by moving alphabetically through the faculty list on a yearly basis to appoint a member-at-large. The Head shall also consider the composition of the SRC that resulted from the nomination process, and if the nomination process resulted in an unbalanced representation across graduate streams, the Head will appoint as member-at-large the first person in the alphabetical listing who will also create a balanced representation across the graduate streams. In the event that the first person selected is unable or declines to serve on the SRC, the Head will approach the next eligible person from the faculty list and so on.

Conflict of Interest: Members will be excused from deliberations when in a conflict of interest. SRC members are expected to disclose any potential conflict of interest to the committee, and the committee has the right to exclude members from the deliberations of specific cases due to perceived conflict of interest. Conflict of interest includes, but may not be limited to, deliberation of the SRC member's own case or that of a family member and deliberation of a faculty member's case with whom the SRC member has an active collaboration. When individuals are

excused from SRC deliberations due to conflict of interest, the remaining SRC members will conduct the deliberations relevant to the case at hand.

SRC Procedures for Awarding, and Recommending Special Increases

Since the process for deciding awards of special increases at both the Department and College level is norm referenced, rather than criterion referenced, excellence deemed as the basis for awards will vary from year to year, just as happens in other collegial processes, such as the awarding of grants by Tri-Councils.

The following *Principles for the Award of Special Increases* will guide the deliberations, procedures and decisions of the SRC:

1. We have a highly productive department and want to maximize the number of people who are recognized for their accomplishments within the categories described below.
2. The award of a special increase is to recognize excellence in one or more of the categories defined by the collective agreement. Moreover, excellence pertains to the quality, and not only the quantity of one's contributions in a particular area.
3. Standards for excellence in performance shall differ by rank for tenured and probationary faculty, such that the standards are higher for tenured than for probationary faculty.
4. The award of a special increase requires that evidence be presented to substantiate the quality of the faculty member's performance. Faculty members are expected to take an active role in gathering such information; they have the responsibility to notify the Head by the end of the review period (June 30) if they wish the Head to assist in gathering the relevant information.
5. In keeping with the spirit of the Collective Agreement, the SRC is directed to consider the contributions made by faculty in all of the relevant categories as well as to cases where performance excels in two or more categories.
6. When ranking contributions, priority will be given to those individuals who provide supporting evidence in each of the categories of teaching, research, and administration/ public service.
7. When considering recommendations for merit, the relative weighting of these three categories shall take into account their relative weighting in a faculty member's Assignment of Duties.

The following procedures shall be followed by the SRC members:

Distribution of Information: The Head will circulate the CV update information and any additional supporting material provided by each eligible faculty member to SRC members (see attached table of common indicators and data sources for each category). In cases where an individual did not receive merit in the previous year(s), the Head will also circulate the

information from the previous year(s) up to a maximum of three years total facilitating the consideration of a cumulative case. A faculty member can initiate a cumulative case encompassing more years by request.

Ranking Procedure: Each SRC member will independently rank all eligible faculty (with the exception of cases in which there is a conflict of interest) based on the information provided. Each SRC member will provide their rankings to the other committee members. The Head will compute the average ranking for each faculty member under deliberation, disseminate this information to all SRC members and call for a meeting to discuss the rankings.

If there is SRC agreement regarding the averaged rankings, then these will form the basis for the final determination regarding the awarding and recommendation of special increases.

If there is disagreement regarding the averaged rankings, the SRC will try to reach consensus through further deliberation and seeking further information and/or clarification from those whose cases are at issue. In the event that consensus cannot be reached on all cases following these measures, the original averaged rankings for the disputed cases will form the basis for the final determination regarding the awarding and recommendation of special increases.

Reporting Procedure: As outlined in the Collective Agreement, the Head shall “inform employees in the department of the Committee’s rankings, decisions for the award of Special Increases and recommendations to the College Review Committee, as well as the Committee’s reasons for such awards and recommendations”.

Allocation Guidelines for the Award of Special Increases

Each year the award of special increases will be distributed among the eligible categories. The distribution across categories may vary from year to year, but the following represents a guideline for allocation to serve as a guide for the deliberations of the SRC:

- 50% for research and scholarly work
- 30% for teaching; performance of full range of duties
- 20% for university work and public service; administrative contributions; improvements in academic qualifications; improvement and development

The SRC will establish an overall ranking of individuals and identify the categories for which the ranking is based (e.g., teaching, research, teaching and administration, etc.). The highest ranked individuals will be identified and recognized through the award of special increase.

The Collective Agreement stipulates that at least 2/3 of the available special increase monies must be in the form of full increments (i.e., in any given year, the number of half-increment awards cannot exceed the number of full increment awards).

Categories Eligible for Consideration	Possible Indicators/Data Sources
<p>Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction of classes (graduate and undergraduate) • Supervision of student research (graduate and undergraduate) • Skills/professional supervision of graduate students • Innovation in instruction and/or application of technology to the classroom • Curriculum development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receipt of teaching awards - University/Collegial/External awards (e.g., Provost or College Awards; 3M Awards) are weighted more heavily • Peer teaching evaluations • Student evaluations (PTEQ or equivalent) • Evidence of innovation in instruction, curriculum development and/or application of technology to the classroom • Course materials (course outlines, grading materials, etc.) • Participation in teaching development including workshops and conferences • Letters of support from peers and students • Letters of support from community partners for skills/professional supervision • Technical reports stemming from skills/professional supervision
<p>Research and Scholarly Work</p> <p>The main evidence for research and scholarly work is through publications which are weighted in priority according to the following list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Books or Monographs • Peer Reviewed Articles • Editor of a Book • Book Chapters • Technical Reports <p>Additional evidence for research and scholarly work includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference Presentations/Posters • Receipt of Research Grants/Contracts 	<p><u>Peer Reviewed Articles, Book Chapters, Books and Monographs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of each publication including the title, authors, date of acceptance or publication, outlet and number of printed pages or manuscript pages. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indication of the faculty member's activities related to the publication (e.g., research idea, design and methodology, data analysis, writing) • Estimate of the faculty member's contribution to the publication (e.g., 50%, 75% responsible) • Evidence relating to the impact/contribution of the publication • Evidence of the quality of the publisher for books/monographs • Evidence of the quality and reputation of the chapter contributors in the case of editing a book • Evidence of peer review <p><u>Non-Refereed/Community-Based/Technical Reports</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of each report including the title, authors, date of submission, outlet and number of printed or manuscript pages. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indication of the faculty member's activities related to the report (e.g., research idea, design and methodology, data analysis, writing) • Estimate of the faculty member's contribution to the report (e.g., 50%,

	<p>75% responsible)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence relating to the impact/contribution of the report (e.g., feedback from agency and/or editor) <p><u>Conference Presentations/Posters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of each conference presentation/poster including the title, authors, date of conference, name of conference, outlet and number of pages if proceedings are published. • Estimate of the faculty member's contribution to the presentation/poster (e.g., 50%, 75% responsible) • Evidence of peer review <p><u>Receipt of Peer Reviewed Grants and/or Non-Remunerated Contracts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of each awarded grant/contract including the title, co-investigators, funding agency, duration and amount • Evidence relating to faculty member's role in the awarded grant/contract (e.g., PI, CoI)
<p>Practice of Professional Skills Consideration of this category will not usually occur as the majority of professional skill activities for Psychology faculty are subsumed under other categories (research, public service).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of activities relevant to practice of professional skills • Peer review of practice of professional skills • Letters of support from community/clients/co-professionals • Evidence of significance of the contributions
<p>University Work and Public Service Many activities fall within this category and those activities must be related to the faculty member's academic qualifications or area of expertise. Common examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal reviews; Grant reviews • Editorial activities • Contributions to Professional Organizations • Contributions to Community Organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of each relevant activity including name of organization, type and extent of contribution, estimate of time commitment • Evidence of the significance of the contribution • Letters of support from colleagues, community members and/or clients

<p>Administrative Contributions</p> <p>Many activities fall within this category. Common examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overseeing a major program revision • Developing new standards and/or guidelines for a committee • Lobbying at the national level • Changing the structure of a committee or organization • Engaging in a long-term planning exercise • Undertaking a lengthy program review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of each relevant activity including name of organization, type and extent of contribution, estimate of time commitment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the significance of the contribution • Letters of support from colleagues, committee chairs/members, community members, etc.
<p>Improvements in Academic Qualifications</p> <p>Activities within this category must enhance the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research, administration and/or practice of professional skills. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing a degree • Obtaining licensure or certification • Significant retraining in specialization <p>Note: The achievement of qualifications required for permanent employment (e.g., clinical registration or completion of PhD) will not be basis for special increase.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing of each improvement in academic qualifications including type and detailed description, date received <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the qualifications (e.g., certificate, degree, license, etc.) • Description of how the upgrade in qualifications enhances the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research, administration and/or practice of professional skills.
<p>Offer of Employment</p> <p>This category is under the purview of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an offer of employment

<p>President's Review Committee</p>	<p>Performance of Full Range of Duties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of high quality performance in assigned duties in two or more categories using the indicators outlined previously within each category
<p>Improvement and Development</p> <p>Note: Based on the principles governing the Departmental Standards for the Award Increases, individuals would be expected to meet a minimum standard of achievement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of significant improvement in any of the categories listed above using the indicators outlined previously within each category



DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION & CULTURE
**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF
SPECIAL INCREASES**

PROCEDURES FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

I. SALARY COMMITTEE.

In accordance with Article 17.3.1 of the Collective Agreement, the members of each department shall annually establish a Department Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The committee shall consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department.

II. CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES OF SALARY

The Department of Religion and Culture will follow section 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. Standards for the award of Special Increases are established in accordance with the provisions of Articles 17.2 and 17.3

Award of Merit Increment is based on recognition of excellence in at least one category or more than one category as identified in the Collective Agreement when considered together. Recognition of excellence would be based on clear evidence of the performance of assigned duties at a level beyond the standard expectation from a faculty member according to their rank, or performance of meritorious duties over and above the assigned duties. In the event of equal meritorious performance between faculty members at different ranks, the priority will be given to the member holding the lower rank.

Research and scholarship is expected of all faculty holding tenure-track or tenured appointments. Merit recognizes excellence in research and scholarly work. Rank should be factored into expectations of achievement in research and scholarly work.

Award of special merit increment would be based on the demonstrated excellence in performance of duties in the following categories.

Teaching

Normal teaching assignment in the Department of Religion and Culture is 15cu for tenured or tenure track appointees. Term Appointees teach more than 15 cu as

negotiated at the time of the appointment to a maximum of 18 cu. Faculty teaching loads will be equitable from year to year in terms of number of preps, new preps, and numbers of students taught. All tenured and tenure track faculty are expected to participate in graduate teaching and supervision as needed. As Faculty move through the ranks there will be expectation of greater contributions to curricular development and graduate teaching, graduate supervision, and committee work of the Department.

Basis for award for special increment for teaching will be evidence of excellence in teaching as demonstrated by the cv update, statement of teaching activities, peer evaluations, signed letters from undergraduate and graduate students, and statistically validated student evaluations as well as evidence including teaching awards, extraordinary overload, additional or exemplary non-standard teaching contributions (e.g. curriculum or program development, study abroad program etc.), graduate student completions, supervision, advising, or performance of external examiner role.

Benchmark and Criteria for evaluation of teaching for merit award:

Each case for merit award recommendation based on teaching would take into consideration the following elements:

1. Teaching Dossier provided by the instructor with detailed class outlines, use of texts, course package, examinations, evaluation methodology, innovation in teaching, new courses and class preparation, information on field trip, lectures and group assignments, participatory learning, and use of learning communities to encourage experiential learning etc.;
2. Peer evaluation of the class/classes taught during the year/years for which a merit award being recommended;
3. Statistically validated student evaluation of teaching questionnaire;
4. Signed letters from undergraduate and graduate students.

The committee shall assess whether the teaching is meritorious based on the evaluation of the above instruments.

Research and Scholarly Work

The Department of Religion and Culture expects all its members to be involved in research and scholarly work commensurate with their rank.

Award of special increment for excellence in research and scholarly activity will be made on the basis of the cv update, evidence of publication or acceptance for publication of a finished manuscript (in the form of a letter). The following items would be considered for demonstration of excellence under this category: peer-reviewed books, peer reviewed articles in academic journals, edited books, book chapters, book reviews, editorship of an academic journal, peer-reviewed and invited conference presentations, non invited conference presentation at national and international academic meetings, and invited academic and public lectures, external funding for research, and any other evidence deemed appropriate by the Committee.

(i) Publication

There is limited expectation of research and scholarly work from faculty appointed at **Lecturer/Instructor rank**. Their primary responsibility is teaching and usually their assigned teaching load is higher than the faculty appointed at any of the professorial rank. While not required, faculty at the Lecturer/Instructor rank are expected to participate in locally organized conferences, workshops, and symposiums etc. as and when opportunity arise. They are encouraged to participate in provincial and national level conferences.

It is expected that **Assistant Professors** would develop a long term research program with clearly identified goals and objectives. In the initial years of their appointment they are expected to present the results of their research to colleagues at the locally organized conferences, workshops, symposiums etc. as well as regional and national conferences. Publication of peer-reviewed journal articles, books, edited volumes, or book chapters in reputable venues at this rank will make a strong case for merit. Publication of book reviews, articles in non-peer-reviewed venues, or presentations at conferences and scholarly meetings will strengthen a case for merit.

Associate Professors are expected to have an established research program, and should be presenting research results to colleagues locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. Regular publication in the form of peer-reviewed articles, books, or edited volumes is expected. Publication or acceptance of a peer-reviewed book or edited volume, or more than one peer-reviewed articles or book chapters in reputable venues will make a strong case for merit. Publication of book reviews, articles in non-peer-reviewed venues, or presentations at conferences and scholarly meetings will strengthen a case for merit.

Professors are expected to have an established research program, and should be presenting their research results to colleagues locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. Regular publication of research results in the form of peer reviewed journal articles, books, or edited volumes are expected. The publication or acceptance of a peer-reviewed book, edited volume, or more than two peer reviewed journal articles, or book chapters in reputable venues will make a strong case for merit. Publication of book reviews, articles in non-peer-reviewed venues, or presentations at conferences and scholarly meetings will strengthen a case for merit.

Benchmark and Criteria for research & scholarship/publications:

The following constitutes the benchmark and criteria for recognition of meritorious performance by faculty at different rank in the area of research & scholarship/publications:

Lecturer/Instructor: Presentation of an invited paper at a national or international conference or an invited lecture at an academic institution of national repute may be considered meritorious for a faculty at this rank. The conference proceedings with the published abstracts would be an important tool for evaluating the case.

Assistant Professor: Any peer reviewed publication or acceptance for publication - at least one journal article, books, edited volumes, edited refereed Journal, or book chapters will be considered meritorious at this rank.

Associate Professor: Any peer reviewed publication or acceptance for publication - more than one journal articles, books, edited volumes, edited refereed Journal, or book chapters will be considered meritorious at this rank.

Professor: Any peer reviewed publication or acceptance for publication - more than two peer reviewed journal articles, books, edited volumes, edited refereed Journal, or book chapters will be considered meritorious at this rank.

(ii) Forthcoming Publications

Unpublished work can be considered for merit increment if there is clear evidence with a supporting document that the manuscript has been accepted in its current form for publication through refereed process.

(iii) Artistic Work

Artistic work is not a category acceptable for award of merit increment in the Department of Religion and Culture.

Practice of Professional Skills

Practice of Professional Skills is not an applicable category in the Department of Religion and Culture.

Extra University Work and Public Service

The Department of Religion and Culture would consider award of special increment based on excellence in extra university work and public service. Such awards would be made on the basis of evidence drawn from the cv update, letters from appropriate bodies or parties, and substantive evidence of excellence in contributions to professional bodies, editorial boards, ethics boards, publishers, other universities, conference and workshop organization, media engagement, or other outreach and engagement activities. Awards of and recommendations for special increases in this category will only be made if (i) The work is outside of the assigned duties of the employee, as specified in the employee's letter of appointment or by past practice, and (ii) The work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee.

Benchmark and Criteria for evaluation:

Any one of the following elements independently or jointly may be considered in determining meritorious character of service rendered : Chairing an academic session and organizing a panel for an academic conference at national or international level, acting as referee for a refereed publication, being elected as Chair of a national or international academic body, being asked to review a case for tenure or promotion at

another institution are some of the examples of the activities which will be considered in determining the meritorious nature of service rendered. The expectation would vary for different rank. Organizing and Chairing a panel for a national conference may be meritorious for an instructor or lecturer but not for a full Professor. Acting as an external reviewer for one case of tenure or promotion at another institution may not be considered meritorious for a colleague at a full Professor rank, but more than one case will definitely add weight to a positive consideration for merit award in this category.

Administrative Work

The Department of Religion and Culture expects all its members to participate in the Department's administrative needs and committee work commensurate with their rank. **Probationary faculty and Assistant Professors** are expected to make a fair and reasonable administrative contribution to the Department. **Associate Professors** are expected to make a fair and reasonable contribution to the administration of the Department and College or University. **Professors** are expected to make a fair and reasonable administrative contribution to the Department, College and University.

Faculty member may be considered for award of a merit increment for excellence in administrative work. Evidence drawn from the following sources will be the basis of such consideration: cv update, letters from Department Heads, Deans or Committee Chairs, and substantive evidence of excellence in the contributions to the administrative work of the Department, the College and/ or University. Aspects to be evaluated include quality and impact of the faculty member's contribution and the amount of time and/or effort involved.

Benchmark and criteria for evaluation;

Chairing a major College or University level Committee, serving for consecutive terms on some major College or University level Committee, Chairing a substantive curriculum review committee at the Departmental level are some of the examples of the criteria to be used in determining meritorious nature of contribution in this category. Here again, the expectation would vary depending on the rank of the colleague.

Administrative Service as a Department Head

Standards for awards of and recommendations for special increases in this category are set by the College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans. . The Department Head may be awarded a special increase for excellence in serving the Department in accordance with the provisions of the articles 17.3.3 and 17.4.3 of the Collective Agreement.

Improvement in Academic Qualifications

People who have improved their academic qualifications by completing a degree, course of study, or similar program may be considered for a special increase.

Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

A faculty member who receives an offer of employment from a comparable institution may be considered for a special increase. Such an offer shall be in writing.

Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties

A special increase may be awarded to a faculty member when excellence in performance of assigned duties has been demonstrated through the combination of two or more categories listed above. Awards of and recommendations for special increases shall be made on the basis of evidence as described in the above categories.

Improvement and Development

Award of and recommendation for a special increase may in exceptional circumstances be made to a faculty member who demonstrates significant improvement in the category of teaching, research or administration.



College of
Arts and Science

Approved by the College Review Committee
- June 30, 2011

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

(April 14, 2011)

General Principles:

The annual Salary Review process will take into consideration the normal expectations for faculty workloads as designed in the Department's document on "Guidelines for Assignment of Duties," as well as criteria outlined in the Department document on Categories of Evaluation and Standards of Performance for Tenure and Promotion.

A faculty member will be recommended for a special salary increase when he or she is evaluated as having met the standard in each of the following categories appropriate for his or her rank and is evaluated to have met the standard at a superior level in one or more of the designated categories. Recommendations and rankings will take into account performance and expectations for the appropriate academic ranks as specified in the Tenure and Promotion standards.

The annual Salary Review will be conducted by a Salary Committee constituted in accordance with the terms of Article 17.3.1, consisting of the Department Head as Chair, and three additional members of faculty selected at an annual meeting of faculty. Committee membership normally rotates so that each eligible faculty member has an opportunity to serve on the committee on repeated intervals. In instances in which new faculty are hired, committee membership may be increased to provide the incoming faculty member with an opportunity to participate and gain insight into the salary review process.

Conflict of Interest: Members will be excused from deliberations when their own cases are being considered, and in situations in which a conflict of interest arises. Salary Review Committee members are expected to disclose any potential conflict of interest to the committee, and the committee has the right to exclude members from the deliberations of specific cases due to perceived conflict of interest. Conflict of interest includes, but may not be limited to, deliberation of the committee member's own case or that of a family member and deliberation of a faculty member's case with whom the SRC member has an active collaboration. When individuals are excused from committee deliberations due to conflict of interest, the remaining SRC members will conduct the deliberations relevant to the case at hand.

The Department Salary Committee will rank order and determine the amount of special increase, if any, in its awards and recommendations to the CRC on the basis of the strongest cases overall, typically in categories 1 and/or 2 combined with 5, but it will also give consideration to documented excellent performance in one or more other categories, including

cumulative performance (normally over a period of time specified by the candidate). It is also acknowledged that the nature of workloads and productivity in the discipline mean that the criteria below reflect general principles rather than strictly quantitative indicators, given that performance may fluctuate considerably from one year to another.

The following categories will be considered for the Award of Special Increases (based on Article 17.2), based on criteria indicated for each of the designated categories:

1. Teaching:

In addition to performance of assigned teaching duties in accordance with Department guidelines, a special increase for excellence in teaching can be made based on accumulated evidence of exemplary teaching (through a record of superior peer and student evaluations), innovative teaching contributions (such as development of teaching-related materials or curricula) as recognized by peer or external bodies; awards for teaching excellence; graduate mentorship (primarily supervision, but committee membership also taken into consideration) substantially above norms; innovative program development; collaborative and cooperative teaching (such as implementation and coordination of teaching circles and learning communities); activities that integrate teaching, community service and research; and high levels of activity related to direct contact hours (such as high enrollment courses) or to related activities such as student advising, orientation, and recruitment.

Evidence in support of meritorious teaching must include positive student and peer evaluations as well as evidence of superior performance in other contributions to the scholarship of teaching. Such evidence would include documentation of supervision and completion of graduate theses, introduction and teaching of new courses, teaching-related publication and innovations, or other relevant evidence outlined in University and College standards and guidelines regarding the preparation of documentation in support of teaching excellence.

2. Research and Scholarly Work:

Evidence in support of meritorious performance in research and scholarship will be based upon work identified within the categories of appropriate academic publications and scholarly activities for Sociology in Part I. A. Categories of Evaluation (4.1) in the Department's document on Categories of Evaluation and Standards of Performance. Evaluation of scholarly work is based, in the first instance, on research culminating in publications that are peer reviewed.

There are several well-established and clearly recognized journals and publication outlets in the discipline, but the Department guidelines acknowledge that it is not appropriate to rank order journals in the discipline because of the rapidly changing, interdisciplinary nature of many of its areas of specialization. However, candidates are advised to provide members of the Salary Committee with evidence, along with their cv updates, of the academic standing, reputation and review process for journals and other publication outlets that are not core journals or established university presses.

On an annual basis, the publication of at least one single-authored peer reviewed article or book chapter (or equivalent in total of proportional contributions in cases of co- or

multiple-authored works) is normally considered standard performance within the discipline; levels of publication in excess of these levels, or specific publications that are especially exemplary (such as instances in which work appears in the top-ranked journals in the discipline or its related fields) will be considered for special salary increases.

Publication of a peer-reviewed single-authored book would normally constitute a basis for an increase of at least one full increment; edited collection would be recommended for at least one-half increment (or more depending on number of chapters or integrative sections produced by editor). Co-authored or co-edited work would be prorated based on these guidelines. Recognition of previously published work in the form of awards for research achievement would also constitute a basis for merit.

Within the discipline, scholarly work takes on several forms. Priority is given to solo and collaborative work in applying for Tri-Council and other externally funded refereed funding sources that support the production of peer-reviewed publications. Faculty in the discipline also engage in other forms of scholarly work, including community-based research projects, self-funded research, interdisciplinary partnerships, and other collaborative research ventures. Normally, the outcomes of such research in the form of refereed publications is recognized for salary purposes, but consideration for special salary increases will be given to cases in which evidence is presented to demonstrate that engagement in these activities is at a significantly high level and/or varied or innovative forms of dissemination result from this work. This may include knowledge dissemination and translation in the form of reports, presentations and special events for community, governmental, international, and academic bodies, special or travelling exhibits, artistic productions, videos or project-based websites.

3. Practice of Professional Skills:

(normally does not apply in Sociology).

4. Extra-University Work and Public Service:

A special increase may be awarded for excellence in outreach and engagement, in accordance with the criteria in Article 17.2.4, in cases where evidence is provided of recognized meritorious involvement in community, governmental or international organizations as well as in relation to recognized meritorious involvement in organizations related to one's academic or professional interests.

5. Administrative Work:

All faculty are required to participate to university governance, including collegial processes and administrative activities in the Department, as well as College and University, at levels appropriate to their academic rank. Cases for a special increase may be considered when there is demonstrated meritorious service on Department, College, University, or Faculty Association Committees, as well as other administrative work to develop or sustain Department or institutional activities, such as mentorship, program

support or development, and contributions to institutional initiatives such as internationalization, Aboriginal programming, and community engagement that fall outside of regular committee service (normally supported by documentation to indicate the meritorious nature of such activity)

6. Administrative Service as a Department Head or Assistant Dean.:

This is normally assessed by a committee other than Department Salary Committee. However, the Department Salary committee may consider recommendations based on exceptional contributions to the Department or University through cumulative service.

7. Improvement in Academic Qualifications:

Cases for a special increase will be considered in situations in which recognition is given for special accomplishments, typically in the form of honorary degrees, appointments to bodies such as the Royal Society of Canada or specialized credentials that may enhance contributions to the performance in one or more other categories (i.e., distinct from a situation in which an academic credential is a requirement for the granting of tenure).

8. Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution:

(normally assessed at time of written offer).

9. Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties:

Awards for special increase may be considered in cases in which a faculty member has demonstrated superior performance in two or more categories in a given year or over a longer period of time.

10. Improvement and Development:

A special increase may be awarded to a faculty member who demonstrates significant improvement or development in one or more of the designated categories, above. This would normally include situations in which candidates have demonstrated evidence of significantly improved teaching performance through participation in teaching-development workshops such as those offered through the Gwenna Moss Centre, pursuit of an area of scholarship markedly new to the faculty member and/or to the discipline, or played a significant role in activities not typically highlighted in annual cv updates, such as project management of large funded research initiatives.