

## College of Kinesiology Standards for Merit and Salary Increase

**General:** Please refer to the circulated preamble introduction for the philosophy and principles used by the committee in making and revising these standards. In general, it is the faculty member's responsibility to follow the Standards guidelines in presenting their submission and provide appropriate description and justification that will assist the committee's understanding of any contribution.

Usually, description and justification can be satisfied by 2 to 5 lines of text that clarifies contributions (see examples throughout the Standards) or explains/justifies the activity relative to a category in any of the 4 areas (teaching, scholarship, service, professional practice). Non-traditional activity should be similarly described and justified.

### I. Standards for Merit: Teaching and Learning

Teaching is a responsibility assigned by the Dean and varies among faculty members based on the specific needs of the College. Meritorious contributions in teaching are considered for activities in addition to the teaching responsibilities assigned by the Dean and agreed upon by the faculty member in a given year. Categories of activities are listed below, with Category 1 representing the greatest contributions, and Categories 2 and 3 representing lesser contributions. For special case or for team teaching, please describe role and activity as necessary (2 to 5 lines maximum).

#### **CATEGORIES:**

***Category 1:*** Major Teaching Awards and Evidence of Exemplary Supervision, new course development. In general, the recognition of consistent excellence or ongoing program or course development spanning more than a term, or ongoing supervision, assistance, and help with graduate and undergraduate supervision **spanning more than a term.**

#### **Examples:**

- Teaching Awards – 3M Teaching Awards, Provost's Teaching Awards (Adjudicated), Master Teacher Award or other university, national or international, peer-reviewed recognition of teaching excellence
- Graduate Student and Post-doc supervision – this includes the role as a supervisor and committee member. The number of grad students and committees are considered in merit decisions and viewed in relation to other assigned duties.
- New course development and additional courses beyond assigned duties – such as 898, 899, 498 or 499 or other extra courses not in the normal year-to-year teaching requirement of a faculty member (e.g. beyond the normal yearly assigned duties for teaching for a faculty member).
- Supervision of Honours Students – this is not an assigned duty
- Undergrad research initiatives or course offerings

**Category 2:** Teaching Publications, Presentations and Seminars, Teaching Awards, Major Course Additions/Revisions, Recognition of consistent excellence or ongoing program or course development **spanning a single term.**

**Examples:**

- USSU Teaching Excellence Awards (recognition by students)
- Major changes to courses – considered in merit decisions if the revision includes more than 50% of the course material and goes beyond the normal course update and revision process
- Course overload – College or university level requests to increase enrolment in courses beyond the normal course limit would be considered
- Teaching overload- Teaching courses in addition to normal responsibilities as, for example the case of covering courses while a faculty member is on sabbatical.
- Teaching publications not included under the category of scholarly work (up to the candidate to describe)
- Invited teaching presentations – outside university
- Teaching workshops/seminars – leading or organizing sessions or consulting with the GMCTE or other such Teaching and Learning centres/organizations.

**Category 3:** Other Teaching -related Activities . **Single instances of teaching that require expertise.** May require a half day to 5days of work ( i.e., 6 to 40 hours). Substantially lower frequency than Category 2. When viewed individually, relevant to merit but not a deciding factor. When considered cumulatively may assist merit decision, especially in conjunction with Category 1 and 2 activities.

**Examples:**

- Invited teaching presentations – in college, outside college, but within the university
- Guest or invited lectures – describe role and purpose of lecture
- Webinars or similar outlets – describe role and purpose
- USSU teaching award nominations

## II. Standards for Merit: Scholarly Work:

Once again this would take into account the weighting of assigned duties given that these job responsibilities must be satisfied first before merit consideration. The distribution of assigned responsibilities takes into account those responsibilities assigned annually by the Dean and agreed upon by the faculty member.

**Category 1:** Consistent with other areas of service and teaching, examples of meritorious work or professional practice should be of a greater level of magnitude and/or reflect ongoing continuous activity. For example, a refereed publication of research reflects the planning/conduct of a study, its possible funding, the submission of the research manuscript and the refereed adjudication and review process. **This ongoing activity could take up to a year of cumulated or continuous work.** These elements in these examples have some similarity because of their ongoing and larger magnitude.

### Examples:

1. Peer-reviewed publications published or accepted in scientific journals (not just abstracts).
  - The role of the faculty in the authorship order should be described as well as whether the publication was supported by an obtained grant. Also, because publication traditions vary between disciplines and between North American and International journals (e.g., first author as PI in the former case and last author as PI in the latter case) this should be described as necessary.
2. National competitive peer reviewed Grants awarded
  - describe role/responsibility as PI or as Co-I and the grant term, the funding agency and the amount (e.g., Tri-council) as well as type (e.g., Equipment , or standard operating, special competition etc). Faculty should specify role and responsibility. Two to three line percent contribution description regarding the role should be specified consistent with PI or Co-I role.
3. Ongoing multi-year grants as above that were competitively reviewed (description required as above) Two to three line percent contribution description regarding the role should be specified consistent with PI or Co-I role.
4. Provincial competitive, peer-reviewed grants that go through the same process as national level grants. Two to three line percent contribution description regarding the role should be specified consistent with PI or Co-I role.
5. National or International invited presentations to a scientific meeting (expertise and standing of the expert is recognized and the speaker is sought after.
6. Published Invited chapters in an edited book where the editors cumulate chapters around a recognized theme or the book represents a seminal contribution to an area of scientific study. Co-authors roles should be described in a two to three line percent contribution description regarding the role should be specified

**Category 2:** Example reflecting a **substantive part, but not all of the publication process of scholarly work as described in Category 1.** Part of the work toward a potential publication is the self-initiated, refereed presentation at a scientific meeting. These papers make the work public to a knowledgeable scientific audience of peers and trainees and they reflect a substantive part of the process toward publication

recognized in Category 1. This example not only reflects the science but also the training of the highly qualified personnel that assisted in getting the work to this stage.

**Examples:**

1. Competitive peer-reviewed presentations to a national or international scientific meeting (role descriptions and contributions as described in Category 1).
2. Published abstracts in refereed journals that required the scientific review of the abstracts
  - Given that both abstracts and presentations require different processes an abstract and presentation should both count (e.g., abstract to gain entry to the conference and appear in the journal; related presentation displayed and critiqued before a scientific audience and contributes to the conference program).
3. Refereed or Invited symposia presented at a conference (groups of papers housed under a theme).
4. Refereed presentations presented at scientific meetings that are part of the self-initiated segment of the program (See example 2 above)
5. Grant submissions to federal level agencies that complete all of the internal review steps outlined by the University and encouraged by the Office of Research. Two to three line percent contribution description regarding the role should be specified consistent with PI or Co-I role.
6. Grant submissions classified as 4A should be specified and reported similar to Category 1 awards. Two to three line percent contribution description regarding the role should be specified consistent with PI or Co-I role.
  - These contributions clearly require major ongoing time commitments of the applicants (describe processes) and are strongly expected by the University and College. They are considered meritorious because they can consume as much time in preparation review and submission as some manuscripts. They have a substantive and ongoing characteristics and are the product of ongoing consultation and work between the investigators applying, tri-council representatives facilitating research on campus, the office of research , copy-editors, etc. These processes can be described/demonstrated and reflect the overall investment. Currently applications that go through this process and applicants that enter into these competitions are not even acknowledged for merit consideration. Further, their inclusion for merit at Category 2, acknowledges that even grants worthy of funding do not get funded and the large majority of grants submitted are rejected (only 20-27% success )
7. Grant submissions to provincial level agencies that complete all of the internal review steps outlined by the University and encouraged by the Office of Research. Two to three line percent contribution description regarding the role should be specified consistent with PI or Co-I role.
  - Saskatchewan Health Research Foundation new investigator awards (2 year duration)
8. Reviewed Letters to the Editor
9. Invited Talks by another University to that university's spectrum of audiences (for a larger research theme sponsored by the University and/or other agencies)

**Category 3:** Example reflecting a substantive part of the publication process of scholarly work as described in Category 2. Part of the work toward a potential publication is the self-initiated, refereed presentation at a scientific meeting. At some of these meetings proceedings to conference delegates only are circulated . These are not typically published outside the membership of the meeting

### Examples:

1. Conference only published proceedings
2. Non- peer reviewed publications such as book reviews, annotated bibliography abstracts
3. Invited, not reviewed articles
4. Letters to the Editor, not reviewed
5. Invited talks to College/Faculty/Department Colloquiums (based upon expertise of the individual)
6. CIHR Café Scientifique talks/seminars/discussions at individual's own university
7. Invited , not reviewed, formal radio or television broadcast of the individual's work (theme-based)
8. Student award applications: Faculty members must specify role and justify the extent to which they contributed and why these should be considered meritorious. If the application left the University for the federal or provincial competition, this should be specified. If the award was successful, this should be specified . Two to three line explanation maximum.
9. Manuscript submission to a journal. When submitting for merit , a journal submission (under review) in year 1 (Cat 3) should be tracked into year 2/year 3 concerning publication where publication is Cat 1. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide this tracking and justify. If counted as submission in year 1 as Cat 3 and the journal is slow bringing its accepted/published MS forward (i.e., as in over the course of a year), then year 2 would not count and publication in year 3 would count as Cat 1.

### III. Standards for Merit: Service

1. Service : Basic responsibility assigned by the Dean, not applicable for merit
2. Service for consideration for merit: This service is other than assigned and **must have some direct relation to the job and the applicant's representing U of S in some way**

Types:

College, University, Provincial, Federal, International, Community outreach (municipal/provincial)

#### Categories:

**Category 1:** Ongoing, regular – requires regular ongoing amounts of time/meetings/work (e.g. monthly for a year).

Acknowledges expertise/work contribution **as substantial and continuing** (past and present) as in over the course of a year, work is reviewed, monitored, and or done collaboratively with others. In the case of an award, is reviewed, adjudicated, and is an honour voted upon by a society. Please describe role and activity as necessary (2 to 5 lines maximum).

#### **Examples :**

- Elected officer of professional or scientific society (normally for 1 + year obligation),
- Conference program committee chair: year long work of preparing program, selecting speakers, chairing abstract review, organizing content of submissions etc.
- Ad hoc College Committee as requested by faculty or the Dean for any issue
- Chair of Board of Directors (monthly meetings , budget reviews ,policy setting, mission and direction setting, etc.)
- Editor of a Journal or Associate Editor if the journal is sufficiently busy (e.g., monthly issue)

**Category 2:** Ongoing but intermittent - requires ongoing amounts of work/time but quarterly or bimonthly throughout a year or regularly for 1 term in a year( e.g. weekly or twice per month) ; definite difference from Category 1 is the intermittent nature.

Acknowledges expertise/work contribution **as substantial** for **specific blocks of time** (e.g., a term) or **cumulates to this time intermittently** over a year , work is reviewed, monitored, and or done collaboratively with others. Please describe role and activity as necessary (2 to 5 lines maximum).

#### **Examples :**

- Editorial Board member with mandatory number of reviews
- Associate Editor assisting with contacting communicating with reviewers for a content section of a journal with 4 to 6 issues annually
- Grant adjudication committee member (review of substantial number of grants and attendance at federal or provincial final adjudication meetings)

- Conference program committee member (assisting with speaker selection, review of abstracts , on-site responsibilities, program content)

**Category 3:** Single instances of service that require expertise. May require a half day to 5 days of work ( i.e., 6 to 40 hours). Substantially lower frequency than Category 2. When viewed individually, relevant to merit but not a deciding factor. When considered cumulatively may assist merit decision, especially in conjunction with Category 1 and 2 activities. Based upon the amount of time, formal adjudication and reporting devoted to activities, this category could be divided into “A” and “B” levels where A-level activities would be larger and more formal process activities and B-level activities would be single instances and require less committed time. Please describe role and activity as necessary (2 to 3 lines maximum).

**Examples : A-level**

- Professional certification evaluation of courses or programs of certification
- External tenure and promotion review and report
- External College, department, or unit review and report
- Multiple invited federal or provincial grant reviews from the same agency
- Multiple year term - Internal university small grant reviews (i.e., President’s SSHRC internal funds)

**Examples: B-level** (clearly single instance by comparison with examples in A-level)

- Single invited federal or provincial grant reviews
- Internal university small grant reviews (i.e., President’s SSHRC internal funds)
- Peer evaluation of teaching (i.e., 1 to 3 per year)
- High school science academy lab tours/lectures
- Journal Reviewing: Multiple reviews that cumulate to 40 hours (A week’s work assuming that one review takes 5 hours ) may be considered for a Cat. 2. Faculty members should justify heavy journal reviewing if 40 hours is exceeded.

As with the other areas of scholarly/ professional activities and teaching/mentoring/training, activities in the service category could cumulate.

#### IV. Standards for Merit: Practice of Professional Skills

Practice of Professional skills is one of the key responsibilities for the AP faculty member and provides the opportunity to play a leadership role in the discipline. The candidate would be considered to have performed meritorious work if they have performed above the baseline as documented and agreed upon in the assignment of duties. For the AP positions, it is reasonable to expect that the practice of professional skills would share some of the characteristics of Scholarly work experienced by the research intensive faculty member. Given that examples of the practice of professional skills is not always straightforward, it is the faculty member's responsibility to describe and justify aspects of practice that are less well known than the examples used for each category below. Please describe role and activity as necessary (2 to 5 lines maximum).

**Category 1:** The defining feature of Category 1 for Scholarly Work is peer-reviewed and competitive. For the majority of work completed in the category of Practice of Professional Skills, these will not be part of the process. Exceptions to this could include such projects as: major overhaul of the policy and procedures of an organization which reflects ongoing, cumulative work, meetings, discussion and revisions leading to a draft revision which then must be reviewed and accepted by a an organization's board and membership. This type of major overhaul might take a year and be the primary responsibility of the AP faculty member.

**Examples:**

1. Major review and changes to SKESA policy manual.
2. Creation of new certification modules for CSEP.

**Category 2:** Providing service to the profession where formal or informal feedback is provided by a peer or group of peers and does impact the final output. This process of feedback would be take place over a number of months and include multiple opportunities for revisions. These services would typically be invited.

**Examples:**

1. Revisions of a module for the National Coaching Certification Program.
2. Website content for kinesiology related disciplines. (eg. Heart & Stroke, Arthritis Society)

**Category 3:** Expertise from the faculty member is required without expectation of feedback or review from professional partners or interest groups regarding content. These services may be invited but may also be self-initiated. These projects would typically be one-time events.

**Examples:**

1. Delivery of modules for coaching certification.
2. Delivery of content for the Sport Medicine and Science Council of Saskatchewan.
3. Consultation services to local organizations.
4. Consultation to local sport associations.