

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

Standards of Performance for Award of Special Increases

As per 2010-2013 USFA Collective Agreement Section 17

1. College Review Committee

Article 17.3.4 For departmentalized Colleges, the membership of the College Review Committee shall be the same in the case of salary recommendations as in the case of tenure.

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.

Note: The College of Medicine Review Committee members have historically excluded themselves from deliberations pertaining to their own department. Exclusions also must occur if immediate family members' cases are presented or if a serious conflict of interest exists.

2. Powers of the College Review Committee

Article 17.4.4 states that along with approving departmental standards and developing and communicating college standards, the powers of the College Review Committee with respect to salaries shall be to:

- Receive the decisions made by the Salary Committees and not revise these in any way
- Review recommendations from the Salary Committees and award up to 2 Special Increases (provided that the maximum award for any individual from the department and college is no more than 2 special increases in total)
- Award up to 2 Special Increases to employees who may not have been recommended for merit by the Salary Committee
- Recommend additional Special Increases to the President's Review Committee for those employees in the College who have been awarded more than 1 Special Increase
- Inform:
 - a) individual employees of the outcome of their salary review
 - b) Salary Committees of the CRC's rankings, decisions for awards and recommendations to PRC and the reasons for such rankings, awards and recommendations.
- Submit the College's and Departments' decisions for the award of Special Increases to the President for the information of the Board
- Review the consistency and appropriateness of the rankings, awards and recommendations of the Salary Committees in the College and communicate the results of the review to those committees

3. Documentation from Department Salary Committees and Employees

A Form 1 is required in order to be considered for a Special Increase for the past academic year.

Approved: Dec. 19, 2011

Standards of Performance for Award of Special Increases

A complete CV is required in order to be considered for a cumulative period of time. (Special Increases may be awarded for a period of time back to the date of the last Special Increase awarded.)

A Teaching Dossier along with evaluations from students and peers is required to be considered for Teaching, other than if a Teaching Award was received.

Other dossiers: Research Dossier, Professional Practice Dossier and Administration Dossier would be required when considering faculty in related special increase categories. Faculty members are encouraged to use any applicable templates (attached).

Note: All information in the above documents will be complete to June 30th of the current year.

In order to understand the significance of the information in the above documents, annotations should accompany entries for:

- Awards received: criteria, who made the nomination, frequency of award, scope (regional, provincial, national)
- Publications: role and contribution including percentage of contribution (should be discussed with co-authors)
- Grants: role and contribution including percentage of contribution (should be discussed with co-authors)
- Administrative/Committee Work: hours spent in committee meetings and in preparation; your role and participation; explanation of specific projects and/or letters from the committee chair or organization

4. Categories of Special Increase Awards

It is preferable to base one's merit request on a single category.

As per Article 17.2, these are the categories for the basis of award of special increase when excellence is shown in:

17.2.1 Teaching

Requirements: Teaching dossier with evaluations from students and peers; or a Teaching Award

Example: Consistent teaching with student evaluations above average and peer evaluation above average plus hours at/or above the average along with one or more of the following: an award, commendation, course developed, teaching materials, publications on teaching or workshops presented on teaching.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work

Principles:

- Publication or attachment of a letter/email (dated prior to June 30th) accepting a finished manuscript for publication will be considered
- Grants must be awarded prior to June 30th in order to be considered
- Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/competition

Approved: Dec. 19, 2011

Standards of Performance for Award of Special Increases

- Expectations of grant funding will be different for junior faculty as opposed to senior faculty; ie. junior faculty will be recognized when they attain grants without necessarily producing papers; however, senior faculty will be expected to also show scholarly productivity from grants.

(i) **Publication.** Consideration of an award will take into account the faculty member's amount of time and contribution to produce the publication, the academic merit of the work and the impact factor of the journal in the field.

(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.

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills

a) **Clinical Practice:**

Quality of Care as expected in an academic center, participation in quality assurance process, maintenance of competence, maintain an appropriate service load; willingness to participate in out of hours duties; provision of peer consultation, communication and collaboration; consultation with colleagues beyond the base practice; consultation to service organizations relevant to their program; willingness to participate in multidisciplinary care delivery will be considered the standard.

A Special Increase may be awarded for:

- Regional, provincial, national or international recognition.
- Consistent provision over many years of high quality care as defined above including leadership roles ie. Lifetime contributions.

b) **Scholarly Work:**

- a. Publications: Merit may be award for publications in peer reviewed journals above the average number or a publication that occurs while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- b. Evidence of research funding or institutional support for research as an individual or major member of program based practice – consideration of contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers/adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- c. Scholarship Awards:

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
- (ii) the work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee

Standards of Performance for Award of Special Increases

17.2.5 Administrative Work

- An Administration Dossier should be completed and submitted where a substantial percentage of a faculty member's duties are administrative. These duties are not adequately captured in a CV or Form 1.
- A letter commenting on or substantiating meritorious work, from a Committee Chair or another authority needs to be attached. Example: a new program developed or a program proves successful and is adopted by others.

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 College Review Committee.

3. Determination of Ranking

The College Review Committee's guiding principles in this process are:

- College equity
- To enhance the merit of those employees recommended
- To base evaluations on each faculty members' rank, career path and assignment of duties

Procedure:

- CRC will review and rank all employees' submissions for special increase prior to reviewing the Department Salary Committees' decisions to award and recommend merit increases.
- Each submission will be discussed by the committee, followed by each member allocating a score in confidence (1=low, 6=high) to each submission.
- The committee's score will be averaged to provide the final individual ranking for each.
- The committee will compare the Departments' awards and recommendations to the CRC's awards and evaluate the outcome
- The Department Heads shall appear before the CRC to discuss the Departmental recommendations for special increases for each eligible employee in the department
- The committee will grant their awards and recommend further special increases to the President's Review Committee

Standards of Performance for Award of Special Increases

4. Right to Appear (Article 17.5.4)

When the College 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.

Whenever an individual employee appeals to the President's Review Committee, the respective Salary Committee shall be given an opportunity to state the reasons for its earlier decision. A copy of the statement of reasons by the College Review Committee shall be sent to the individual appellant, who shall be entitled to respond to the President's Review Committee.

Standards of Performance for Award of Special Increases

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

- By:**
- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

TEACHING DOSSIER

NAME: *Surname, Given Name(s)*

| | | |
|---|-------------|-------------------|
| DEGREES: <i>First degree (Major)</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>University</i> |
| <i>Higher degrees(s) (Specialty)</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>University</i> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| POSITIONS: <i>Position #1</i> | <i>20YY - 20YY</i> | <i>Location</i> |
| <i>Position #2</i> | <i>20YY - 20YY</i> | <i>Location</i> |
| <i>Position #3</i> | <i>20YY - 20YY</i> | <i>Location</i> |

| |
|------------------------|
| TEACHING AWARDS |
|------------------------|

| | | |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>Name of Award</i> | <i>20YY</i> | <i>Body conferring the award</i> |
| <i>Name of Award</i> | <i>20YY</i> | <i>Body conferring the award</i> |

| |
|-------------------------------|
| UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING |
|-------------------------------|

NOTE: Courses for which student evaluations are provided are marked "*" "
 Courses for which evaluation by peers is provided are marked "◀" "
 Courses for which I was the Course director are marked "+" "
 Courses for which I prepared a manual, or handout (described later) are marked "@"

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| TEACHING HOURS AND ENROLMENT |
|-------------------------------------|

| <u>lecture-based</u> | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Course name/number | | | | | |
| Enrolment | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Total hours lecturing | XX | XX | XX | XX | XX |
| | | | | | |
| Enrolment | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Total hours lecturing | XX | XX | XX | XX | XX |
| | | | | | |
| <u>tutorial/small group/laboratory</u> | | | | | |
| Course name/number | | | | | |
| # of students in group | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Total hours teaching | XX | XX | XX | XX | XX |
| | | | | | |
| <u>Total hours Lectures/groups</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| <u>Total hours Lectures/groups</u> | XX | XX | XX | XX | XX |
| | | | | | |
| <u>Bedside teaching</u> | | | | | |

Use a narrative account including the number of hours/week spend in consultations with students at the bedside

STUDENT EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

Course name/number/year

(Describe what each numerical score actually means - for example "5-point scale; 1 means "strongly agree" and 5 means "strongly disagree")

1. "Questionnaire statement number 1" score X.XX
2. "Questionnaire statement number 2" score X.XX
3. "Questionnaire statement number 3" score X.XX
4. "Questionnaire statement number 4" score X.XX

Narrative comments are provided as appendix AA

Course name/number/year

(Describe what each numerical score actually means - for example "5-point scale; 1 means "strongly agree" and 5 means "strongly disagree")

1. "Questionnaire statement number 1" score X.XX
2. "Questionnaire statement number 2" score X.XX
3. "Questionnaire statement number 3" score X.XX
4. "Questionnaire statement number 4" score X.XX

Narrative comments are provided as appendix AA

Course name/number/year

(Describe what each numerical score actually means - for example "5-point scale; 1 means "strongly agree" and 5 means "strongly disagree")

1. "Questionnaire statement number 1" score X.XX
2. "Questionnaire statement number 2" score X.XX
3. "Questionnaire statement number 3" score X.XX
4. "Questionnaire statement number 4" score X.XX

Narrative comments are provided as appendix AA

Course name/number/year

(Describe what each numerical score actually means - for example "5-point scale; 1 means "strongly agree" and 5 means "strongly disagree")

1. "Questionnaire statement number 1" score X.XX
2. "Questionnaire statement number 2" score X.XX
3. "Questionnaire statement number 3" score X.XX
4. "Questionnaire statement number 4" score X.XX

Narrative comments are provided as appendix AA

Course name/number/year

(Describe what each numerical score actually means - for example "5-point scale; 1 means "strongly agree" and 5 means "strongly disagree")

1. "Questionnaire statement number 1" score X.XX
2. "Questionnaire statement number 2" score X.XX
3. "Questionnaire statement number 3" score X.XX
4. "Questionnaire statement number 4" score X.XX

Narrative comments are provided as appendix AA

PEER EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

Course name/number/year

Written assessments by Dr. nnnnnnnn and Dr. nnnnnnnn are submitted as appendix AA

HANDOUTS/MANUALS WRITTEN TO ACCOMPANY UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

NOTE: Those marked "*" are submitted as appendix AA

Course name/number/year: TITLE " "

Description:

Course name/number/year: TITLE " "

Description:

GRADUATE / RESIDENT* TEACHING

* RESIDENCY TRAINING is difficult to document, but there are often evaluations by Residents which can be included. In issues such as this, narrative comments are extremely useful.

LECTURES, SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

| | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Enrolment | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Total hours lecturing | XX | XX | XX | XX | XX |

GRADUATE STUDENTS AND POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS

MSc Students (Total number XX)

Name of student (Admitted 20YY, Graduated 20YY)

Name of student (Admitted 20YY, Graduated 20YY)

Name of student (Admitted 20YY, Currently in programme)

PhD Students (Total number XX)

Name of student (Admitted 20YY, Graduated 20YY)

Name of student (Admitted 20YY, Graduated 20YY)

Name of student (Admitted 20YY, Currently in programme)

Postdoctoral trainees (Total number XX)

Name of trainee (20YY-20YY)

Name of trainee (20YY-20YY)

SUPERVISION / SUPERVISORY COMMITTEES

| Date | Name of Student | MSc/PhD Residents PostDocs | Dept/Faculty | Supervisor |
|---------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 20YY-YY | _____ | _____ | _____ | Dr. <u>nnnnnnnn</u> |
| 20YY-YY | _____ | _____ | _____ | Dr. <u>nnnnnnnn</u> |
| 20YY-YY | _____ | _____ | _____ | Dr. <u>nnnnnnnn</u> |
| 20YY-YY | _____ | _____ | _____ | Dr. <u>nnnnnnnn</u> |

SUMMER STUDENTS

| Year | Name of Student | Co-supervisors(if applicable) |
|------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| 20YY | _____ | Dr. <u>nnnnnnnnnn</u> |
| 20YY | _____ | Dr. <u>nnnnnnnnnn</u> |
| 20YY | _____ | Dr. <u>nnnnnnnnnn</u> |
| 20YY | _____ | Dr. <u>nnnnnnnnnn</u> |

EVALUATIONS BY STUDENTS / PEERS OF GRADUATE / RESIDENT TEACHING

Course/program name/number/year

Provide numerical ratings using the scales described for graduate/resident teaching, and/or narrative comments as an appendix. Include also any assessments by Department Committees which are relevant to your skills as a supervisor.

HANDOUTS/MANUALS/PROTOCOLS WRITTEN TO ACCOMPANY GRADUATE / RESIDENT TEACHING

NOTE: Those marked "*" are submitted as appendix AA

Course/program name/number/year: TITLE " _____ "

Description: _____

Course/program name/number/year: TITLE " _____ "

Description: _____

DISTINCTION ACHIEVED BY GRADUATE STUDENTS/ RESIDENTS/ POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS

Narrative comments about the successes achieved by selected trainees, either while under your supervision or subsequently, should be written in narrative form in this section.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

TEACHING WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS ETC. ATTENDED

| Date | Duration | Title | Workshop organizer |
|-------------|----------|-------|--------------------|
| ___/___/9__ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ___/___/9__ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ___/___/9__ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

TEACHING WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS ETC. PRESENTED

| Date | Duration | Title | Workshop organizer |
|-------------|----------|-------|--------------------|
| ___/___/9__ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ___/___/9__ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Add any evaluations which are available of workshops on teaching and learning which you have presented. Numerical data can be presented here, and comments as an appendix.

EXTERNAL TEACHING

| Date | Duration | Title | Description |
|-------------|----------|-------|-------------|
| ___/___/9__ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ___/___/9__ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

TEACHING INNOVATION

| Date | Course Name/number | Nature of innovation |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| ___/___/9__ | _____ | _____ |

ADMINISTRATION ASSOCIATED WITH TEACHING

| Date | Committee or responsibility | Description |
|----------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| 19 - ___ | _____ | _____ |
| 19 - ___ | _____ | _____ |
| 19 - ___ | _____ | _____ |
| 19 - ___ | _____ | _____ |

PUBLICATIONS/PRESENTATIONS CONCERNING TEACHING

(Authors)/(Year)/(Title)/(Volume)/Page number(first and last page) and (Date)/(Title)/Occasion on which the talk was presented

SELF-EVALUATION

OTHER MATERIAL

ADMINISTRATION DOSSIER

NAME: *Surname, Given Name(s)*

| | | |
|---|-------------|-------------------|
| DEGREES: <i>First degree (Major)</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>University</i> |
| <i>Higher degrees(s) (Specialty)</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>University</i> |

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS:

| | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Position #1</i> | <i>19YY - 19YY</i> | <i>Location</i> |
| <i>Position #2</i> | <i>19YY - 19YY</i> | <i>Location</i> |
| <i>Position #3</i> | <i>20YY - 20YY</i> | <i>Location</i> |
| <i>Position #4</i> | <i>20YY - 20YY</i> | <i>Location</i> |
| <i>Position #5</i> | <i>20YY - 20YY</i> | <i>Location</i> |

ADMINISTRATION AWARDS

| | | |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>Name of Award</i> | <i>19YY</i> | <i>Body conferring the award</i> |
| <i>Name of Award</i> | <i>20YY</i> | <i>Body conferring the award</i> |

UNDERGRADUATE ADMINISTRATION

NOTE: Examples might include - Curriculum committee membership and contribution; Phase Coordinator; Assistant Dean – Undergraduate Medical Education; Undergraduate coordinator for clinical departments; LCME/CACMS Accreditation site visit teams; Director of Admissions, Director of the School of Physical Therapy, etc. Contributions should be annotated to provide a statement of responsibilities for the position and the significant contributions to enhancing the work of that position.

POSTGRADUATE ADMINISTRATION

NOTE: Examples might include - Program Director; RCPC/CFPC committees, site visit Accreditation teams; Assistant Dean – Postgraduate Medical Education; Assistant Dean – Continuing Professional Learning; Associate Dean – Medical Education. Contributions should be annotated to provide a statement of responsibilities for the position and the significant contributions to enhancing the work of that position.

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL THERAPY ADMINISTRATION

Note: Examples might include – Director, School of Physical Therapy; Department Headship; departmental committees other than residency program director and undergraduate coordinator; Health Region positions not directly related to the College of Medicine (e.g. OR allocation committee, regional departmental committees; etc. Contributions should be annotated to provide a statement of responsibilities for the position and the significant contributions to enhancing the work of that position.

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE ADMINISTRATION

NOTE: Examples might include - Faculty Council/General Academic Assembly committees; Associate Dean – Research & Graduate Studies; Associate Dean – Regina Programs; Associate Dean – Biomedical Sciences; Associate Dean – Faculty Affairs; Associate Dean – Physical Therapy and Inter-professional

Health Education; Health Region positions of leadership directly related to the College of Medicine; Health Region committee membership for clinical faculty. Contributions should be annotated to provide a statement of responsibilities for the position and the significant contributions to enhancing the work of that position.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN ADMINISTRATION

NOTE: Examples might include – Faculty Council and its committees, institute level leadership such as CUISR, INTERVAC, other administrative units, including VP/AVP level appointments. Contributions should be annotated to provide a statement of responsibilities for the position and the significant contributions to enhancing the work of that position.

OTHER ADMINISTRATION

NOTE: Examples might include – provincial committees and taskforces; Professional association committees or appointments at the local, provincial and national level. All work at the international level should be reported here. Contributions should be annotated to provide a statement of responsibilities for the position and the significant contributions to enhancing the work of that position.

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

Merit awards for Administrative Work
 360 assessments, if available
 Annual assessments if no merit award
 Letters from external agencies, committee chairs, health region managers and administrators, etc

ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP TRAINING

NOTE: Please detail all workshops, graduate studies, and other improvements to administrative qualifications.

ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS ETC. ATTENDED

| Date | Duration | Title | Workshop organizer |
|--------------|----------|-------|--------------------|
| ___/___/9___ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ___/___/9___ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ___/___/9___ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS ETC. PRESENTED

| Date | Duration | Title | Workshop/seminar organizer |
|--------------|----------|-------|----------------------------|
| ___/___/9___ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ___/___/9___ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Add any evaluations which are available of workshops on administration which you have presented. Numerical data can be presented here, and comments as an appendix.

ADMINISTRATION INNOVATION

NOTE: Narrative comments about innovation successes achieved in the area of administrative responsibility while under your supervision or subsequently if you had a major role in concept development.

SCHOLARSHIP IN ADMINISTRATION

NOTE: Publications, technical reports, presentations related to administration.

(Authors)/(Year)/(Title)/(Volume)/Page number(first and last page) and
(Date)/(Title)/Occasion on which the talk was presented

SELF-EVALUATION

NOTE: Annotation of 360 or separate self-evaluation. Please make special note of work done to develop key institutional relationships and team development.

OTHER MATERIAL

College of Medicine
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE DOSSIER

NAME:

DEGREES:

POSITIONS: (University & Health Region)

CAREER PATH:

Nature of Professional Practice

(Paragraph)

Direct Patient Care (Most Recent 5 Years)

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| A. Outpatient Care | 2006/ 2007 | 2007/ 2008 | 2008/ 2009 | 2009/ 2010 | 2010/ 2011 |
| B. Inpatient Care | 2006/ 2007 | 2007/ 2008 | 2008/ 2009 | 2009/ 2010 | 2010/ 2011 |
| C. Special Services | 2006/ 2007 | 2007/ 2008 | 2008/ 2009 | 2009/ 2010 | 2010/ 2011 |

D. On Call Information

E. Consulting Work Outside Clinical Practice

Professional Associations

Significant Contributions

(Narrative explaining your most significant contributions to date as a clinician)

Administrative Contributions

(ie. Unit Head, Division Head, Program Director)

Other Supporting Documentation

A. Continuing Medical Education

B. Letters of Support

(from Colleagues, referring Physicians, Agencies, Health Regions, etc.)

College of Medicine
RESEARCH DOSSIER

NAME:

DEGREES:

POSITIONS:

CAREER PATH:

RESEARCH GOALS

(Paragraph)

RESEARCH GRANTS

GRANTS HELD:

GRANTS PENDING:

THESES SUPERVISED (completed):

PUBLICATIONS

List your most significant. Explain why they are your most important and what they have contributed to the field.

Books, Chapters in Books, Expository and Review Articles:

Papers in Refereed Journals:

a) Published:

b) Accepted:

Contributed Papers in Published Conference Proceedings and Abstracts:

Technical Reports Relevant to Academic Field:

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE CONTRIBUTIONS

(Eg. Organized a conference, edited a book)

PATENTS

College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans

PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

USFA 2010-2013 Collective Agreement, Section 17

1. Formation of College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans

As per Article 17.3.3, this committee is to be chaired by the Dean and consist of the chair and a minimum of 3 Department Heads and/or Assistant Deans. In the initial year of establishment, a call for volunteers went to the eligible members resulting in a total of 5 members on the College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans. Ideally this committee should include representation from clinical Department Heads, biomedical Department Heads and Assistant Deans. (Note: Associate Deans cannot serve as members of this committee.)

2. Responsibilities of the Committee

As per Article 17.4.3, the responsibilities of this committee are to:

- propose standards for the award of special increases and have them approved by the College Review Committee; then communicate those standards to all Department Heads and Assistant Deans
- receive and rank submissions from all eligible Department Heads and Assistant Deans, award special increases where appropriate and submit those decisions to the College Review Committee
- recommend to the College Review Committee
 - a) additional special increases for those who may merit an additional award
 - b) those who would have received an award except that there were insufficient funds to do so
 - c) those who were not awarded or recommended and the justification for that decision
- inform Department Heads and Assistant Deans of the above rankings, decisions and recommendations and the reasons for those.

3. Documentation from Faculty

- A. Consideration for special increase will require the following documents from Department Heads and Assistant Deans:
- an updated Curriculum Vitae, Form I and Administration Dossier. (Sample admin dossier attached.) The information to be included will be up to June 30th
 - A cover letter from the faculty member outlining their achievements and presenting their case for consideration of a special increase in one or more categories.
- B. The following guidelines will help clarify entries to give a clearer understanding of the work undertaken:
- Annotation of publications and grants should clearly indicate the **percentage of the contribution to the project** (in discussion with co-authors) and the **role of** the faculty member.

College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans

- Awards should be annotated indicating the **significance** of the award (ie. what it recognizes, how often it's awarded, the nomination process, regional/provincial/national/international).
- Committee work, especially beyond the scope of duties as department head or assistant dean, should be annotated with time, effort and achievements or progress, and if possible supported by a letter of contribution from the organization or professional body.

4. Categories for Special Increase

As per Article 17.2, this Committee may award a special increase based on one or more of the following categories where excellence is demonstrated:

A. Teaching

Documentation required for possible consideration in this category is a complete Teaching Dossier including evaluations from students and peers, with description of any awards, courses or teaching materials revised/created and teaching innovation.

B. Research and Scholarly Work

- Publication

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.

"Accepted" papers will count when letters from the publisher confirming the article has been accepted are attached.

- Unpublished Work

For unpublished research or scholarly work if it is established that the work has academic merit and that there is no appropriate publication outlet for a particular subject matter.

Example: The number of PostDoc's, PhD and MSc students will determine an average/expected number of publications. Merit may be awarded for numbers above the average/expected number.

- Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/competition.

C. Practice of Professional Skills

5.1a) Clinical Practice:

These will be considered the standard in clinical practice: Quality of Care as expected in an academic center, participation in quality assurance process, maintenance of competence, maintain an appropriate service load; willingness to participate in out of hours duties; provision of peer consultation, communication and collaboration; consultation with colleagues beyond the base practice; consultation to service organizations relevant to their program; willingness to participate in multidisciplinary care delivery.

5.1b) Educational Practice:

These teaching roles will be considered: Curriculum development, teaching and the creation of instructional materials, mentorship and advising, educational administration or leadership, and assessment of learners.

Merit may be considered for:

- Regional, provincial, national or international recognition.
- Consistent provision over many years of high quality care as defined above, including leadership roles ie. Lifetime contributions.

College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans

- 5.2 a) Publications: Merit may be awarded for publications in peer reviewed journals dependent on the role and contribution to each, while carrying out the assigned administrative duties.
- b) Evidence of research funding or institutional support for research either as an individual or major member of program based practice – consideration of contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent administrative duties.
- D. Extra University Work and Public Service
- E. Administrative Work
- F. Administrative Service as a Department Head or Assistant Dean
A letter substantiating the meritorious work from the Dean or another authority is required.
- G. Improvement in Academic Qualifications
- H. Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution
- I. Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties
When excellence of assigned duties has been demonstrated in two or more categories listed above.
- J. Improvement and Development
When significant improvement or development has been demonstrated in the categories listed above for reasons acceptable to the Committee.

5. Process Prior to College Salary Committee Review

- a) Unified Department Heads
- Submitted documentation will be shared with the Saskatoon Health Region representative, who will provide their assessment of the Department Head's performance to the Dean.
 - The Dean will provide his assessment of the Department Head's performance, including and taking into account the assessment from the Saskatoon Health Region to the College Salary Committee.
 - Evaluations of each Department Head's performance will be sought from department faculty (university and community), admin staff, the department executive committee, colleagues in the College, then aggregated and provided to the College Salary Committee.
- b) All other Department Heads
- The Dean will provide his assessment of each Department Head's performance.
 - Evaluations of each Department Head's performance will be sought from department faculty (university and community), admin staff, the department executive committee, colleagues in the College, then aggregated and provided to the College Salary Committee.
- c) Assistant Deans
- The respective Department Head will provide their assessment of the duties performed by the Assistant Dean in the department (.75 FTE), to the Dean.
 - The Dean provides his assessment of the duties as Assistant Dean and includes the assessment from the Department Head (.25 FTE), to the College Salary Committee.

College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans

- Evaluations of the Department Head's performance will be sought from pertinent faculty, aggregated and provided to the College Salary Committee.

6. Determination of Ranking and Merit Award

Submissions to the College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans will be separated into three groups:

- a) Department Heads of clinical departments (Anesthesiology Perioperative Medicine & Pain Management, Family Medicine, Medical Imaging, Medicine, Obstetrics Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences, Pathology, Pediatrics, Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Psychiatry, Surgery)
- b) Department Heads of non-clinical departments (School of Physical Therapy, Community Health & Epidemiology, Anatomy & Cell Biology, Biochemistry, Microbiology & Immunology, Pharmacology, Physiology)
- c) Assistant Deans (UGME, PGME, CPL)

Evidence that the administrative duties have been performed at an acceptable level in the position will be necessary, in order to be considered for a special increase.

The percentage of time devoted to administration vs. other assigned duties (clinical practice, research, teaching, etc.) will be taken into account.

The time-period under consideration can be either the last academic year or a cumulative period, retroactive to when the last special increase was awarded.

Each submission will be discussed by the committee, followed by each member allocating a score (1=low, 6=high), in confidence, to each submission. The committee scores will be averaged to provide the final individual ranking.

Each individual will be ranked within the subset of their group.

All submissions will then be combined into one group and following discussion and consensus by the committee, ranked so that merit increase awards can be granted and recommendations forwarded to the College Review Committee.

The Dean will meet with each Department Head and Assistant Dean to complete the Salary Review forms and advise them of the College Salary Committee's decision.

7. Appeal

Following the decision of both the College Salary Committee for Department Heads and Assistant Deans and the College Review Committee, faculty members may appeal in writing to the President's Review Committee if either no special increase was awarded or to seek a further merit award.

Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative Medicine and Pain Management
College of Medicine
University of Saskatchewan

**PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE
FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE (As Per USFA Section 17)**

Department Committee Structure and Process as per Article 17

CV, Teaching Dossier and Form 1 to be up-to-date to June 30th

1. Preparation of Form 1

Form 1 is the basis for Salary Review. The following are basic guidelines to clarify Sections of Form 1 to facilitate a clearer understanding of the activities undertaken.

- a. Include annotation in each applicable category which clearly indicates the percentage of the project (i.e. paper, poster, abstract, oral presentation, grant) for which you were responsible. This should be discussed with the co-authors
- b. Indicate Teaching hours as follows – do **not** include hours for preparation (refer to Teaching Dossier)
 - i. Teaching done outside of *clinical* activity ie. didactic lectures, tutorials
 - ii. Teaching done associated with *clinical* activity ie. PGME/UGME learner supervision
 1. PGME - Indicate if you are primarily responsible for curriculum development of core rotations
 2. PGME – Indicate if you are primarily responsible for delivery of curriculum of core rotations
 3. PGME – Indicate involvement in multidisciplinary curriculum development for rotations external of Anesthesiology
 4. PGME – Indicate % time with PGME learners
 5. UMGE – Indicate time with UGME learners
 6. UGME - Indicate if you are primarily responsible for curriculum development of core rotations
 7. UGME – Indicate if you are primarily responsible for delivery of curriculum of core rotations
 8. Intraprofessional – Indicate time with Intraprofessional learners
 - iii. Teaching done associated with *supervision* i.e. MSc, PhD, Dean's Summer Student
- c. Indicate the percentage of time providing *clinical* service (Section 23: Practice of Professional Skills)

d. Administrative/Committee Work

- i. Indicate role in committee – Chair or member
- ii. Indicate hours spent in committee meetings/activity
- iii. Indicate hours spent in preparation of committee meetings/activity

e. Awards

- i. Provide a description of the source, local/national/international, and significance of any award.

2. Application for a Special Merit Increase should preferably be requested based on one of the following categories. You will need to indicate which category should be highlighted forward for a Merit. A letter or file must be prepared to support the merit award for the specific category.

17.2.1 Teaching. A Special Merit Increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

Requirements:

- 1) CV
- 2) Statement of Teaching philosophy
- 3) Teaching dossier
- 4) Written outline of the significance of the Teaching contributions
- 5) Evaluations from both Learners and Peers
- 6) Awards/ commendations/publications, course or teaching materials etc if available

Example: Consistent teaching with learner evaluations above average and peer evaluation above average plus hours at/or above the average along with one or more of the following: an award, commendation, course developed, teaching materials, publications on teaching or workshops presented on teaching.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work. (Category 4) A Special Merit Increase may be awarded 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 a Special Merit Increase. The size of the Special Merit Increase should reflect the amount of time necessary to produce the publication, as well as the academic merit of the work. *In order for "Accepted" papers to count, letters from the publisher confirming acceptance must be attached.*

(ii) Unpublished Work.

Unpublished Research or Scholarly Work are grounds for recommending a Special Merit Increase if it is established that the work has academic merit and that there is no appropriate publication outlet for a particular subject matter.

Examples: The number of PhD, MSc and Dean's Summer Students will determine an average/expected number of publications. Merit may be awarded for numbers above the average/expected and will include overall contribution, reputation of Journal and whether the Journal is related to Anesthesiology.

Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/competition.

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills.

A Special Merit Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the Practice of Professional Skills.

a) Clinical Practice:

Quality of Care as expected in an academic center, participation in quality assurance process, maintenance of competence, maintain an appropriate service load

- willingness to participate in out of hours duties
- provision of peer consultation, communication and collaboration
- consultation with colleagues beyond the base practice
- consultation to service organizations relevant to their program
- willingness to participate in multidisciplinary care delivery will be considered the standard.

Merit may be considered for:

- Regional, provincial, national or international recognition.
- Consistent provision over many years of high quality care as defined above including leadership roles ie. Lifetime contributions.

b) Scholarly Work:

a. Publications:

A Special Merit Increase may be awarded for publications in peer reviewed journals or a publication that occurs while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers adjusted for junior/senior faculty.

b. Evidence of research funding or institutional support for research as an individual or major member of program-based practice – consideration of contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers/adjusted for junior/senior faculty.

c. Scholarship Awards

17.2.4 Extra University Work and Public Service. A Special Merit Increase may be awarded 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 assigned duties, as specified in the letter of appointment or by past practice. Please note that, University Faculty in clinical departments do not merit a Special

Merit 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. Any University Faculty who are 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 Merit Increase may be awarded for significant administrative duties

A letter commenting on or substantiating meritorious work, from the Chair or another authority needs to be attached.

Example: a new program developed, a program proves successful and is adopted by other places.

17.2.7 Improvement in Academic Qualifications. A Special Merit Increase may be awarded to any University Faculty 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 Merit Increase may be awarded to any University Faculty 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 Merit Increase may be awarded to any University Faculty 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 Merit Increase may be awarded to any University Faculty demonstrating significant improvement or development in the categories listed above for reasons acceptable to the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee.

3. Documentation for merit can be based on either:

1. The past year – based on Form 1
2. Cumulative evidence since the last merit Award - this will require documentation from prior years.

4. Formation of Departmental Salary Committee

As per Article 17.3.1, the Department Salary Committee will be comprised of 3 University Faculty members plus the Department Head. The University Faculty members will be elected by all of the Department's University Faculty with the exception of the Department Head.

5. Determination of Ranking within the Department

A spreadsheet will be completed that will record the activities in each category as outlined in each individual's Form I. A relative rating guide will be used that will take into account:

- The individual's career path and assignment of duties
- The individual's rank will help determine where in the range of expected productivity they would fit
- The individual's allocation of funded non-clinical time
- Percentage of individual work involved in each project
- Hours for teaching and committee work
- Percentage of time spent in clinical activity (where appropriate)

The results of this algorithm will provide an overall point system which will be averaged among members. Those members who are above the average/benchmark will be considered for the next phase of salary review discussion. There will also be expected guidelines in place for research and teaching categories.

The Department's Salary Review Committee will discuss the individual merits based on the case put forward in writing by the individual.

The Department Head will meet with each University Faculty member to review the rationale for the decision.

References:

1. USFA Agreement
2. Community Health and Epidemiology Standards for Merit 2010
3. Department of Psychiatry, University of Manitoba, (Sareen, 2010)

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

Internal Guide for Research Productivity

Documentation:

1. Current CV
2. Grant Support and Current Submissions
3. List of Research Trainees
4. Copies of Publication, Abstracts etc



**Proposed Standards for the Award of Special Increases
Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology – May 11th, 2011**

The Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology Salary Review Committee has previously applied many of the following procedures in determining recommendations to the College of Medicine for the award of Special Merit Increases for its faculty. In response to the requirement by the new Collective Agreement for departments to establish their own standards for the award of merit, the Department now proposes the following standards for the annual award of Special Merit Increases.

- 1) That a Departmental Salary Review Committee (DSRC) be established each year, consisting of at least the department head (chair), one senior faculty (drawn from the Professorial rank), one junior faculty (drawn from the Associate and/or Assistant Professorial rank) and one faculty member who served on the previous year's DSRC, to evaluate the annual or cumulative performance (retroactive to the last merit increase) of each faculty member in one or more of the categories described in article 17.2 of the 2010 – 2013 Collective Agreement. A Committee member whose own case is considered will be excluded from the Committee during consideration of their case, but will otherwise fully participate on the Committee.
- 2) Evaluation of all faculty employees (except the department head) will be based on the information that is provided by each employee in their completed Form 1, updated CV and updated Teaching Dossier, as articulated in article 17.1.3.1 of the Collective Agreement.
- 3) A special increase may be awarded to a faculty member who has demonstrated excellence in one or more of the categories described in article 17.2 – category examples include (but are not limited to) the following and are dependent on the career path and assignment of duties:

A) **Teaching** (Evaluations and Awards) – examples of achievements/activities considered for award include (but are not limited to):

- (i) receipt of a teaching award
- (ii) curriculum development
- (iii) teaching evaluations from students
- (iv) teaching beyond the assigned duties

For any teaching award received, the scope and prestige of the award must be given.

NB: In order to be awarded under the “Teaching” category, the College requires that an up to date Teaching Dossier be submitted for consideration, including teaching evaluation(s) where available.

B) **Research and Scholarly Work** – examples of achievements/activities considered for award include (but are not limited to):

- (i) Publication(s) – (for each manuscript “accepted” or “in press”, a dated letter of acceptance from the related editorial office need be provided)

- (ii) Major New Grants or Renewals received; (the onus is each faculty member to clarify whether grant monies received are from first installment of a newly awarded grant or a grant renewal, or if monies are ongoing funds from a

previously received/reported grant. Grants should be reported only after their official start date.)

- (iii) Unpublished research or scholarly work deemed to have academic merit (preferably by external peer review), where there is no appropriate publication outlet for that particular subject matter

NB: It is up to the individual employee to articulate the impact/relevance of any publications and/or work completed to enable the DSRC to evaluate the submission.

C) **Extra University Work and Public Service:** - achievements/activities considered include work outside of assigned duties - for example serving on a National Grant Panel or the Executive of a Professional Association.

D) **Administrative Work** – In this category, there should be a letter substantiating meritorious work written by the authority (eg., Assistant Dean) or the Chair of the relevant committee.

E) **Performance of Full Range of Assigned Duties** – This category is used when an employee demonstrates excellence in performance of duties in more than one category

4) Following evaluation and discussion of all cases, the DSRC members will individually and secretly assign a ranking for each member; this will then be averaged to establish the ranked list upon which the awarding of merit increments will be based.

5) The DSRC will submit to the College Review Committee:

- a) decisions for the award of special increases
- b) recommendations for additional special increases where employees may merit an additional award
- c) recommendations for additional special increases for employees who may merit an award, but there were insufficient funds
- d) a listing of those not recommended or awarded a special increase.

In each case above, the DSRC will submit its reasons and the documentation for the recommendation.

6) Following the committee deliberations and decision, the department head will inform the employee within one week of the DSRC's decision regarding their case.

The faculty of the Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology have voted on and approved these standards, which may be amended by the faculty when necessary.

Dated May 13, 2011

Respectfully submitted to CRC for Approval May 17, 2011

Amended September 12, 2011

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30** Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1** Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30** Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- awarded one-half or full merit where appropriate (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31** College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards where appropriate (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28** Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31** President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)



Department of Biochemistry

Standards for Salary Review and the Award of Special Increases

1. Salary Review Procedures

The Salary Review Committee (SRC) of the Department of Biochemistry has been established according to the University of Saskatchewan Collective Agreement (2010-13) Article 17.3.1.

2. Powers and Responsibilities of the Salary Review Committee

According to Article 17.4.1 they are:

- (i) to propose standards of performance for the award of Special Increases;
- (ii) to communicate these standards, in writing, to the College Review Committee and, on approval, to all employees in the Department;
- (iii) to 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) to submit the Department's decisions for the award of Special Increases to the College Review Committee (CRC);
- (v) to recommend to the CRC for Special Increases those eligible employees in the Department, except the head, to whom the SRC would have awarded a Special Increase except that the Committee had insufficient funds available to make such awards;
- (vi) to recommend to the CRC for additional Special Increases those eligible employees, except the head, who have been awarded a Special Increase by the Department and who may merit additional award;
- (vii) to submit to the CRC a list of those employees not awarded or recommended for a special increase and the justification for the salary action;
- (viii) to inform employees in the Department of the Committee's rankings, decisions for the award of Special Increases and recommendation to the CRC, as well as the Committee's reasons for such awards and recommendations.

3. SRC Structure

Based on Article 17.3.1, the SRC will consist of three Department faculty members and the Head. The Head will chair the SRC. All probationary, tenured and limited term faculty members are eligible for appointment to the SRC provided that: i) the term appointment is for more than one academic year; ii) there is at least one academic year remaining in the appointment at the time of appointment to the committee; and iii) the faculty member held an appointment in the Department during the academic year under review.

Appointment of SRC Members: Where possible, the SRC will include eligible faculty from all three ranks (i.e. Assistant, Associate and Professor). Faculty who have Lecturer or other similar appointments will be included in the Assistant Professor pool. When this is not possible due to a lack of representation at a certain rank, the faculty member will be selected from the rank that has the highest representation in the department. The selection of the faculty members in each of the three ranks will be by drawing names out of three hats that represent each of the three ranks. In order that all faculty members participate equitably in this process, appointments will be for a one-year term only, after which faculty will be exempt from serving on the SRC until all other faculty in their respective pool have served.

Conflict of Interest: As outlined in Article 17.3.1, SRC members will participate fully in all deliberations, however they will be excused when their own case is discussed. The committee has the right to exclude members from the deliberations of specific cases due to perceived conflicts of interest.

4. Basis for the Recommendation of Special Increase Awards

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

- The award of a Special Increase is to recognize excellence in one or more of a subset of categories defined by the Collective Agreement (Article 17.2). In the Department of Biochemistry, Special Increases may be awarded or recommended for meritorious activity in four different categories; (i) Research and Scholarly Work, (ii) Teaching, (iii) Administrative Work, (iv) Extra University Work and Public Service. Moreover, the ranking procedure described below will in essence also allow for the awarding of a Special Increase for excellence in the full range of responsibilities. Although these four categories are emphasized given the nature of the Department range of activities, the Department Salary Committee will consider cases for possible merit under all of the categories set out in Article 17.2.
- Explicit consideration will be made of the individual's rank and career stage. For example, standards are higher for tenured than for probationary faculty, for Full Professors than Assistant Professors.
- Evaluation of meritorious achievement will take into account the assignment of duties.
- The award of a Special Increase requires excellence in one or more of the aforementioned categories, which is supported by documented evidence to substantiate this claim. The submitted documentation will consist of a completed Form 1, an updated CV, and updated Teaching Dossier. Faculty members are expected to take an active role in gathering such information to support their case for a Special Increase.

- Faculty members may be recommended for a Special Increase either based on performance in the year preceding review or based on performance over a number of consecutive years preceding review. While there may be exceptions, in the latter case the period of review would normally be subsequent to the last year that a Special Increase was received (or less). A faculty member can initiate a cumulative case encompassing previous years by request. In the event that a faculty member is being considered based on performance other than the most recent year, the SRC must be provided with a cumulative report of performance for that period in the category/categories relevant to the case.

The following **procedure** will be followed by the SRC:

Distribution of information: The Head will circulate to SRC members the full CV and CV update(s) information, the Teaching Portfolio which includes student and/or peer teaching evaluations, and any supporting material provided by each eligible faculty member which serves to expand or clarify aspects presented in the CV update or Teaching Portfolio. Prior to the meeting of the SRC, the department head will review each case and determine if any clarification is required from the faculty member in question.

Ranking Procedure: The committee will review the cases of all faculty members before any scoring takes place. Once all of the cases have been discussed, committee members will be asked to provide a score, ranging from 1 to 10 with 0.5 increments, in each of the four categories (Research, Teaching, Admin, Public Service). The average score for each faculty member in each of the categories will be calculated, and then multiplied by a weighting factor as follows: Research and Scholarly Work, 0.4; Teaching, 0.3; Administration, 0.2, Public Service, 0.1. The total of these four scores will then be added together to arrive at a conglomerate score that will form the basis for the overall rank. In addition to this conglomerate score, the rank score of all faculty in each category will also be documented. If there is SRC agreement regarding the combined rankings as well as the individual 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 rankings, the SRC will attempt to reach consensus through further deliberation. In the event that consensus cannot be reached by the SRC, the original rankings for the disputed case will form the basis for the final determination regarding the awarding and recommendation of Special Increases.

Award or Recommendation of Special increases: The SRC will establish an overall ranking of individuals and identify the categories for which the ranking is based (teaching, research and scholarly work, administration, public service, or full range of responsibilities). The highest ranked individuals will be identified and recognized through the award of a Special Increase and may be recommended to the CRC for an additional Special Increase. In the department of Biochemistry, two awards will be earmarked for meritorious service in Teaching, Administration, or Public Service. In the first instance, the two awards will be made for meritorious achievement in two different categories. If not possible, then the two awards can be made in one category. Two awards will also be earmarked for meritorious service in Research and Scholarly Work. In the case of a tie for a ranking in a particular category, the faculty member with the higher conglomerate score will be assigned the higher ranking in that category. Any unused awards in the designated categories described

above can be used for awards in any other category. The remainder of the awards will be distributed for meritorious achievement by faculty based on the overall rankings determined as described above. The monies awarded by the SRC can be half or full increments which will be determined by the salary committee based on the evidence provided for each particular case. As stipulated in Article 18.2.4.2 of the Collective Agreement, at least 2/3 of the available Special Increase monies awarded by the SRC will be in the form of full increments. The maximum award that can be provided to a faculty member by the SRC is one full increment.

The overarching guiding principles for awarding and recommending Special Increases will be:

- a) Requirements for the SRC to award one (1.0) or one-half (0.5) Special Increase:
 - Meritorious performance in at least one category (Section 5) with competency in all others that are applicable
- b) Requirements for the SRC to recommend the award of an additional Special Increase to the College Review Committee (i.e. in addition to an award at the Departmental level) requires:
 - Outstanding contribution in one or more of the five categories as per section 4 with competency in all others that are applicable
- c) Individuals who were deemed worthy of a Special Increase at the Department level but where there were insufficient funds available will be recommended by the SRC to the College Review Committee for a Special Increase.

5. Standards and Criteria for each Category

Note - for the four categories listed below, the faculty member has the primary responsibility for clearly documenting the basis for which the case is being made.

Research and Scholarly Work: The primary but not sole evidence to be used in assessing what is meritorious will be peer-reviewed publications and the award of new research grants. Generally, publications will carry more weight since they reflect what has been achieved with the grant money obtained while grant awards provide the faculty member with the opportunity to achieve research results. With respect to publications, their evaluation will include more than simply the number of publications and the impact factor of the journals. Other criteria to be used will be the role of the faculty member and their trainees on the paper (i.e. are they senior or corresponding author); and the size of the research team and resources that the faculty member has at their disposal i.e. some assessment of the "bang for the buck". The above will serve as guiding principles when making assessments of meritorious activity.

Some specific evidence will be recognized as being meritorious in this category. Receiving a research grant or salary support award from a tri-council agency and other peer-reviewed national funding organization (e.g. Heart & Stroke, Canadian Diabetes) will be considered to be meritorious, with the caveat being the role of the faculty member on

the grant (PI vs. co-applicant). Publication of a research paper in a top ranked journal in the field (e.g. Science, Nature, Cell, Molecular Cell) will generally be considered to be meritorious with the caveat being the role of the faculty member on the paper. Provincial, national or international awards in recognition of research achievements and/or research leadership will, in most circumstances, be considered meritorious. Patents/Invention reports may also contribute to excellence in this category.

Teaching: Evidence for meritorious teaching will include student and peer reviews. Teaching awards (e.g. USSU Teaching Excellence awards) will also be evidence of excellence. Other aspects that may contribute to recognition of meritorious performance are (i) significant contribution to curriculum/course development, and (ii) superior supervision of graduate students/postdoctoral fellows as judged by the Department Head, Graduate Chair or others.

Administration: To have demonstrated excellence, there must be clear evidence of an significant commitment of time and effort, of leadership or other noteworthy contributions to the administrative activities of the Department, College or University. Although not necessarily required, letters from department heads or committee chairs that outline the faculty member's contribution and impact may provide evidence used in assessment of meritorious activity.

Extra University Work and Public Service: Demonstrated excellence in public service will consist of performing a particular public service activity in a superior manner that are outside of assigned duties and are not performed for extra pay other than a nominal fee. Recognition of public service will occur insofar as such activity entails application of expertise or ability associated with the faculty member's area of expertise. Evaluation of excellence will be based on the contribution to public welfare and the effectiveness with which the individual's professional training, skills and judgment have been applied. Service to professional bodies will be evaluated on the basis of the number, duration and importance of offices held, participation in workshops and meetings, contribution of various types to professional journals, and extent of public relations activities which promote the faculty member's academic or professional body. Credit for involvement in international projects may be given under this category. Appropriate individuals must provide a statement in support of excellence by the faculty member.

6. Right of Appeal

A faculty member is entitled to appeal the decisions of the SRC and the CRC. Appeals are made to the President's Review Committee (PRC) in writing, and can be made on the basis of not receiving an award from the Department/College or if the award made is believed to be too low.

7. TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

**Proposed Standards for the Award of Special Increases for Faculty
Department of Community Health and Epidemiology
September 19, 2011**

1.0 Background

In each of the past five years the Department of Community Health and Epidemiology (CH&E) has determined the recommendations for the award of special increases for its faculty through a systematic, transparent and agreed-upon manner which included the following: voting by ballot by the faculty whether the review should be conducted by the head of the department or by a committee; compilation of data reported by faculty in Form 1 into a matrix that included the key measurement indicators in teaching and graduate student supervision, research and scholarly work, administration and committee work, and community service; development of a 'baseline' performance measures for department; and meeting between each faculty member and the head to review and communicate the recommendation that would be forwarded to the CRC.

Over the years, following this process we have debriefed at faculty meetings and identified improvements that we could make to the process. Two improvements introduced in recent years have been the following: include a data column in the matrix that captures what has been referred to as contextual or qualitative data, such as major achievements, challenges, or other notable citations that are not reported in any other data columns, and accounting for faculty seniority/rank (professor, associate professor/assistant professor) in developing baseline performance measures.

Given this experience in CH&E, the requirement to develop standards and procedures to evaluate Awards of Special Merit Increase is easily met by formalizing the practices we have followed in the past several years.

2.0 Purpose

This document sets out procedures to be followed in selecting the Departmental Salary Review Committee (DSRC), adjudication of merit, and communication with faculty and the Dean and the CRC regarding the outcome of review. We will debrief annually the procedures followed and if necessary make any improvements.

3.0 Selection of the Salary Review Committee

3.1 That a Departmental Salary Review Committee (DSRC) be established each year from the ranks of the tenured, tenure-track, or without term faculty in the department. The committee will comprise of at least the department head (chair), one senior faculty (drawn from the professorial rank), one junior faculty (drawn from associate or assistant professor ranks), and one member who served on the previous year's DSRC.

3.2 The selection will be done by unidentified ballots, where eligible faculty will vote for three from a list of candidates. Department head's secretary will receive and collate the votes.

4.0 Powers and Responsibilities of the DSRC

The following will be the responsibilities of the DSRC as set out in Article 17.4.1 of the 2010-2013 Collective Agreement.

- 4.1 To propose standards and procedures for the award of special merit increases.
- 4.2 To submit these standards and procedures to the CRC for approval.
- 4.3 To communicate these standards in writing to departmental faculty members.
- 4.4 To receive, rank and review the submissions of each faculty member, with the exception of the Head, and make awards of one-half or full Special Increase as judged appropriate.
- 4.5 To communicate decisions to the CRC.
- 4.6 To recommend to the CRC faculty who should receive a further Special Increase beyond that at the department level, and faculty who would have been awarded an increase had the Department had more funds.
- 4.7 To inform faculty members of the decisions, and to review the basis of the decisions.

5.0 Procedures and Evidence Base for Awarding and Recommending Special Merit Increases

5.1 By the announced due date faculty will provide their Form 1, Form 2 (if applicable), teaching dossier and any other supporting material to the department Head.

5.2 The department Head will review all submitted documents for each faculty member and mainly drawing from information provided in Form 1 and teaching dossier abstract relevant information and enter them into a data matrix with column headings in four main categories that will be reviewed: Teaching and student supervision, Research and scholarly work, Administrative and committee work, and Public service and contributions to academic and professional bodies. We will also capture any notable accomplishment or achievements or challenges in an additional column labelled 'Notable accomplishments or challenges' (qualitative information).

5.3 Based on the information collected in the data matrix, the Head will provide department's 'baseline' standards for indicators in each of the four areas under consideration: Teaching and student supervision, Research and scholarly work, Administrative and committee work, and Public service and contributions to academic and professional bodies. This baseline standard will represent the department faculty's overall performance in a given year. If faculty numbers permit, two sets of baseline standards will be calculated: one including senior faculty (professor rank), and one including those in associate and assistant professor ranks.

5.4 Each faculty's performance data in each of the four main categories will be compared to the appropriate standard or baseline performance. Any additional 'qualitative' information provided will also be taken into account. Based on this comparison the committee will adjudicate an award, or recommend, either one full-increment or one half-increment special increase.

5.5 In terms of time period under review, each faculty member will be considered under one of two options: last academic year (July 1 in a given year to June 30 of the following year), or cumulative period of time, retroactive to the last special increase merit award.

5.6 While the four categories set out in clause 5.3 are the main categories under consideration, given the nature of the Department and faculty expertise and their range of activities, it is the DSRC's responsibility to consider cases for possible merit under all of these categories set out in Article 17.2 of the 2010-2013 Collective Agreement. It is recognized that all evaluative instruments have limitations and that it is the sum of performance in one or more categories, taking into account the rank and career

path of the faculty, which is the determining factor. Periodic review of these procedures and standards, and revisions as necessary, will also ensure greater relevancy and applicability.

5.7 Member of DSRC will be excused when their own case is discussed. The DSRC may also exclude a member from deliberations of special cases due to perceived conflicts of interest.

5.8 All decisions by the DSRC will be made by consensus as much as possible. If necessary, a simple majority will indicate a decision.

6.0 Timeline

The timeline for considerations of the award of special merit increases is reproduced below.

- | | |
|---------|--|
| June 30 | Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2) |
| Sept 1 | Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case |
| Nov 30 | Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2) Department Salary Committee to have: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii) |
| Jan 31 | College Review Committees to have: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi) |
| Feb 28 | Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4) |
| Mar 31 | President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5) |

CH&E “benchmark” performance

| | Book Chap. (CV category 11) | Peer-reviewed papers (CV cat 12) | Non-peer reviewed papers (CV cat 13, 16) | Conference presentations/ Abstracts (CV cat 14, 15, 17, 19) | Invited lectures (CV cat 18) | Grants/contracts (CV cat 21) | Teaching hours (CV cat 9) | Students supervised/ Ctee membership (CV cat 10) | Administration/ Service (CV cat 25, 26, 27) |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| CH&E reference performance | .5 book chapters | 3+ papers total; 1.4 as first author | 1.4 total; 1 as first author | 4 – 5 conference presentations | 2 invited talks | 2.3 grants total; 1-2 as PI | 49 hrs of student contact | Primary supervisor for 2 MSc, 2 PhD | 1-2 dept, college committees 1-2 professional, community services |

Department of Academic Family Medicine

PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

As per USFA Section 17

Process & Department Committee structure will follow Article 17

All information to be included will be up to June 30th.

Please include CV, Teaching Dossier and Form 1

1. Formation of a Department Salary 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 Faculty Members of the Department. Eligible Faculty Members include those holding Probationary, Tenured, Continuing Status or Term Appointments if the term of the 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 Faculty Members 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 to be considered the Committee Member will excuse himself/herself from the proceedings of the Committee.

Procedure: During the first Academic Meeting of the current academic year, a discussion will be held to determine how members would like to constitute the Department's Salary Committee. Since the Department has clinical members, a medical Educator and scientist-researchers who are non-physician clinicians, representation from each group will be requested. All interested and eligible Faculty Members will be part of the Committee.

2. Preparation of a Form 1

The Annual Form 1 provides the basis for the yearly salary review. The CV and Teaching Dossier will provide support to the application of individuals requesting review on a cumulative basis.

The Annual Form 1 is the basis for the Salary Review. The following are basic guidelines to help clarify certain areas of the Form 1 to assist you in preparing the document so as to provide a clearer understanding of the work that you have undertaken over the past academic year.

A. Annotation

Include annotation in each applicable category which clearly indicates the percentage of the project (i.e. manuscript, Abstract, Oral Presentation; Poster Presentation; Grant, etc.) for which each Faculty Member is responsible. This should have been discussed and agreed to with the co-authors.

B. Teaching

Based on the Assignment of Duties, indicate the hours of teaching as follows – do not include hours for preparation (refer to Teaching Dossier)

- Teaching done outside of clinical activity e.g. Lectures, Small Group Teaching, Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Seminars, On-Line Teaching, Tutorials, Examination.

Department of Academic Family Medicine

- Teaching done associated with clinical activity e.g. Residents, JURSI, Undergraduates and/or others e.g. Nurse Practitioner Student.
- Teaching done that is associated with scholarly activity e.g. Undergraduate Course in Medicine, Undergraduate outside of Medicine, CLR 800.3, Graduate Course outside of Medicine, Supervision and/or Participation on a Graduate Committee of a MSc/PhD student or a Post-Doctoral Fellow.

C. Clinical Practice

Based on the Assignment of Duties, indicate the percentage of time spent in the Practice of Professional Skills (Section 23) providing clinical services:

- as a solo physician.
- with a learner (identifying the level of learner assists with identifying the time taken to facilitate the work being done).

Example: I spend 55% of my time in the practice of professional skills. I have a Resident/JURSI or undergraduate learner with me 90% of the time and I practice solo 10% of the time.

D. Administrative/Committee Work

Indicate your role on the committee – Chair/Co-Chair or Member. In addition to this, indicate the hours you actually spent attending committee meetings and in preparation.

Example: Member of the Executive of the Education Committee - attended 6 of 10 meetings for a total of nine hours and in addition to this I spent a total of 20 hours in preparation preparing Reports.

E. Scholarly Activity

Please see Internal Guide for Productivity related to Scholarly Activity (attached).

F. Awards or Honours

If a personal Award or Honour has been given in any category, provide a description of it by commenting on: whether or not the Award/Honour is from a local/national or international body; whether any financial award is attached to the Award/Honour; and, the significance of the Award/Honour. Awards and honours to students that you have supervised should be included for evaluation.

Example: Dr. Michael Krochak Award is selected by and awarded by the Saskatchewan College of Family Physicians. This award is intended to recognize an individual, group or organization that has made a significant contribution to Family Medicine in Saskatchewan. This contribution may have occurred through clinical, research, educational or administrative activities. The award is open to college members and non-members. It recognizes contributions made within the province or nationally.

It is the responsibility of the Department's Salary Committee to consider cases for possible merit under all of the categories set out in Article 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. The options for the time period are either the last academic year or a cumulative period of time, retroactive as far back as the last Merit Award. The number of years to base an Award on is at the discretion of the Committee. Evaluation of meritorious achievement will take into account the faculty member's Career Path and the Assignment of Duties.

Department of Academic Family Medicine

It is recognized that all evaluative instruments or rubrics have limitations and that it is the sum of performance in one or more categories which is the determining factor.

Note: Manuscripts that were identified as being “Accepted” in the previous academic year on the Form 1 should not be listed on the current academic year’s Form 1.

3. Determine if there is a category that you feel that you deserve to go forward for merit. The following categories will be considered. A letter or file must be prepared to support the Merit Award for the specific category.

17.2.1 Teaching - a Special Increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

* Rubric will be developed so that the elements evaluated will be transparent.

Requirements:

- current CV.
- Teaching Philosophy.
- current Teaching Dossier.
- A written description or explanation of the significance of the contributions should be included.
- Evaluations from students and peers over time.
- Awards/commendations/publications, course or teaching materials etc. to be attached if available.

Example: Consistent teaching with Student Evaluations above Average and Peer Evaluations above Average plus hours at/or above the average along with one or more of the following: an award, commendation, description of the course developed, teaching materials, Workshops/Seminars presented on Teaching and/or publications on teaching.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work. (Category 4) - A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the research and scholarly activities:

* Rubric developed. See Internal Guide for Productivity related to Scholarly Activities (attached).

▪ Publications.

Publications or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication is 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.

In order for “Accepted” papers to be considered, a letter or e-mail from the publisher confirming the article has been “Accepted” must be attached.

▪ 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 (iPod Apps) and patentable inventions.

- Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/competition.

Scholarships and/or Awards.

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills (Category 5) - a Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the practice of professional skills.

* Rubric will be developed so that the elements evaluated will be transparent.

The Department of Academic Family Medicine recognizes that the practice of Family Medicine encompasses both the Principles of Family Medicine and the Triple C Curriculum competencies; thus, the rubric that developed will include these aspects.

Example:

1. Clinical Practice.

Quality of Care as expected in an academic center which would include: participation in a quality assurance process; maintenance of competence; maintenance of an appropriate service load; willingness to participate in after hours or out of hours duties; communication and collaboration; provision of peer consultations and evaluations; participate fully as a team member; consultation with others related to the Residency Training Program; and, willingness to participate in intra/interdisciplinary prevention and management will be considered the standard.

Merit may be considered for:

- local, regional, provincial, national or international recognition.
- consistent provision of high quality care over many years as defined above including leadership roles e.g. Lifetime Contributions.

2. Scholarly Work/Activities.

- Publications: Merit may be award for publications in peer- reviewed journals above the average number or a publication that occurs while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties as compared with peers and adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- Evidence of the: scholarship of teaching and learning; curriculum development; Unpublished Work and/or Technical Reports; Presentations; research funding or institutional support for research as an individual or member of a program of research – consideration for contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties as compared with peers and adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- Scholarships and/or Awards.

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:

- 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.
- 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. A letter commenting on or substantiating meritorious work, from the Chair or other authority needs to be attached.

Example: a new program developed, a program proves successful and is adopted in other Departments or at other sites.

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.

4. Determination of Ranking within the Department

Rubrics will be developed similar to that which has been developed for Scholarly Activity which will reflect the activities in each category applicable to each Faculty Member as extracted from each Faculty Member's Form 1. A spreadsheet will also be developed and completed by the Department Salary Committee that will provide an aggregate of the activities of every Faculty Member regardless of the Category – 5.1a, 5.1b or 4.

A relative rating guide will be used that will take into account:

- Full or Part-Time Status.
- Rank (Tenured, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) will help determine where in the range of expected productivity they would fit.
- Career Path and Assignment of Duties will be reflected in the evaluation.
- Percentage of individual work involved in each project.
- Hours for teaching and administrative/committee work.
- Percentage of time spent in clinical activity (where appropriate)

The results of this approach will reflect those that are above the average/benchmark and who will subsequently be considered for the next phase of the salary review discussion. In addition to this, the Department Salary Committee will discuss the merits of each Faculty Member based on the case put forward in writing by the Faculty Member.

The Department Head will meet with each Faculty member to review the rationale.

This document will be reviewed annually to ensure that it continues to meet that which is outlined in the Collective Agreement and the expectations of the Department of Academic Family Medicine in the College of Medicine.

References:

1. University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association. Collective Agreement 2010-2013 between the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Saskatchewan's Faculty Association. Retrieved on September 18, 2011 from <http://www.usask.ca/vpacademic/pdf/USFA-2010-13.pdf>.
2. University of Saskatchewan. Standards for Merit in the Department of Community Health and Epidemiology – 2010. Saskatoon, SK: University of Saskatchewan.
3. University of Manitoba. Standards for Merit in the Department of Psychiatry – 2010. Winnipeg, MN: University of Manitoba.
4. University of Saskatchewan. Standards for Merit in the Department of Psychiatry – 2011. Saskatoon, SK: University of Saskatchewan.
5. University of Saskatchewan. Standards for Merit in the Department of Physiology – 2011. Saskatoon, SK: University of Saskatchewan.

Department of Academic Family Medicine

Internal Guide for Productivity related to Scholarly Activities (2 of 4 categories required)

| MEMBERS Scholarly Activity | 10% FTE | 10-25% | 25-50% | >50% FTE |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Publications | One publication per year in peer-reviewed journals with at least 30% of the article being contributed by the applicant. | 1-2 publications per year in peer-reviewed journals with at least 40% of one article being contributed by the applicant. | 2-3 publications per year in peer-reviewed journals with at least 50% of 2 articles being contributed by the applicant. | 3-5 publications per year in peer-reviewed journals with at least 50% of 2-3 articles being contributed by the applicant. |
| Unpublished Work/Technical Reports | Not required. | 1-2 Unpublished Work(s) and/or Technical Report which has academic merit e.g. patent, iPod App. | 2-3 Unpublished Work(s) and/or Technical Report which has academic merit e.g. patent, iPod App. | 3-5 Unpublished Work(s) and/or Technical Report which has academic merit e.g. patent, iPod App. |
| Presentations | Poster or Oral Presentation at a Provincial or National Conference. | 1-2 or more presentations (Poster and/or Oral) at a Provincial or National Conference. | 2-3 or more presentations (Poster or Oral) at a Provincial or National Conference. | 3 or more presentations (Poster or Oral) at Provincial, National or International Conferences. |
| Invited Lectures | An Invited Lecture at a Local Conference. | 1-2 Invited Lectures at a Local or National Level. | 2-3 or more Invited Presentations at a National or International Level. | 3 or more Invited Presentations at a National or International Level. |
| Supervision | Dean's Summer Student Research Project, Resident Research Projects and/or participation on a MSc and/or PhD Committee. | Supervision of a Resident Research Project and/or participation on a full-time or part-time Graduate Student Committee (MSc, PhD or a Post-Doc). | Supervision of a Resident Research Project and/or a full-time and/or part-time Graduate Students (MSc, PhD or a Post-Doc); as well as, other mentoring roles such as Faculty Development. | Supervision of one or more Resident Research Projects and/or a full-time and/or part-time Graduate Students (MSc, PhD or a Post-Doc); as well as, other mentoring roles such as Faculty Development. |
| Funding/Grants | Local or Regional Funding to support research projects. | Local or Regional Funding to support research projects. | One or more National Agencies with possible funding from Local and/or Regional Agencies. | One or more National Agencies with possible funding from Local and/or Regional Agencies. |

Documentation required by Clinical Faculty and PhDs depending upon the time allocated to Scholarly Activity

1. Current CV.
2. Copies of Publication, Unpublished Work and/or Technical Reports, Abstracts etc.
3. List of Invited Lectures/Presentations.
4. List of those being Supervised related to Scholarly/Research Activities.
5. Funding/Grants Awarded.

Department of Academic Family Medicine

Timeline for SALARY REVIEW Procedures

To be completed by:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Article 17.2).
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case.
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Article 17.5.2)
- Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Article 17.4.1 iii)
 - recommended and made awards (Article 17.4.1 iii)
 - submitted recommendations to the College Review Committee (Article 17.4.1 iv)
 - recommend to the College Review Committee for additional Special Increases for eligible and who have also been awarded a Special Increase by the Department Salary Committee and who may merit an additional award (Article 17.4 v)
 - recommend to the College Review Committee for additional Special Increases for eligible and to whom the Department Salary Committee would have awarded Special Increases except that the committee had insufficient funds available to make such an award (Article 17.4 vi)
 - submit to the College Review Committee those Faculty Members who were not awarded or recommended for a Special Increase and the justification for the salary action (Article 17.4 vii)
 - inform Faculty Members of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (Article 17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Articles 17.4.4. v & vi; 17.5.4)
 - made awards (Article 17.4.4. vi & vii)
 - submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Article 17.4.4. viii)
 - informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (Article 17.4.4. ix)
 - informed Departmental Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Article 17.4.4. x)
 - submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Article 17.4.4. xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department's Salary Committee or the College's Review Committee must submit the appeal to the Secretary of the President's Review Committee (Article 17.5.5; Article 17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Article 17.4.5)



Department of Medical Imaging

PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

As per 2010-2013 USFA Collective Agreement Section 17

All information to be included will be up to June 30th.

Please include CV, Teaching Dossier and Form 1

1. Preparation of Form 1

The Form I is the basis for Salary review. The following are basic guidelines to help clarify certain areas of the Form I to help with clearer understanding of the work undertaken.

- a. Include annotation in each applicable category which clearly indicates the **percentage of the project** (ie. paper, poster, abstract, presentation, grant) that you were responsible for. This should be discussed with the co-authors.
- b. Indicate **Teaching hours** as follows – do **not** include hours for preparation (refer to Teaching Dossier)
 - i. Teaching done **outside of clinical activity** ie. didactic lectures, tutorials
 - ii. Teaching done **associated with clinical activity** ie. resident/jursi supervision
 1. Resident – 6 month rotation ~ 80 days available for clinic full-time (excluding academic day, holidays, study week, post call)
 2. Jursi – 6 week rotation ~ 20 days available
 - iii. Teaching done **associated with supervision** ie MSc, PhD, PDF
- c. Indicate the **percentage of time spent in clinical work** in section 23 A – Practice of Professional Skills
- d. **Administrative/Committee Work**
 - i. Indicate hours spent in committee meetings and separately in preparation
 - ii. Indicate role in committee – chair or member
- e. **Awards**
 - i. If an award has been given in any category provide a description of the source, local/national, any financial award and the significance.

Documentation for merit can be based on either:

1. The past year – based on Form 1
2. Cumulative evidence since the last merit award - this will require documentation from prior years.

Merit should preferably be requested based on one category.

Department of Medical Imaging

2. Determine if there is a category that you feel that you deserve to go forward for merit. The following categories will be considered. A letter or file must be prepared to support the merit award for the specific category.

17.2.1 Teaching. A Special Increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

Requirements: 1) CV 2) teaching philosophy 3) teaching dossier 4) a written description of explanation of the significance of the contributions should be included 5) Evaluations from students and peers 6) Awards/ commendations/publications, course or teaching materials etc. if available.

Example: Consistent teaching with student evaluations above average and peer evaluation above average plus hours at/or above the average along with one or more of the following: an award, commendation, course developed, teaching materials, publications on teaching or workshops presented on teaching.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work. (Category 4) 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.

In order for "Accepted" papers to count, letters from the publisher confirming the article has been accepted must be attached.

(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.

Example: The number of PostDoc's, PhD and MSc students will determine an average/expected number of publications. Merit may be awarded for numbers above the average/expected and will include overall contribution, reputation of journal.

Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/competition.

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the practice of professional skills.

Examples:

a) Clinical Practice:

Quality of Care as expected in an academic center, participation in quality assurance process, maintenance of competence, maintain an appropriate service load; willingness to participate in out of hours duties; provision of peer consultation, communication and collaboration; consultation with colleagues beyond the base practice; consultation to service organizations relevant to their program; willingness to participate in multidisciplinary care delivery will be considered the standard.

Merit may be considered for:

- Regional, provincial, national or international recognition.
- Consistent provision over many years of high quality care as defined above including leadership roles ie. Lifetime contributions.

Department of Medical Imaging

b) Scholarly Work:

- a. Publications: Merit may be award for publications in peer reviewed journals above the average number or a publication that occurs while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- b. Evidence of research funding or institutional support for research as an individual or major member of program based practice – consideration of contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers/adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- c. Scholarship Awards:

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.

A letter commenting on or substantiating meritorious work, from the Chair or another authority needs to be attached. Example: a new program developed, a program proves successful and is adopted by other places.

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.

Department of Medical Imaging

3. Determination of Ranking within the Department

A spreadsheet will be completed that will record the activities in each category as outlined in each individual's Form I. A relative rating guide will be used that will take into account:

- The individual's full or part-time status
- The individual's rank will help determine where in the range of expected productivity they would fit
- The career path and assignment of duties will be reflected in evaluation
- Percentage of individual work involved in each project
- Hours for teaching and committee work
- Percentage of time spent in clinical activity (where appropriate)

The results of this algorithm will provide an overall point system which will be averaged among members. Those members who are above the average/benchmark will be considered for the next phase of salary review discussion. There will also be expected guidelines in place for research and teaching categories.

The salary review committee will discuss the individual merits based on the case put forward in writing by the individual.

The Department Head will meet with each Faculty member to review the rationale.

4. Department Salary Committee

The Department Salary Committee structure will follow Article 17.3.1. For this initial year, the committee shall consist of all eligible faculty members.

References:

1. USFA Agreement
2. Community Health and Epidemiology Standards for Merit 2010
3. Department of Psychiatry, University of Manitoba, (Sareen, 2010)

Department of Medical Imaging

Internal Guide for Research Productivity

Documentation:

1. Updated CV
2. Grant Support and Current Submissions
3. List of Research Trainees
4. Copies of Publication, Abstracts etc

This will be used for clinical faculty and PhD's depending on the research time allotment.

| MEMBERS RESEARCH | < 20% FTE (2 of 4 categories required) | 25-50% | 50-75% | >75% FTE |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Funding | Local or regional funding to support research assistant or conduct clinical projects | Local or regional funding to support research assistant or conduct clinical projects | One or more national agencies with possible funding from local source | One or more national agencies with possible funding from local source |
| Supervision | Dean's research project MSc or PhD committee | Supervision of full-time or part-time research trainee | Supervision of at least one full-time research trainee | One or more research trainees along with additional part-time trainees |
| Publication | 1-2 per year in peer reviewed journals – should have at least 50% of the role in 1 article | 1-3 per year with at least 1 article in which there has been >50% input by applicant | 2-4 per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant | 3-5 papers per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant |
| Presentation | Poster or paper presentation at local or national level | 1-2 presentations at national level | 1-3 presentations at national level | 1-3 presentations at national level |

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

Department of Medicine

PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

As per USFA 2010-2013 Collective Agreement Section 17

Faculty to submit an updated CV, Teaching Dossier and Form 1
(all information up to June 30th)

1. Formation of Department Salary 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.

Procedure: The current Department Salary Committee is comprised of eight members (19% of the membership) plus the Department Head who is chair. The Department Head sought volunteers who were asked to serve for two years. The members represent three professors, three associate professors and two assistant professors. When the term is complete, they either withdraw and a member of equal rank is sought or they may serve another term.

2. Preparation of Form 1

The Form I is the basis for Salary review. The following are basic guidelines to help clarify certain areas of the Form I to help with clearer understanding of the work undertaken.

- a. Narrative indicating the **percentage of the project** that you contributed.
- b. Indicate **Teaching hours** (hours of your time; exclude preparation time)
 - i. Teaching **outside of clinical activity** - didactic lectures, tutorials
 - ii. Teaching done **with clinical activity**
 1. Use the hours per Define teaching hours in the DoM Merit Increase Assessment form
 - iii. Teaching **associated with supervision** ie MSc, PhD, PDF
- c. Indicate the **percentage of time spent in clinical work** in section 23 A – Practice of Professional Skills
Use percentage from Assignment of Duties
- d. **Administrative/Committee Work**
 - i. Use as outlined in 6. Administration from Merit Report Form
 - ii. Indicate role in committee – chair or member

Department of Medicine

e. Awards

- i. If an award has been given in any category provide a description of the source, local/national, and financial award and the significance.

Documentation for merit can be based on either:

1. The past year – based on Form 1
2. Cumulative evidence since the last merit award - this will require documentation from prior years.

Merit should preferably be requested based on one category.

Procedure:

The DoM process will be based on the Merit Report Form score that include teaching, research, administration, and extension. Since we have not developed a process for assessing clinical performance, this will not be directly included. Indirectly it will be considered. For example, if the Merit Report Form raw score is equal for one faculty with 25% clinical time to another faculty with 50% clinical, the assigned score for 50% clinical faculty will be higher. The reason for this is that the score was obtained with less time to teaching, research, administration, and extension.

2. Determine if there is a category that you feel that you deserve to go forward for merit. The following categories will be considered. *A letter or file must be prepared to support the merit award for the specific category.*

17.2.1 **Teaching.** (Category 2) A Special Increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

Requirements: 1) CV 2) teaching philosophy 3) teaching dossier 4) a written description of explanation of the significance of the contributions should be included 5) Evaluations from students and peers 6) Awards/ commendations/publications, course or teaching materials etc if available.

Example: Consistent teaching with student evaluations above average and peer evaluation above average plus hours at/or above the average along with one or more of the following: an award, commendation, course developed, teaching materials, publications on teaching or workshops presented on teaching.

Procedure:

In the interests of objectivity and concision, teaching philosophy and an explanation of significance of teaching contribution will not be considered by the DoM.

Again, as in 1. above, the DoM review will be based on the total contribution from Teaching, Research, Administration, and Extension.

17.2.2 **Research and Scholarly Work.** (Category 4) 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.

In order for "Accepted" papers to count, letters from the publisher confirming the article has been accepted must be attached.

(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.

Department of Medicine

Example: The number of PostDoc's, PhD and MSc students will determine an average/expected number of publications. Merit may be awarded for numbers above the average/expected and will include overall contribution, reputation of journal. Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/competition.

Procedure:

The distinction that the DSC will make are PI or CoI in peer reviewed grants or non-peer reviewed grants.

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills. (Category 5) A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the practice of professional skills.

Examples:

a) *Clinical Practice:*

Quality of Care as expected in an academic center, participation in quality assurance process, maintenance of competence, maintain an appropriate service load; willingness to participate in out of hours duties; provision of peer consultation, communication and collaboration; consultation with colleagues beyond the base practice; consultation to service organizations relevant to their program; willingness to participate in multidisciplinary care delivery will be considered the standard.

Merit may be considered for:

- Regional, provincial, national or international recognition.
- Consistent provision over many years of high quality care as defined above including leadership roles ie. Lifetime contributions.

Procedure:

- a. Merit for clinical practice has not been separately defined. Merit will be covered in Awards such as SMA Clinician of the Year. Therefore clinical practice is not included in arriving at the final score.
- b. By definition the AoD will be in line with Career Path. Since we have not developed a process for assessing clinical performance, this will not be directly included. Indirectly it will be considered. For example, if the Merit Report Form raw score for one faculty with 25% clinical time is equal to another faculty with 50% clinical, the assigned score for 50% clinical faculty will be higher. The reason for this is that the score was obtained with less time for teaching, research, administration, and extension.

b) *Scholarly Work:*

- a. Publications: Merit may be award for publications in peer reviewed journals above the average number or a publication that occurs while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- b. Evidence of research funding or institutional support for research as an individual or major member of program based practice – consideration of contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers/adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- c. Scholarship Awards:

Procedure:

The DoM will evaluate as outlined in the Merit Report Form Section 4.

Department of Medicine

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.

Procedure: As outlined in the Merit Report Form Section 7.

17.2.5 Administrative Work. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee with administrative duties.

A letter commenting on or substantiating meritorious work, from the Chair or another authority needs to be attached. Example: a new program developed, a program proves successful and is adopted by other places.

Procedure: As outlined in the Merit Report Form Section 6.

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.

Procedure:

This is not part of the Merit Assessment Form but will be considered separately when noted on Form 1.

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.

Procedure:

This is not part of the Merit Assessment Form but will be considered separately when noted on Form 1.

This is determined by the salary gap between the UoS salary and the offer of employment.

| | |
|---------------|--------|
| <\$60,000 | 5 CDI |
| \$60-79,000 | 6 CDI |
| \$ 80-99,000 | 7 CDI |
| \$100-119,000 | 8 CDI |
| \$120-140,000 | 9 CDI |
| >\$140,000 | 10 CDI |

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.

Procedure

The total number as defined on the Merit Assessment Form will determine recommendations for increases.

Department of Medicine

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.

Procedure

If in the opinion of the DSC, there is accumulated merit over a sustained period, a special increase may be recommended. For example, if some faculty have contributed to the Department's activities but not been recognized, for example, sustained high quality teaching that has not been previously recognized are awarded or sustained high quality administration such as a training program directors that either maintained full accreditation or went from probation to full accreditation.

3. Determination of Ranking within the Department

A spreadsheet will be completed that will record the activities in each category as outlined in each individuals' Form 1. A relative rating guide will be used that will take into account:

- The individuals full or part-time status
- The individuals rank will help determine where in the range of expected productivity they would fit
- The Career Path and Assignment of Duties will be reflected in evaluation
- Percentage of individual work involved in each project
- Hours for teaching and type of committee work
- Percentage of time spent in clinical activity as outlined in Assignment of Duties.

The results of this algorithm will provide an overall point system which will be averaged by rank of members. Those members who are above the average will be recommended for a special increase. The guidelines include teaching, research, administration, and extension. Clinical practice will not be directly considered.

The salary review committee will discuss the individual merits based on the case put forward in Form 1. All faculty Form 1 reports will be reviewed by the DSC. Each of the eight members of the DSC will review about 5 faculty reports. After the individual review, each report will be reviewed subsequently by the who DSC for a final recommendation.

The Department Head will meet with each Faculty member to review the report, the process, and the result after the DSC has made its recommendation.

Department of Medicine

Internal Guide for Research Productivity

Documentation:

1. Current CV
2. Grant Support and Current Submissions
3. List of Research Trainees
4. Copies of Publication, Abstracts etc

This will be used for clinical faculty and PhD's depending on the research time allotment.

| MEMBERS RESEARCH | < 20% FTE (2 of 4 categories required) | 25-50% | 50-75% | >75% FTE |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Funding | Local or regional funding to support research assistant or conduct clinical projects | Local or regional funding to support research assistant or conduct clinical projects | One or more national agencies with possible funding from local source | One or more national agencies with possible funding from local source |
| Supervision | Dean's research project MSc or PhD committee | Supervision of full-time or part-time research trainee | Supervision of at least one full-time research trainee | One or more research trainees along with additional part-time trainees |
| Publication | 1-2 per year in peer reviewed journals – should have at least 50% of the role in 1 article | 1-3 per year with at least 1 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant | 2-4 per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant | 3-5 papers per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant |
| Presentation | Poster or paper presentation at local or national level | 1-2 presentations at national level | 1-3 presentations at national level | 1-3 presentations at national level |

September 2011 (Final)

Department of Medicine

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

- By:**
- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)



Department of Microbiology and Immunology

Standards for Salary Review and the Award of Special Increases

1. Composition of the Salary Review Committee (SRC)

The SRC will consist of three Departmental faculty members and the Head, as allowed by Article 17.3.1 of the Collective Agreement. Where possible, each of the three members will be from the different ranks of Assistant, Associate and Full Professor. Members will be chosen each year by lot, and will be exempt from serving for a further two years, unless a lack of members does not allow this. The department may, in exceptional circumstances, select two members from the same rank.

Conflict of Interest Members will be excused when their own case is discussed. The committee may also exclude a member from deliberations of special cases due to perceived conflicts of interest.

2. Powers and Responsibilities of the SRC

as outlined in Article 17.4.1 of the Collective Agreement

- (i) To propose standards of performance for the award of special merits
- (ii) To submit these standards to the CRC for approval,
- (iii) To communicate these standards in writing to departmental Faculty
- (iv) To receive, rank and review the submissions of each Faculty member, besides the Head, and make awards of one-half or full Special Increase (SI) as judged appropriate
- (v) To submit decisions to CRC
- (vi) To recommend to CRC faculty who should receive a further special increase beyond that of the department, and faculty who would have been awarded an increase had the Department had more funds
- (vii) To submit to CRC a list of those not recommended for SI together with a justification
- (viii) To inform Faculty of decisions, and to indicate the basis of the decisions

4. SRC Procedures for awarding and recommending special increases

The following considerations will guide the deliberations and decisions of the SRC in awarding or recommending special increases.

Awards of, or recommendations for, SI are made on the basis of excellence in one or more categories defined by the Collective Agreement. The four *categories* most pertinent to our department are (i) Research and Scholarly Work, (ii) Teaching, (iii) Administrative Work, (iv) Extra University Work and Public Service. Although these four categories are emphasized given the nature of the Department range of activities, the Department Salary Committee will consider cases for possible merit under all of the categories set out in Article 17.2.

The faculty members' rank, career path and assignment of duties will be taken into account. Standards will be higher for tenured than for non-tenured faculty, and for Full Professors than for Assistant Professors.

Faculty members are responsible for providing the information on which awards are based, by providing a completed Form 1, an updated CV, teaching dossier, and other supporting material.

Awards of SI require excellence in at least one category, and such an assessment must be substantiated by documentation.

Assessment of merit will be based on either the last academic year or a cumulative period of time, retroactive as far back as the last merit award.

Distribution of information The Head will circulate to SRC members the CV update(s), the Teaching Portfolio, which contains student and/or peer teaching evaluations, and any supporting material provided by the faculty. The Head will also circulate information from previous years, up to a maximum of three, in those cases where an award can be made on the basis of accumulated merit. Prior to the meeting of the SRC, the department head will review each case and determine if any clarification is required from the faculty member in question.

Ranking Procedure: The committee will first review the contributions of all Faculty members, in an attempt to discover and resolve highly disparate views. The committee members will identify those faculty who are to be considered for merit on an accumulated basis. The committee members will then score the faculty on a scale of 1 to 10 in each category, a score of 5 reflecting an average performance in that category. The average score for each faculty member in each of the categories will be calculated, and then multiplied by a weighting factor as follows: Research and Scholarly Work, 0.4; Teaching, 0.3; Administration, 0.2, Public Service, 0.1. The sum of these four weighted scores constitutes the aggregate score. The aggregate score depends upon scores in all categories and provides an assessment of merit over all four categories. The rank score of all faculty in each category will also be documented. Here the score represents merit in one category.

Award or Recommendation of Special increases: The SRC will establish an overall ranking of individuals and identify the categories for which the ranking is based (teaching, research and scholarly work, administration, public service, or all categories). The individuals with the highest

aggregate scores will be recognized through the award of a Special Increase. In addition, the SRC may make awards to individuals excelling in one, or even two categories, as shown by their score ranking in one category. These individuals may also be recommended to the CRC for an additional Special Increase.

Awards based upon a high score in a particular category are important in a particular context. It is departmental policy that newly recruited Faculty do little teaching or administrative duties in their first two years of service. It is inevitable in these cases that aggregate score will be low. In practice, merit in these circumstances is usually based solely upon the category of research and scholarly work. As stipulated in Article 18.2.4.2 of the Collective Agreement, at least 2/3 of the available Special Increase monies awarded by the SRC will be in the form of full increments. The maximum award that can be provided to a faculty member by the SRC is one full increment. Recommendation for the award of additional SI to the CRC will be made on the basis of outstanding performance in one or more categories. In addition, individuals who were deemed worthy of a Special Increase at the Department level, but where there were insufficient funds for such an award, will be recommended by the SRC to the College Review Committee for a Special Increase.

5. Standards and Criteria for each Category

Research and Scholarly Work: The assessment of merit will be primarily but not solely based upon peer-reviewed publications and the award of new research grants. The current holding of a tri-council or similarly competitive grant will also be considered to be of merit. The evaluation of publications will take into account not just their number but their scientific significance, partially reflected in the prominence of the journal in which the publication occurs (impact factor and/or ranking within specialty), the role of the faculty member in the publication, as for example reflected in being corresponding author, and whether the faculty member's trainees played a major role in the research/publication. The awarding of national and international prizes will be considered meritorious, as well as invited presentations at academic institutions and conferences. Patents and invention reports will also be considered in this category.

Teaching: Evidence for merit in this category, for the teaching of courses that are not substantially new, will include student and/or peer evaluations. Student evaluation scores must be above the average for all faculty in the department in order for student evaluations on their own to be evidence of meritorious achievement. Teaching awards will also be evidence of excellence. In addition, merit can only be awarded once for superior teaching of the same course/set of courses within a period of four years unless the faculty member receives a teaching award.

Awards can also be made under this category on the basis of meritorious performance in developing new courses or curricula. In these cases, the faculty member should provide material that attests to the novelty and significance of the new courses and curricula and, if possible, evaluations of its appreciation by students and/or peers. Awards can also be made on the basis of superior supervision of graduate students/postdoctoral fellows. Evidence of such superior supervision includes high quality publications in which the graduate student/PDF has made major contributions, and presentation by such individuals at conferences. Written statements as to the basis of a superior performance by the Department Head, Graduate Chair or others, can be

considered.

Administration: There must be clear evidence of a significant commitment of time and effort, of leadership or other noteworthy contributions to the administrative activities of the Department, College or University, for an award to be made. Evidence may be provided by letters from department heads or committee chairs that outline the faculty member's contribution.

Extra University Work and Public Service: Demonstrated excellence in public service will consist of performing a particular public service activity in a superior manner that are outside of assigned duties and are not performed for extra pay other than a nominal fee. Pertinent examples of such public service are being members of grant or scholarship panels, reviewing journal articles and editorial activities associated with a scientific journal, and being an external examiner of Graduate Theses. Recognition of public service will occur insofar as such activity entails application of expertise or ability associated with the faculty member's area of expertise. Evaluation of excellence will be based on the contribution to public welfare and the effectiveness with which the individual's professional training, skills and judgment have been applied. Service to professional bodies will be evaluated on the basis of the number, duration and importance of offices held, participation in workshops and meetings, contribution of various types to professional journals, and extent of public relations activities which promote the faculty member's academic or professional body. Credit for involvement in international projects may be given under this category. Appropriate individuals must provide a statement in support of excellence by the faculty member.

6. Right of Appeal

A faculty member is entitled to appeal the decisions of the SRC and the CRC. Appeals are made to the President's Review Committee (PRC) in writing, and can be made on the basis of not receiving an award from the Department/College or if the award made is believed to be too low.

7. Important Dates

See TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE of the College of Medicine Review Committee (appended).

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- awarded one-half or full merit where appropriate (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards where appropriate (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)



Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences
PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

As per USFA Section 17

Process & Department Committee structure will follow Article 17

All information to be included will be up to June 30th.

Please include CV, Teaching Dossier and Form 1

1. Preparation of Form 1

The annual Form 1 provides the basis for yearly salary review. The CV and teaching dossier will provide support to the application of individuals requesting review on a cumulative basis.

This review will be undertaken by a committee of the Department elected by and from its members who are required to complete a Form 1 on an annual basis. In a small department, all members may be requested to participate.

The following are basic guidelines to help clarify certain areas of the Form 1 to assist you in preparing the document so as to provide a clearer understanding of your involvement in departmental activities to the members of the committee involved in the salary review.

With regard to research and scholarly work, a faculty member's application for award of special merit would reflect the category under which his/her application for tenure and promotion would occur. Category 4 (Research and Scholarly Work) would generally apply to a PhD and category 5 (Practice of Professional Skills) would generally apply to an MD. A faculty member could receive an award under one category or the other, but not both.

A. Research and Scholarly Work

Include annotation and a percentage in each applicable category to clearly indicate your contribution to the project (i.e. paper, poster, abstract, presentation and grant). The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) guidelines for authorship should assist you in determining your contribution. The accumulated total percentage contribution of all participants on any project should not exceed 100%.

B. Teaching Activity

Indicate teaching contributions and time commitment in the form of lectures, small group teaching, seminars, problem based learning (PBL) sessions, examination supervision for:

- a. Undergraduate medicine

- b. JURSI program
- c. Postgraduate medicine
- d. Undergraduate courses outside of medicine
- e. MSc or PhD programs and
- f. other

Indicate contributions and time commitment to clinical teaching in:

- a. office setting
- b. operating theatre
- c. on-call
- d. rotation supervision
- e. other

C. Practice of Professional Skills

From your assignment of duties forms estimate the percentage of professional time you spend providing clinical care:

- a. without a learner
- b. with a learner

Example: I spend 55% of my time in the practice of professional skills. I have a learner with me 90% of the time and I have no learner with me 10% of the time.

D. Administrative/Committee Work

Indicate your role on the committee – chair or member. Indicate the hours you actually spent attending committee meetings and in preparation.

Example: Member of the Surgical Operations Committee - attended 3 of 10 meetings for a total of 4 and 1/2 hours for which I spent a total of 2 hours of prep time.

E. Awards or Honours

If a personal award or honour has been given in any category provide a description of it, a comment on local/national/international body, define the nominating committee and indicate the significance of the award. Awards and honours to students you supervise should be included for evaluation.

Example: Council of Resident Education in Obstetrics and Gynecology (CREOG) teaching award selected by the residents of our local program recognizing excellence in education provided by me to them. This award is provided annually through CREOG to which our Department is a member.

2. The following categories may be considered for recognition of special merit increase or portion thereof. A personal letter acknowledging your extraordinary contribution(s) must be provided to assist the committee in understanding the value of your work to the Department, the College, the University or other bodies (provincial, national and international).

17.2.1 Teaching. (Category 2)

A special merit may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

Document requirements to be provided by the candidate for consideration: 1) updated teaching philosophy; 2) teaching dossier; 3) written description of the significance of the contribution(s); 4) student and peer evaluations; and 5) description of any award(s) received.

Example: Teaching with student and peer evaluations noting above average contributions; an award or special commendation recognizing outstanding contribution; course or teaching material development or modification; publications: or workshops presented on teaching.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work (Category 4)

A special merit may be awarded for excellence in the research and scholarly work.

Document requirements to be provided by the candidate for consideration: 1) updated research and scholarly philosophy; 2) research and scholarly dossier; 3) written description of the significance of the contribution(s); 4) description of any award(s) received. These contributions require the year of completion for them to be considered.

A. Publications and Presentations

- (i) **Peer reviewed publication(s)**
- (ii) **Non-peer reviewed publication(s):** These articles will carry less weight as they are not peer reviewed.
- (iii) **Invited paper(s) in published conference proceedings**
- (iv) **Contributed paper(s) in published conference proceedings and abstracts**
- (v) **Technical reports relevant to academic field**
- (vi) **Book contribution(s): published, chapters in, reviews**
- (vii) **Invited lecture(s) and presentation(s)**
- (viii) **Non-invited contributions to conferences**

B. Research

- (i) **Peer reviewed grants (e.g. CIHR)**
- (ii) **Non-peer reviewed (e.g. industry sponsored)**
- (iii) **Patents and copyrights granted**
- (iv) **Thesis (es) supervision completion**
- (v) **Resident research collaboration/supervision**
- (vi) **Summer student research supervision**

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills (Category 5)

A special merit or portion thereof may be awarded for excellence in the practice of professional skills exceeding the standards as determined by the Department, the Saskatoon Health Region. Document requirements to be provided by the candidate for consideration: 1) updated professional skills dossier; 2) written description of the significance of the contribution(s); 3) description of any award(s) received.

Documentation of the standards will aid in support of the notion the standards have been exceeded.

These contributions will be considered in the year of contribution.

A. Clinical Practice:

Quality of care is expected to meet policies and procedures of the Department, the Region and the Province.

Example: Active participation as a member of quality assurance and safety programs or quality improvement projects will be considered as exceeding standards.

B. Continuing/Ongoing Medical Education

The maintenance and development of professional skills and knowledge is the standard of care. Proof of this may be provided by proof of attendance at meetings and the professional development record from the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada.

Example: Accepted invitations to present at professional meetings and (re)certification and training of colleagues in practice will be considered as exceeding the standards.

C. Scholarly Work:

Scholarly work should be linked to your profession or discipline and should be undertaken with the expectation of presentation to peers, acceptance by the broader educational community and publication in reputable peer reviewed literature so as to share the work with other members of the professional and academic communities.

Example: Development of guidelines for professional care, review(s) of grants, case reports, curricular development, and reviews of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals may be considered for special merit. (See 5.2 Scholarly Work)

17.2.4 Extra University Work and Public Service (Category 7)

A special merit may be awarded for excellence in the University Work and Public Service.

Document requirements to be provided by the candidate for consideration: 1) updated university work and public service section of CV; 2) written description of the significance of the contribution(s); 3) description of any award(s) received; and 4) letters of support from senior members of a committee, community or service organization supporting the individual's claim. These contributions will be considered in the year of completion.

(i) Extra work and public service will be considered in this category only if it falls outside of the assigned duties of the employee as specified in the employee's letter of appointment. Employees in clinical departments will not merit a special increase or portion thereof for any assigned extension of clinical work; and

(ii) Extra work done for additional pay or stipend will not satisfy the criterion for consideration in this category.

17.2.5 Administrative Work (Category 6)

A special merit or portion thereof may be awarded for excellence in Administrative Work.

Document requirements to be provided by the candidate for consideration: 1) updated administrative dossier; 2) written description of the significance of the contribution(s); 3) letter substantiating meritorious work from the chair or a senior leader of the appropriate constituency

familiar with the candidate's work; and 4) description of any award(s) received. These contributions will be considered in the year of completion.

The standards for participation in administrative work is to prepare for, attend at and contribute to meetings of committees to which you are assigned to or volunteered for.

A special merit may be considered with exceptional contributions as a member or chair of a committee or committees.

Example: Involvement in the development and integration of a new program that proves successful in improving patient care or personnel work environment would be considered as an exceptional contribution to administration.

17.2.7 Improvement in Academic Qualifications

All members of the Department are expected to maintain academic qualifications by completing the appropriate updates in clinical care, education and research as they develop.

A special merit may be awarded to an individual who improves his/her academic qualifications program or course recognized by the granting of a degree or specialized certificate of achievement.

Example: The completion of a university program that grants an MSc or PhD or a series of courses granting a certificate for leadership in education or administration.

17.2.8 Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

Special merits will be awarded to any employee who declines an offer of employment in writing from a comparable institution. Evidence of the declined offer must accompany the application.

17.2.9 Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties

A special merit or portion thereof may be considered for an employee demonstrating excellence in performance of assigned duties through the combination of three or more categories listed above. The Department Salary Review Committee must determine the appropriateness of such an award from the documentation provided

17.2.10 Improvement and Development

A special merit may be awarded to an employee demonstrating significant improvement or development in the categories listed above for reasons acceptable to the Department Salary Review Committee. This would most appropriately fall into provision of an award based on documentation of cumulative evidence.

3. Determination of Ranking within the Department

This is a complex undertaking in our Department due to the mix of clinicians (MD in Category 5) and researchers (PhD in Category 4). Evaluation of meritorious achievement will take into account the faulty member's rank, career path and assignment of duties. A spreadsheet will

record of ranking from 1 to 5 of the activities in each category for each individual from the information provided on his/her Form 1. A relative rating guide will be used to rank contributions to:

- Teaching
- Research and scholarly activity
- Practice of professional skills
- Administration
- University work and public service

The results of this algorithm will provide an overall point grade with a range of 5 to 40 for each individual. An average will be determined using the total of the point grades divided by the number of members. Those whose point grade is above the average/benchmark or who meet the criteria for special merit increase will be considered in the salary review discussion.

The Department Head will provide each member of the Department with a written notice of the outcome from the Salary Review Committee and afterwards meet face to face with each Faculty member to review the recommendation.

References:

1. USFA Agreement
2. Community Health and epidemiology Standards for Merit 2010
3. Department of Psychiatry, University of Manitoba, (Sareen, 2010)
4. Department of Psychiatry, University of Saskatchewan 2010

Documentation:

1. Updated and current CV
2. Updated Form 1
3. Teaching dossier
4. Administrative dossier
5. Letter(s) of support
6. Copies of publications, abstracts, etc.

| RANKING | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|-----------------|---|---|--|---|
| Teaching - 1 (Undergraduate) | Meets standards | Teaching in phase B/C course with professional skills program or JURSI lecture series | Teaching in phase B/C course and professional skills program and JURSI lecture series | Course Coordinator | Course curriculum development |
| Teaching – 2 (Postgraduate and other) | Meets standards | Director of CME/OME <u>or</u> Academic half-day teaching (2 or more/year) | Provincial conference program director or course coordinator | National subspecialty conference presentation invitation or course coordinator | Program director of PG program <u>or</u> International conference presentation invitation or course coordinator |
| Research And Scholarly Activity – 1 (Funding) | Meets standards | Non peer reviewed funding | Minor agency peer reviewed funding | CIHR funding as co PI <u>or</u> Industry sponsored research | CIHR or equivalent grant agency funding as PI |
| Research And Scholarly Activity – 2 (Supervision) | Meets standards | Summer student supervision | Resident research supervision | MSc or PhD Committee supervisor | MSc or PhD supervisor |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
| Research And Scholarly Activity – 3 (Publications) | Meets standards | non-peer reviewed publication(s) | peer reviewed publication in minor journal | peer reviewed publication in one major journal or book chapter | 2 or more peer reviewed publications in major journal(s) or complete book |
| Practice of Professional Skills | Meets standards | Develop peer reviewed guidelines for Departmental or Regional clinical care | Develop peer reviewed guidelines for provincial clinical care | Develop peer reviewed guidelines for national clinical care or completion of specialized certificate granting program | Completion of MSc or PhD or equivalent degree |
| Administration | Meets standards | Department, or regional clinical committee chair or division chief | Chair and/or chief multiple department or regional clinical committees and/or divisions | Member of provincial or national clinical care committee | Chair of provincial or national clinical care committee |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|--|--|---|
| University Work and Public Service | Meets standards | Service to city or regional service committee(s) | Service to provincial or minor national granting organization or member of provincial academic or professional organization | Service on editorial board or service to major national or international granting organization or executive member of national academic or professional organization | Service on 2 or more editorial boards or service to 2 or more major national or international granting organizations or executive member of international academic or professional organization |
|---|-----------------|--|--|--|---|

4. Formation of Department Salary Committee

The Department Salary Review Committee will be comprised of three (3) in-scope members of the Department and the Department Head (Article 17.3.1). The Department Head will chair the committee. The other three (3) committee members will be selected with one member representing each rank of the Department membership. If there are no members in a given rank, an additional committee member will be chosen from the rank with the greatest number of members.

5. Timeline for Salary Review Procedure

By:

- June 30** Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2).
- Sept 1** Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30** Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2).

Department Salary Committee to have:

- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)

Jan 31

College Review Committees to have:

- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)

Feb 28

Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)

Mar 31

President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

**DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY AND LABORATORY MEDICINE
STANDARDS FOR SALARY REVIEW AND THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES**

Salary Review Committee (SRC)

The SRC will consist of four tenure track or continuing status faculty members (no more than two members representing a given Division), and the Head. All probationary and permanent 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 and those who are out-of-scope. At the time of soliciting volunteers for the SRC, the Head will distribute a listing of SRC membership for the previous two years in order to aid in the process.

Selection of SRC Members: The Head will annually request volunteers for membership on the SRC. In the event that more than two individuals volunteer from a given Division or there are more than four individuals volunteering, then selection of the four committee members will be via a priority ranking vote by all eligible department members. In the event of a tie vote, the Head will jointly consult with the individuals receiving the tied vote to determine who will be appointed to the SRC. Should insufficient volunteers come forward, individuals who have served on the SRC for the two prior consecutive years can again serve on the SRC.

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 is not 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.

Allocation Guidelines for the Award of Special Increases

Each year the award of special increases will be distributed among the three following general categories. The distribution across categories will likely vary from year to year, but the following ranges will serve as a guide for the annual deliberations of the SRC.

- 0-75% for activities (e.g., scholarly output) related to research or practise of professional skills
- 0-50% for teaching
- 0-50% for performance of administrative duties at the departmental, college, and university levels; for public service/extension work; or for improvement in academic or professional skills qualifications

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



The Collective Agreement stipulates that at least two-thirds of the available special increase monies must be in the form of full increments. Specifically, in any given year, the number of half-increment awards cannot exceed the number of full increment awards.

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 the Tri-Council Grant Agencies.

To be considered for review and award of a special increase, an individual must provide the SRC with the percentage (%) of work time for the year that was dedicated to each of the above three categories as defined by their career path and annual Assignment of Duties. The three values must total 100%.

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

- In keeping with the spirit of the Collective Agreement, the SRC is directed to consider the contributions made by faculty in each of the three categories above as well as to cases where performance excels in two or even all three categories.
- The award of a special increase is to recognize excellence in job performance. Moreover, excellence pertains to the quality, and not only the quantity of one's contributions in a particular area. As such, the SRC will assess and recognize individuals for their accomplishments within the three categories described above in relation to the time allotted to each (i.e., activity in a given category will be expected to be commensurately more if the work time allotment is high).
- Standards for excellence in performance shall differ by rank, with higher expectations for tenured or permanent faculty than for probationary faculty, and with higher expectations, in order, for full professors compared to associate, compared to assistant professors.
- 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.
- When ranking contributions, priority will be given to those individuals who provide appropriate supporting evidence for activities listed in each of the three categories.

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 SRC members. In cases where an individual did not receive merit in the previous year(s), the individual can request via the Head that assessment be done on a cumulative basis of two or more years. In such cases, the Head will also circulate the information from the required previous year(s) that an individual requests be considered.



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”.

The following information is provided to guide faculty members in preparation of materials for salary review and the SRC in reviewing the materials before it.

Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine Information Guide for Salary Review and Award of Special Increases

The basis for the review are the annually updated CV, Form 1, and Teaching Dossier, as well as the percentage of work time for the year that was dedicated to each of the three general categories for award of special salary increases. Information to be included will be up to June 30th each year.

1. PREPARATION OF FORM 1

- a. Include annotation which clearly indicates your role in the project (i.e., paper, poster, abstract, presentation, grant) that you were responsible for. This should be discussed with the co-authors involved
- b. Indicate teaching hours as follows – **do not include** hours for preparation
 - i. Teaching done outside of clinical activity (didactic lectures, tutorials/small groups)
 - ii. Teaching associated with clinical activity (resident/jursi supervision)
 - iii. Teaching associated with supervision (MSc, PhD, PDF)
- c. Administrative/Committee/Public Service/Extension Work: indicate whether the work involved a formal standing committee, or an informal or ad hoc committee, indicate hours spent in meetings and separately in preparation, and role, whether chair or member
- d. Awards: if an award has been given in any category, provide a description of the source, and the nature and the significance of the award



2. RESEARCH/PRACTISE OF PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

Research and Scholarly Work

The main evidence for research and scholarly work is through publications which are weighted in priority according to the following list: books or monographs, peer-reviewed articles, editor of a book, book chapters, and technical reports (or the equivalent). Additional evidence for research and scholarly work includes receipt of research grants or contracts, and conference presentations or posters.

Possible indicators and information type/sources for research and scholarly work follow in (a) – (d). The chart immediately thereafter contains general guidelines on expectations related to percentage of time assigned to research endeavours.

(a) Peer-reviewed books, monographs, articles, and book chapters,

- Listing of each publication including the title, authors, date of acceptance or publication, outlet and number of printed pages or manuscript pages
- 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

(b) Non-Refereed/Community-Based/Technical Reports (and equivalent)

- Listing of each report including the title, authors, date of submission, outlet and number of printed or manuscript pages.
- 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%, 75% responsible)
- Evidence relating to the impact/contribution of the report (e.g., feedback from agency, editor)

(c) Conference Presentations/Posters and proceeding publications

- 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 contribution to the presentation/poster (e.g., 50%, 75% responsible)
- Evidence of peer-review

(d) Receipt of peer-reviewed grants and/or non-remunerated contracts

- Listing of each awarded grant/contract, including the title, co-investigators, funding agency/source, duration and amount
- Evidence relating to the faculty member's role in the awarded grant/contract



EXPECTATIONS IN RELATION TO TIME DEDICATED TO RESEARCH

| | < 25% | 25-50% | 50-75% | >75% |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Funding for basic or clinical research | Local or provincial funding | Local, provincial, national or international funding | Funding from one or more national or international sources with possible funding from local/provincial sources | Funding from one or more national or international sources with possible funding from local/provincial sources |
| Trainee Supervision | Summer/BSc honours research student(s), periodically one or more research trainees | Summer/BSc honours research student(s), one or more research trainees | Summer/BSc honours research student(s), two or more research trainees | Summer/BSc honours research student(s), two or more research trainees |
| Peer-reviewed publication* | 1-2 per year, at least 30% of the role in 1 | 1-3 per year, at least 50% of the role in 1 | 2-4 per year, at least 50% of the role in 2 | 3-5 per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant |
| Presentation | Oral or poster presentation at local, national or international levels | 1-2 presentations at national or international levels | 2-3 presentations at national or international levels | 2-3 presentations at national or international levels |

*The indicated publication numbers are a guideline to be used in conjunction with consideration of the length and quality of the publications, the review process involved, as well as the intended audience for the reported findings. It is incumbent upon the individual involved to provide this information together with a clear description of their role/involvement for each publication.

Practise of Professional Skills

(a) Clinical Practise

- Evidence of an appropriate service load, quality of work, participation in quality assurance processes, maintenance of competence, provision of peer consultation
- Evidence of regional, provincial, national or international recognition
- Evidence of leadership in area(s) of expertise and practise

(b) Scholarly Work:

- Evidence of scholarly output
- Evidence of research funding

Refer to information provided in (a) – (d) and the chart under **Research and Scholarly Work**



3. TEACHING

Clinical, non-clinical and supervisory-type teaching will be assessed. Whether there is a coordinating role in the teaching is important. Curriculum development, innovation in instruction and application of technology in the classroom should be described and evidence given for effort involved and impact.

Possible indicators and information type/sources for teaching are as follows.

- Teaching awards, with university/collegial external awards weighed more heavily
- Student and peer teaching evaluations, both validated and informal
- Curriculum development, instruction innovation and application of technology in the classroom
- Course materials
- Participation in training/workshops related to teaching

4. ADMINISTRATION/PUBLIC SERVICE AND EXTENSION WORK/IMPROVED QUALIFICATIONS

Administration and Public Service/Extension Work

Include administrative work at the department, college or university levels whether as a member or chair of a formal committee, or as a participant or leader involved in an informal (ad hoc) assignment. Similarly, administration or involvement related to public service/extension activities should be detailed with regard to time and role. This can include doing reviews for journals or funding agencies, editorial activities, and contributions to community and professional organizations. For public service/extension work, the work must be outside of assigned duties, or as specified in the employee's letter of appointment. As well, the work done can not involve extra pay that is more than a nominal fee.

Each relevant activity listed must include detail allowing full understanding of the faculty member's responsibilities/output. Letters from colleagues, committee chairs/members, etc., describing an individual's specific role/contributions are useful.

Improved Qualifications

Activities must enhance the faculty member's performance in the areas of administration, teaching, or research/practise of professional skills. Examples are completing a degree or certification not required for employment, and retraining either in area of specialization or in an additional area.

Each improvement in qualification must be described in detail allowing full understanding of the faculty member's improvement in qualifications. Details must also be provided how the change in qualifications enhances the faculty member's performance in teaching, research/practise of professional skills, or administration and public service/extension work.



TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE**By:**

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
 Department Salary Committee to have:
 - considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
 - awarded one-half or full merit where appropriate (Art.17.4.1 iii)
 - submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
 - informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
 - considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
 - made awards where appropriate (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
 - submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
 - informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
 - informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
 - submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)



Department of Pediatrics

Procedure for Standards of Performance for Award of Special Increase

Formation of the Departmental Salary Committee (Art. 17.3.1) The Committee will consist of the chair and a minimum of three eligible employees of the department. Eligible employees include those holding probationary, tenured and continuing status. Members of the committee will be drawn from junior and senior members of the department and will be chosen from a pool of volunteers. A committee member whose own case is considered can still participate in the committee, except when the committee member's own case is being considered.

Documentation for merit can be based on the past year (Form 1) or cumulative evidence since the last merit award (requires documentation from prior years). Merit should preferably be requested based on one category.

Form 1 is the basis for Salary Review. Faculty members should include any relevant documentation (CV, Teaching Dossier, etc.) that supports the awarding of a special increase. Completion of other dossiers (e.g. Professional Practice, Research and Administration) is encouraged as they become available from the College Review Committee. An optional one-page summary outlining the member's justification to receive an award of special increase may be included especially if the importance of the member's achievement may not be apparent from the Form 1 alone. An updated CV is required so that the committee has all of the information in order to consider the option of a cumulative period of time retroactive to when the last award was received.

1. Preparation of Form 1. The following are basic guidelines for completing your Form 1 and for updating of your CV

- a) Include annotation in each applicable category which clearly indicates the **percentage of the project** (e.g. paper, poster, abstract, presentation, grant, etc.) that you were responsible for. This needs to be discussed with the other members working on the same project.
- b) Indicate **teaching hours** (does not include preparation time) in your Teaching Dossier:
 - i. Outside of clinical activity (e.g. didactic lectures, tutorials, etc.)
 - ii. Associated with clinical activity (e.g. resident, medical student, etc.)
 - iii. Associated with supervision (e.g. graduate student, post-doctoral fellow)
- c) Indicate the percentage of time spent in clinical work (taken from CV 23A – Practice of Professional Skills). You may wish to complete a Professional Practice Dossier so as to better track your clinical work
- d) Administrative/Committee Work. You may wish to complete an Administration Dossier to track your administrative work

- i. Indicate hours spent in committee meeting and separately in preparation
 - ii. Indicate role in committee (e.g. chair, member)
- e) Awards
- i. If an award has been given in any category, provide a description of the source, local/national, any financial award and the significance. You may include this information in the optional one-page summary.

2. Categories Eligible for Merit

Although the following categories are the most relevant given the nature of the Department's range of activities, the Department Salary Committee will consider cases for possible merit under all categories set out in Article 17.2 of the Collective Agreement.

a) **Teaching:** A special increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

Merit may be considered for:

- Consistent teaching with above average peer and student evaluations plus hours at/or above the average.
- Acceptance of a teaching award
- New course development or major reorganization of an existing course

Minimum documentation required: Form 1

- Evaluations from students and peers
- Teaching dossier
- Course outline for new course or indications of revisions of existing course

b) **Practice of Professional Skills:** A special increase may be awarded for excellence in the practice of professional skills.

- i. **Clinical Practice:** Quality of care as expected in an academic centre, participation in quality assurance, maintenance of competence, maintenance of an appropriate service load, willingness to participate in out of hour duties, provision of peer consultation, communication and collaboration, consultation with colleagues beyond the base practice, consultation to service organizations relevant to their program and willingness to participate in multidisciplinary care delivery will be considered the standard.

Merit may be considered for:

- Regional, provincial, national or international recognition
- Consistent provision over many years of high quality care as defined above including leadership roles (e.g. lifetime contributions)
- Minimum documentation required: Form 1

- Letter(s) of recognition
- Updated CV
- Professional Practice dossier, awards, commendations, etc. may also be submitted to make the case

ii. **Scholarly Work:** It is expected that the individual will be carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers at a similar rank and career path.

- Publications (including case reports, technical reports, book chapters, reports to healthcare agencies)
- Presentations at peer-reviewed regional, provincial, national or international scientific meetings
- Clinical Investigations with research funding (Principal Investigator or Co-investigator) or institutional support for research, invitation as grant reviewer or university program external reviewer
- Scholarship awards

Merit may be considered for above average number of publications, presentations, funding or scholarship award.

Minimum documentation required: Form 1

- Updated CV
- Research dossier, awards, commendations, etc. may also be submitted to make the case.

iii. **Extra University Work and Public Service:** The work is outside of the assigned duties of the employee and is not done for extra pay beyond a nominal fee.

Merit may be considered for excellence in outreach and engagement, clinical service, committee work or public service.

Minimum documentation required: Form 1

- Letter of recognition of extra-university work or public service.
- Updated CV
- Professional Practice dossier, awards, commendations, etc. may also be submitted to make the case

c) **Administrative/Committee Work:** A special increase may be awarded to an employee with administrative duties

Merit may be considered for above average administrative/committee duties while having an appropriate teaching and clinical service load for rank and position and/or exceptional work in this area

Minimum documentation required: Form 1

- Letter of commendation from the chair or another authority.
- Updated CV
- Administrative dossier, awards, commendations, etc. may also be submitted to make the case.

d) Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties: A special increase may be awarded to an employee when excellence in performance has been demonstrated through the combination of two or more categories listed above.

Minimum documentation required: Form 1

- Updated CV
- Other relevant dossiers, awards, commendations, etc. may also be submitted to make the case

3. Determination of Ranking within the Department

The rank, career path and assignment of duties will be taken into account when evaluating meritorious achievement.

A spreadsheet recording the activities in each category as outlined in Form 1 will be prepared for each individual. A relative rating guide will be used which will take into account:

- The individuals full-time or part-time status
- The individuals rank will help determine where in the range of expected productivity they would fit
- Percentage of individual work involved in each project
- Hours of teaching and committee work
- Percentage of time spent in clinical work

The results of this spreadsheet will be used to establish a departmental benchmark for each category. Those members who are above the benchmark will be considered for merit in that category.

References:

1. University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association. Collective Agreement 2010-2013 between the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association. <http://www.usask.ca/vpacademic/pdf/USFA-2010-13.pdf>
2. University of Saskatchewan. Standards for Merit in the Department of Community Health and Epidemiology - 2010
3. University of Saskatchewan. Standards for Merit in the Department of Psychiatry, University of Saskatchewan – 2011

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

Approved September 28, 2011



Dept. of Pharmacology, College of Medicine

Review Procedures for the award of Special Merit Increases: September 16, 2011

Besides Dept. meetings, the Dept. Head meets with all the faculty members at regular intervals on a one on one basis to discuss issues of concerns, work performance, progress towards tenure and promotion. Over the last ten or more years, the Department Faculty members have unanimously voted by a secret ballot to let the Department Head determine the recommendation for special merit increases for Faculty members via a secret ballot vote held annually by the faculty members of the Department. The new collective agreement as per sections 17.3.1 and 17.4.1 now requires this function be carried out by a Department Salary Committee. Instead of a salary committee all faculty members of the Department will join to determine this work and the details are provided below.

The rationale for the establishment of such committees is for a fairer evaluation of meritorious performance in a Faculty member execution of his/her duties and responsibilities for the purpose of determination of the award of a Special Salary Increase. It is not intended to be a critical comparative review of each other's performance, which has the potential to be destructive to relationships in a Department with a small complement of faculty members. It is a responsibility of the Dept. Head to report on the overall performance of the Department.

Following a discussion at the Department meeting held on Sept. 20, faculty members agreed to the following guidelines for 2011-2012. These guidelines will be reviewed and approved on an annual basis.

Performance review process for Special Salary Increases in the Dept. of Pharmacology:

1. As done previously, the Dept. Head will meet with each Faculty member to review work accomplished for the period under consideration (usually for the preceding year, but may span several years depending upon circumstances). The Dept. Head will advise faculty members of documentation required for consideration for Special Increases (Updated CV and teaching dossier, Form 1 and associated documentation). These meetings are important to obtain a sense of direction from individual faculty members and overall view of accomplishment of the Dept.
2. The Dept. Head will provide a detailed review of work performance for each Faculty member on the "Salary Review Form". This will be reviewed by the Faculty member for accuracy.
3. Based on the information collected from all Faculty members, the Dept. Head will provide a written de-identified overview of the Dept. performance for the period under consideration (e.g. courses taught, mean course evaluations, research grant information, individual awards, overall number of publications, committee work, etc), prior to the Salary Review Committee meeting. This will provide the benchmarks for evaluation of individual faculty performance (as detailed in the salary review form and associated documents), relative to that of the Dept. overall performance for that year and over time. Each November, the Dept. Salary Review Committee will meet to determine performance(s) deserving of special salary increases, as defined below. November 30 is the deadline to submit decisions and recommendations for

additional salary increments to the College of Medicine Review Committee. The timeline for salary review procedures is given on page 4.

4. All Faculty members of the Department of Pharmacology will be members of the Salary Review Committee and participate in the evaluations, except for the Faculty member under consideration or those members with a unique conflict of interest (e.g. spousal or mentor relationships, extensive research collaborations or others). Faculty members who wish NOT to be considered for Special Salary Increase or participation in the Salary Review Committee may elect to do so.
5. The main criteria for the award of a Special Salary Increase will be “**above average**” performance (relative to the Department mean performance that year and over time, and taking into account professorial rank) in one or more of the following categories, with greater emphasis on (a) and (b), as per the criteria defined below, which are adapted from the College of Medicine Standards for Promotion and Tenure (<http://www.medicine.usask.ca/leadership/faculty-affairs/standards/>) (June 2009).
 - a. Teaching Ability and Performance
 - b. Research and Scholarly Work
 - c. Contributions to Administrative Responsibilities of the Department, College or University
 - d. Public Service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies

Although these four categories are emphasized given the nature of the Department range of activities, it is the Department Salary Committee’s responsibility to consider cases for possible merit under all of the categories set out in Article 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. The options for the time-period are either the last academic year or a cumulative period of time, retroactive as far back as the last merit award. The number of years to base an award on is at the discretion of the committee. Evaluation of meritorious achievement will take into account the faculty member’s career path and assignment of duties.

It is recognized that all evaluative instruments have limitations and that it is the sum of performance in one or more categories which is the determining factor.

Teaching Ability and Performance

Good teaching is expected of all faculty members. Aspects to be considered include but are not limited to organization of class/course, preparation for classes, appropriateness of material presented, clarity of communication, ability to stimulate students’ interest, responsiveness to students’ questions and concerns, fairness and adequacy of evaluation of students’ performance, willingness to try different or new teaching methods and technologies, teaching innovation in curricular design, and extent to which scholarly work is brought into the classroom. Evaluations to be considered will be from self, students and peers. It is recognized that many items listed above are difficult to evaluate in a meaningful way. In-class unsigned student evaluations may be considered if voluntarily submitted by a faculty member for consideration. Usually, a student evaluation alone will be insufficient for the award of a special salary increase.

Research and Scholarly Work

Contribution to scholarly work is expected of all faculty members. Evaluation of above-average performance is from publication in reputable peer-reviewed journals but may also include other works (e.g. research related patents, copyrighted software and audio-visual materials). Attempts should be made to evaluate the quality and

significance of the work. The award of research funding from provincial, national or international granting councils or agencies that employ a process of peer evaluation is also a significant indication of performance. Others aspects to be considered will be personal award for achievement in research and invitations to present at seminars, conferences or workshops outside the University of Saskatchewan.

Contributions to Administrative Responsibilities of the Department, College or University

Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in the collegial decision-making processes, to participate in some administrative work, and are encouraged to be involved in the activities of academic and professional organizations. The degree of involvement in such activities is dependent upon professorial rank. Documentation of degree of involvement and work requirements and performance will be required for consideration for Special Salary Increase in that category.

Public Service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies

Public service is normally defined as the faculty member's provision of expertise to the outside community and will be accorded recognition insofar as the activities entail application of expertise associated with University – related work. To be recognized within this category, service to academic and/or professional organizations must go beyond membership in an organization and focus on documented active participation. Such activities might include: service on the committees or executives of academic or professional organizations; service on selection committees for provincial, national or international granting organizations; or service on the editorial board for academic, professional or scientific journals.

6. Recommendation for the award of 0.5 or 1.0 Special Salary Increase and recommendations for special consideration by the College of Medicine and University Review Committees will be established by the Salary Review Committee at a face-to-face meeting (email or other forms of written communication will not be accepted) and communicated to the College of Medicine Review Committee and the faculty member by the Department Head within 48h.

Draft document September 16, 2011; Discussed at a Dept. of Pharmacology meeting on September 20, 2011 ; Submitted for review to all faculty members, September 20, 2011; Amended on September 20, 2011; Final revisions from Faculty input and electronic approval and final submission sent to Dean, College of Medicine on September 21, 2011.

Submitted Sept. 21, 2011.

On behalf of the Faculty Members in the Dept. of Pharmacology,

V. Gopalakrishnan, PhD.
Professor and Head

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

As per USFA Section 17
Process & Department Committee structure will follow Article 17

All information to be included will be up to June 30th. Please see attached timelines for salary review procedure in Section 4.

Please include CV, Teaching Dossier, Form 1 and other relevant Dossiers

1. Preparation of Form 1

The annual Form 1 provides the basis for yearly salary review. The CV and dossiers will provide support to requests of review on a cumulative basis.

The salary review will be organized and carried out by a Department Salary Review Committee Chaired by the Unified Department Head, consisting of a minimum of three additional eligible faculty members. The Department Salary Committee will include all eligible PM&R faculty members.

The following basic guidelines will help clarify certain areas of Form 1 so that accurate and detailed information is provided of the work being done. Expectations and performance standards for each of the categories of research/scholarly work, teaching, practice of professional skills, administrative/committee work, and awards or honours are also identified.

2. Categories that may be considered for recognition of special merit increase or portion thereof.

A personal letter acknowledging your extraordinary contribution(s) must be provided to assist the committee in understanding the value of your work to the department, the college, the university or other bodies (provincial, national and international).

17.2.1 Teaching (Category 2)

A special merit may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

Requirements: 1) CV 2) updated teaching philosophy 3) teaching dossier 4) written description of the significance of the contribution(s) 5) student and peer evaluations and 6) description of any award(s) received.

Teaching

Indicate teaching contributions and time commitment in the form of lectures, small group teaching, seminars, problem-based learning sessions, examination supervision for:

- Undergraduate program

- JURSI program
- International students/Observerships
- Postgraduate program
- MSc or PhD programs

Indicate contributions and time commitment to clinical teaching in:

- Clinic setting
- Consultation service
- Ward assignment
- Rotation supervision
- Mentorship

Expectations:

The evaluation of teaching performance will be conducted in accordance with the standards outlined and be influenced by the percentage weighting of teaching the faculty member's assignment of duties. Each faculty member is expected to have a teaching component to the assignment of duties (minimum 5%) and is expected to engage in regular professional development for the purpose of enhancing their teaching skills.

For individuals with a substantial time allocation to teaching in their assignment of duties, scholarly work may be represented not only by publication but also by activity enhancing teaching advances including implementation and evaluation of innovative teaching methods and the creation of tools or programs to further student and faculty development efforts. The activities will have been publicly shared, critiqued, and reviewed according to accepted standards. It may include the development of educational workshops, web-based courses, curricular enhancements or standards for application.

Performance Standards

Performance will be judged to be "Superior" when it exceeds expectations.

A faculty member would have demonstrated superior performance by sustained performance exceeding expectations in multiple categories of teaching activities including didactic lectures, small group or patient-based learning, bedside clinical teaching seminars, and/or research training. Examples of superior performance include evaluations in the top 10%, nominations and/or receipt of one or more local or national teaching awards, contributions to course and/or curriculum development and development and/or participation in professional development activities focusing on medical education. Included would be recognition of teaching talent by selection to a major educational administrative portfolio such as Assistant or Associate Dean for undergraduate education, postgraduate education and/or continuous professional learning; directorship of a residency program; coordination of an undergraduate teaching block in the medical curriculum or an undergraduate course in another faculty; or Chairing of major faculty, departmental or university education-related committee.

Superior educators will have published education-related research or experiences in prestigious medical education journals, presented papers or posters at national and international education meetings and encouraged trainees in these endeavours. They will be regular and/or invited participants in the faculty's continuous professional development efforts and/or actively participated in faculty departmental or divisional continuing medical education events.

Leadership in the educational realm shall be considered a measure of superior performance and include activities as identified above but also the development, implementation and/or evaluation of innovative teaching methods. Superior teachers shall be identified by their role-modelling impact as evidenced by unsolicited testimonials from peers and trainees. They will have accepted formal or informal mentorship relationships with students, postgraduate trainees or junior faculty. They may have been nominated and/or received awards for excellence in mentoring. They will have been recognized as a superior teacher by invitations to participate as an educator in teaching enhancement workshops.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work (Category 4)

A special merit may be awarded for excellence in the research and scholarly work.

Requirements: 1) updated research and scholarly philosophy 2) research dossier 3) written description of the significance of the contribution(s) 4) description of any award(s) received.

- **Publication.** Publication, or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication, is 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. In order for "Accepted" papers to count, letters from the publisher confirming the article has been accepted must be attached.
- **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.

Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/connection.

Research and Scholarly Work

Include annotation and a percentage in each applicable category to clearly indicate your contribution to the project (i.e. paper, poster, abstract, presentation and grant). The accumulated total percentage contribution of all participants on any project should not exceed 100%.

Expectations:

The evaluation of research/scholarly work performance will be conducted in accordance with the standards outlined and will be influenced by faculty member's rank and the percentage weighting of research/scholarly work in the faculty member's assignment of duties.

All faculty members are expected to allocate a minimum of 5% of their time to research/scholarly work. The maximum possible time allocation is 75% as all faculty members are also expected to allocate at least 5% of their time to teaching.

For the purposes of the evaluation of research performance, time allocation for research have been divided into three groups based on whether research/scholarly work is 5 to 25%, 26 to 50%, or 51% to 75% time allocation in the faculty member's assignment of duties. **Please see section 17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills to reference the time allocations.**

Performance Standards

Performance will be judged to be "Superior" when it exceeds expectations.

There will be evidence of:

- A substantial record of research productivity with either a landmark paper in a prestigious international journal or multiple papers in high-impact journals that make a significant impact on the field
- A consistent successful record of funding in the form of multiple peer-reviewed national or international grants with substantial funding
- Receipt of peer-reviewed salary awards or renewals at a level appropriate for academic rank
- A significant leadership role in obtaining major peer-reviewed or industrial funding for group research activities
- Recognition in the form of a major national or international award or invitation to present a keynote address at a major meeting with national or international participation
- Exceptional administrative service such as serving as Chair or Deputy Chair of a grant review panel or editor of a high-impact journal

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills (Category 5)

Special merit or portion thereof may be awarded for excellence in the practice of professional skills exceeding the standards as determined by the department, Saskatoon Health Region and the University of Saskatchewan.

Requirements: 1) updated professional skills dossier 2) written description of the significance of the contribution(s) 3) description of any award(s) received.

A. Clinical Practice:

Quality of care is expected to meet policies and procedures of the department, region and province.

Merit may be considered for regional, provincial, national or international recognition or active participation as a member of quality assurance and safety programs or quality improvement projects.

Practice of Professional Skills

From your assignment of duties forms estimate the percentage of professional time you spend providing clinical care including the total percentage of time in the practice of professional skills. From this percentage identify the percentage of time with a learner present and without a learner present.

Expectations:

Each faculty member for whom practice of professional skills represents a portion of the assignment of duties is expected to maintain at least an "acceptable" evaluation in this category. The faculty member must abide by the professional standards of his/her discipline. Individuals with a clinical component to their assignment of duties of over 26% are encouraged to submit a practice of professional skills dossier describing their time commitments to ambulatory care, inpatient ward care, and consultative activities as well as innovative patient care delivery, processes, or devices. They should report the introduction of new programs, patient education and quality improvement activities. Objective peer and patient evaluations could be included.

Performance Standards:

Performance will be judged to be "Superior" when it exceeds expectations.

The faculty member would be judged to have demonstrated superior performance in the area of clinical practice when he/she has achieved substantive recognition at a national or international level as a leader in his/her clinical area of expertise or as an important resource to academic and government agencies. This could be exemplified by the introduction of a new procedure, program or device; discovery of a new diagnostic or therapeutic strategy; and/or leadership efforts resulting in improved quality of care, reduced medical error or cost effectiveness. Exceptional recognition by patient groups or peers for exemplary patient care and/or clinical services would be indicative of superior performance. Collegiality, cooperativeness, and willingness to mentor junior faculty would be important behavioural attributes. The faculty member would be considered by their peers to be a role model of professional integrity.

B. Continuing/Ongoing Medical Education:

The maintenance and development of professional skills and knowledge is the standard of care. Proof of this may be provided by proof of attendance at meetings and the professional development record from the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada.

Merit may be considered for accepted invitations to present at professional meetings and (re)certification and training of colleagues in practice.

C. Scholarly Work:

- Publications: Merit may be awarded for publications in peer reviewed journals above the average number or a publication that occurs while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- Evidence of research funding or institutional support for research as an individual or major member of program based practice – consideration of contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers/adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- Scholarship Awards
- Development of guidelines for professional care, review(s) of grants and review of manuscripts for peer-reviewed journals may be considered for special merit.

Research and Scholarly Work

Include annotation and a percentage in each applicable category to clearly indicate your contribution to the project (i.e. paper, poster, abstract, presentation and grant). The accumulated total percentage contribution of all participants on any project should not exceed 100%.

Expectations:

The evaluation of research/scholarly work performance will be conducted in accordance with the standards outlined and will be influenced by faculty member's rank and the percentage weighting of research/scholarly work in the faculty member's assignment of duties.

All faculty members are expected to allocate a minimum of 5% of their time to research/scholarly work. The maximum possible time allocation is 75%.

For the purposes of the evaluation of research performance, time allocation for research have been divided into three groups based on whether research/scholarly work is 5 to 25%, 26 to 50%, or 51 to 75% time allocation in the faculty member's assignment of duties.

Time Allocation to Research/Scholarly Work – 5 to 25%

To meet expectations of the College of Medicine, a faculty member who has a 5 to 25% time allocation for research will be able to provide evidence of one (5-15% research) or two or more (16-25% research) of the following:

1. **Research or Scholarly Work Productivity** – This will include peer-reviewed publications including abstract presentations at scientific meetings, multi-authored papers, book chapters or review articles, that may be in either paper or electronic format; if the faculty member is a clinician or administrator it may

involve presentations at relevant educational or organizational meetings (e.g. Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada-RCPSC).

2. **Research Funding** – This will include peer-reviewed funding in collaboration with others internal or external to the College of Medicine, participation in design and execution of sponsored clinical trials, or contract research.
3. **Research Mentoring** – This will include contributions to the successful supervision of students in the medical undergraduate programs or in residency or graduate programs for the purpose of creating scholarly work; contributions to graduate supervisory committees; participation in summer student research supervision; or resident research supervision.
4. **Research Administration** – This will include membership on research committees such as local grant panels, or administrative service as an external reviewer of grants and journal articles. For clinicians this may include participation in ethics review, involvement in clinical trials administration or participation on hospital committees related to research activities.
5. **Research Dissemination** – This will include presentations or posters at local, provincial, or national meetings.

Time Allocation to Research/Scholarly Work – 26 to 50%

To meet expectations of the College of Medicine, a faculty member who has 26 to 50% time allocation for research/scholarly work will be able to provide evidence of contributions to three or more of the following:

1. **Research Productivity** – This will include multiple peer reviewed publications annually that include articles in journals considered prestigious in their field of endeavour, major reviews, or books and book chapters that may be in either paper or electronic format.
2. **Research Funding** – This will include a role as principal investigator or co-investigator in one or more peer-reviewed operating grant awards; as principal investigator or co-investigator in the design and execution of sponsored clinical trials, or in major contract research. For educators this will include success in securing educational or faculty development funding from local or national bodies such as the RCPSC.
3. **Research Mentoring** – This will include the successful research supervision of students in the medical undergraduate programs, and/or in residency, graduate or postdoctoral programs; and/or membership on graduate supervisory committees.
4. **Research Administration** – This will include leadership roles (in accordance with rank) in the College of Medicine research endeavours such as senior administrative positions; creation and development of research groups and centres; membership on research committees such as national and international grant panels; work as an external reviewer of grants and journal articles; or membership on editorial boards of scientific or major educational journals.

Time Allocation to Research/Scholarly Work – 51 to 75%

To meet expectations of the College of Medicine, a faculty member who has a 51 to 75% time allocation for research will be able to provide evidence, at a level of commensurate with academic rank, of contributions to all of the following:

1. **Research Productivity** – This will include multiple and/or seminal publications annually in journals considered prestigious in their field of endeavour, major reviews, or books and book chapters that may be either in paper or electronic format.
2. **Research Funding** – This will include the successful acquisition and role as principal investigator in one or more peer reviewed operating grant awards. Individuals in this category are expected to compete successfully for renewal awards. Except under unusual circumstances such as an external salary or endowed chair, faculty members will be expected to successfully compete for external peer-reviewed salary awards and renewals at a level commensurate with academic rank.
3. **Research Mentoring** – This will include the successful mentoring of postgraduate trainees in graduate or postdoctoral training programs as well as membership on graduate supervisory committees.
4. **Research Administration** – This will include acceptance of leadership roles in the department, faculty, and/or universities research endeavours at senior administrative levels such as Director of a research group or centre, administrative service as an external reviewer of grants and journal articles, or membership on editorial boards of scientific journals and/or membership on national/international research groups and committees.
5. **Research Dissemination** – This will include invited research presentations at national and international academic institutions or meetings.

Performance Standards

Performance will be judged to be “Superior” when it exceeds expectations.

There will be evidence of:

- a. A substantial record of research productivity with either a landmark paper in a prestigious international journal or multiple papers in high-impact journals that make a significant impact on the field
- b. A consistent successful record of funding in the form of multiple peer-reviewed national or international grants with substantial funding
- c. Receipt of peer-reviewed salary awards or renewals at a level appropriate for academic rank
- d. A significant leadership role in obtaining major peer-reviewed or industrial funding for group research activities
- e. Recognition in the form of a major national or international award or invitation to present a keynote address at a major meeting with national or international participation
- f. Exceptional administrative service such as serving as Chair or Deputy Chair of a grant review panel or editor of a high-impact journal

17.2.4 Extra University Work and Public Service (Category 7)

A special merit may be awarded for excellence in extra university work and public service.

Requirements: 1) updated university work and public service section of CV 2) written description of the significance of the contribution(s) 3) description of any award(s) received and 4) letters of support from senior members of a committee, community or service organization supporting the individual's claim.

- Extra work and public service will be considered in this category only if it falls outside of the assigned duties of the employee as specified in the employee's letter of appointment. Employees in clinical departments will not merit a special increase or portion thereof for any assigned extension of clinical work; and
- Extra work done for additional pay or stipend will not satisfy the criterion for consideration in this category.

17.2.5 Administrative Work (Category 6)

A special merit or portion thereof may be awarded for excellence in administrative work. The standard for participation in administrative work is to prepare for, attend at and contribute to meetings of committees to which you are assigned to or volunteered for. A special merit may be considered with exception contributions as a member or Chair of a committee or committees.

Requirements: 1) updated administrative dossier 2) written description of the significance of the contribution 3) letter substantiating meritorious work from the Chair or a senior leader of the appropriate constituency familiar with the candidate's work and 4) description of any award(s) received.

Administrative/Committee Work

Indicate your role on the committee—Chair or member. Indicate the hours you spent attending committee meetings and hours spent in preparation.

Expectations:

Each faculty member is expected to provide some administrative service to his/her discipline, the department/college/university, or the hospital/health region. Administrative service to the discipline includes leadership responsibilities for professional societies, responsibilities for review of research proposals and/or review of research publications. Administrative service to the department/college/university or hospital/health region includes membership and/or Chairing of committees; coordination of teaching blocks, multidisciplinary courses, residency training programs; and/or leadership positions. Administrative service to the public in a faculty member's professional capacity includes communication of expertise to government, lay audience education and voluntary professional services. Extra-faculty activities unrelated to the faculty member's discipline or academic position and representing community citizenship are encouraged but optional and will not serve as the basis for merit consideration, tenure or promotion.

Performance Standards:

Performance will be judged to be “Superior” when it exceeds expectations.

Examples of superior administrative contributions can be related to research or education and include contributions to the discipline such as serving as Chair of a grants panel or site visit, serving as editor of a high-impact journal, organizing a major national or international conference, or serving as president of a professional organization; recognition by receipt of a service award from a professional society would be considered meritorious. Superior performance in administration to the department/college/university or hospital/health region would be recognized by effective leadership in coordination of teaching programs, chairing major committees, developing significant new educational or clinical initiatives, or effectively discharging senior administrative positions.

17.2.7 Improvement in Academic Qualifications

All members of the department are expected to maintain academic qualifications by completing the appropriate updates in clinical care, education and research as they develop.

A special merit may be awarded to an individual who improves his/her academic qualifications program or course recognized by the granting of a degree or specialized certificate of achievement.

17.2.8 Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

Special merit will be awarded to an employee who declines an offer of employment in writing from a comparable institution.

Requirements: Evidence of the declined offer must accompany the application.

17.2.9 Performance of the Full Range of Assigned Duties

A special merit or portion thereof may be considered for an employee demonstrating excellence in performance of assigned duties through the combination of three or more categories listed above. The Department Salary Review Committee must determine the appropriateness of such an award from the documentation provided.

17.2.10 Improvement and Development

A special merit may be awarded to an employee demonstrating significant improvement or development in the categories listed above for reasons acceptable to the Department Salary Review Committee. This would most appropriately fall into provision of an award based on documentation of cumulative evidence.

3. Determination of Ranking within the Department

A spreadsheet will record ranking from 1 to 5 of the activities in each category for each individual from the information provided on his/her Form 1 and attached documentation. A relative rating guide will be used to rank contributions to teaching, research and scholarly activity, practice of professional skills, administration, university work and public service.

The results of this algorithm will provide an overall point grade with a range of 5 to 45 for each individual. An average will be determined using the total of the point grades divided by the number of members. Those whose point grade is above the average/benchmark or who meet the criteria for special merit increase will be considered in the salary review discussion.

The Department Head will provide each member of the department with a written notice of the outcome of the Salary Review Committee and afterwards meet face to face with each faculty member to review the recommendation.

References:

1. USFA Agreement
2. Department of Psychiatry, University of Saskatchewan, 2011
3. Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, University of Saskatchewan, 2011
4. University of Alberta Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Guidelines for the Evaluation of Academic Staff for Merit Increments, Tenure, and Promotion 2007

Documentation:

1. Updated Form 1
2. Updated and current CV
3. Teaching dossier
4. Profession practice dossier
5. Research dossier
6. Administrative dossier
7. Letter(s) of support
8. Copies of publications, abstracts, etc.

Merit Increments:

Department standards acknowledge that evaluation of meritorious achievement will take into account each faculty member's career path and assignment of duties.

Expectations for acceptable and superior performance increase with rank and seniority. Merit increments are earned by achievements, contributions and significant professional development during the year under review and are not awarded automatically. When appropriate, a cumulative assessment over a period of several years may be considered to increase the merit increment by 0.5, e.g. for a

faculty member who has consistently performed somewhat better than expected for rank. The Salary Review Committee will ensure that significant achievements are recognized in the year under review (i.e. the year in which they occurred). Multiple previous extra increments will not mitigate against the award of extra merit recognition in the year under review.

In assessment of teaching, it is recognized that course loads may fluctuate between years, and that consideration of performance over more than one year may be used by the Chair to assist the Salary Review Committee in the overall evaluation.

In assessment of research publications, submitted articles will not be considered and merit increments will be assessed on papers published in the print form of the journal during the year under review. If electronic publication (e-pub) occurs in the year under review with the print form of the journal occurring in the following year, the publication will be counted in the following year. It is recognized, however, that research productivity may fluctuate from year to year and that publication history and "in press" articles may be used by the Chair to assist the Salary Review Committee in the overall evaluation. Electronic publications, web and CD based teaching modules, governmental position or policy papers and clinical practice guidelines shall be considered scholarly work with merit assessed by their academic impact. Faculty members are expected to indicate their individual contributions to multi-authored publications or group research grants.

Merit Increments

The Department Salary Committee can only award and recommend in total up to two special increases.

Acceptable—one-half merit increment

When the faculty member's performance demonstrates a significant deficiency in at least one area of evaluation or overall performs below average for rank but remains within acceptable range.

Good—one merit increment

When the faculty member performs competently in all evaluation categories according to his/her assignment of duties, and professional development is an acceptable level expected for rank.

Superior—One and one-half merit increments

When the faculty member has performed significantly better than average for rank, normally achieving a superior rating in at least one category.

Outstanding—two merit increments

When the faculty member has made exceptional achievements during the year, or has achieved a superior rating in two or more categories. This level of achievement is likely to be seen in less than 1% of the faculty members in any given year.

| RANKING | Unacceptable 1 | Below Expectations 2 | Satisfactory 3 | Superior 4 | Outstanding 5 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Teaching (Undergraduate) | | | | | |
| Teaching (Postgraduate and Other) | | | | | |
| Research And Scholarly Activity (Funding) | | | | | |
| Research And Scholarly Activity (Supervision) | | | | | |
| Research And Scholarly Activity (Publications) | | | | | |
| Practice of Professional Skills | | | | | |
| Administration | | | | | |
| University Work and Public Service | | | | | |
| Extraordinary Considerations 17.2.7 17.2.8 17.2.9 17.2.10 | | | | | |

4. Timeline for Salary Review Procedure

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- awarded one-half or full merit where appropriate (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards where appropriate (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

Dept. of Physiology

Review Procedures for the award of Special Salary Increases

May 30, 2011: Revised Sept 12, 2011

It is important for the Dept. Head to meet regularly and individually with faculty members to highlight particular successes and discuss issues of concerns, work performance, progress towards tenure and promotion and other issues relevant to life in the Dept. of Physiology, in addition to our Dept. meetings. One such occasion was for performance evaluation for Special Salary Increase recommendation. This was traditionally done by the Dept. Head in Physiology, following a secret ballot vote held annually by the faculty members of the Department. The collective agreement now requires this function be carried out by a "Department Salary Committee". Below are copies of sections 17.3.1 and 17.4.1 of the Collective Agreement describing the Department Salary Committee mandated structure and terms of reference.

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.*

17.4.1 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;*

The rationale for the establishment of such committees is for a fair(er) evaluation of meritorious performance in a Faculty member execution of his/her duties and responsibilities for the purpose of determination of the award of a Special Salary Increase. It is not intended to be a critical comparative review of each other's performance, which has the potential to be destructive to relationships in a Department with a small complement of faculty members. It is a responsibility of the Dept. Head to report on the overall performance of the Department.

Following a discussion at the Department retreat on May 24, 2011, faculty members agreed to the following guidelines for 2011-2012. These guidelines will be reviewed and approved on an annual basis.

Performance review process for Special Salary Increases in the Dept. of Physiology:

1. As done previously, the Dept. Head will meet with each Faculty member to review work accomplished for the period under consideration (usually for the preceding year, but may span several years depending upon circumstances). The Dept. Head will advise faculty members of documentation required for consideration for Special Increases (Updated CV and teaching dossier, Form 1 and associated documentation). These meetings are important to obtain a sense of direction from individual faculty members and overall view of accomplishment of the Dept.
2. The Dept. Head will provide a detailed review of work performance for each Faculty member on the "Salary Review Form". This will be reviewed by the Faculty member for accuracy.
3. Based on the information collected from all Faculty members, the Dept. Head will provide a written de-identified overview of the Dept. performance for the period under consideration (e.g. courses taught, mean course evaluations, research grant information, individual awards, overall number of publications, committee work, etc.), prior to the Salary Review Committee meeting. This will provide the benchmarks for evaluation of individual faculty performance (as detailed in the salary review form and associated documents), relative to that of the Dept. overall performance for that year and over time. Each November, the Dept. Salary Review Committee will meet to determine performance(s) deserving of special salary increases, as defined below. November 30 is the deadline to submit decisions and recommendations for additional salary increments to the College of Medicine Review Committee. The timeline for salary review procedures is on page 5.
4. All Faculty members of the Department of Physiology will be members of the Salary Review Committee and participate in the evaluations, except for the Faculty member under consideration or those members with a unique conflict of interest (e.g. spousal or mentor relationships, extensive research collaborations or others). Faculty members who not wish to

be considered for Special Salary Increase or participation in the Salary Review Committee may elect to do so.

5. The main criteria for the award of a Special Salary Increase will be “**above average**” performance (relative to the Department mean performance that year and over time, and taking into account professorial rank) in one or more of the following categories, with greater emphasis on (a) and (b), as per the criteria defined below, which are adapted from the College of Medicine Standards for Promotion and Tenure (<http://www.medicine.usask.ca/leadership/faculty-affairs/standards/>) (June 2009).
 - a. Teaching Ability and Performance (17.2.1 Teaching)
 - b. Research and Scholarly Work (17.2.2)
 - c. Contributions to Administrative Responsibilities of the Department, College or University (17.2.5 Administration)
 - d. Public Service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies (17.2.4 Extra University Work and Public Service)

Although these four categories are emphasized given the nature of the Department range of activities, it is the Department Salary Committee’s responsibility to consider cases for possible merit under all of the categories set out in Article 17.2 of the Collective Agreement. The options for the time-period are either the last academic year or a cumulative period of time, retroactive as far back as the last merit award. The number of years to base an award on is at the discretion of the committee. Evaluation of meritorious achievement will take into account the faculty member’s career path and assignment of duties.

It is recognized that all evaluative instruments have limitations and that it is the sum of performance in one or more categories which is the determining factor.

Teaching

Good teaching is expected of all faculty members. Aspects to be considered include but are not limited to organization of class/course, preparation for classes, appropriateness of material presented, clarity of communication, ability to stimulate students’ interest, responsiveness to students’ questions and concerns, fairness and adequacy of evaluation of students’ performance, willingness to try different or new teaching methods and technologies, teaching innovation in curricular design, and extent to which scholarly work is brought into the classroom. Evaluations to be considered will be from self, students and peers. It is recognized that many items listed above are difficult to evaluate in a meaningful way. In-class unsigned student evaluations may be considered if voluntarily submitted by a faculty member for consideration. Usually, a student evaluation alone will be insufficient for the award of a special salary increase.

Research and Scholarly Work

Contribution to scholarly work is expected of all faculty members. Evaluation of above-average performance is from publication in reputable peer-reviewed journals but may also include other works (e.g. research related patents, copyrighted software and audio-visual materials). Attempts should be made to evaluate the quality and significance of the work. The award of research funding from provincial, national or international granting councils or agencies that employ a process of peer evaluation is also a significant indication of performance. Others aspects to be considered will be personal award for achievement in research and invitations to present at seminars, conferences or workshops outside the University of Saskatchewan.

Administration

Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in the collegial decision-making processes, to participate in some administrative work, and are encouraged to be involved in the activities of academic and professional organizations. The degree of involvement in such activities is dependent upon professorial rank. Documentation of degree of involvement and work requirements and performance will be required for consideration for Special Salary Increase in that category.

Extra University Work and Public Service

Public service is normally defined as the faculty member's provision of expertise to the outside community and will be accorded recognition insofar as the activities entail application of expertise associated with University – related work. To be recognized within this category, service to academic and/or professional organizations must go beyond membership in an organization and focus on documented active participation. Such activities might include: service on the committees or executives of academic or professional organizations; service on selection committees for provincial, national or international granting organizations; or service on the editorial board for academic, professional or scientific journals.

6. Recommendation for the award of 0.5 or 1.0 Special Salary Increase and recommendations for special consideration by the College of Medicine and University Review Committees will be established by the Salary Review Committee at a face-to-face meeting (email or other forms of written communication will not be accepted) and communicated to the College of Medicine Review Committee and the faculty member by the Department Head within 48h.

Draft document May 12, 2011; Discussed at a Dept. of Physiology meeting May 24,2011; Amended May 26,2011; Submitted for review to all faculty members, May 26, 2011; Final revisions from Faculty input and electronic approval May 30, 2011.

Submitted May 30, 2011.

Revised Sept 12, 2011.

On behalf of the Faculty Members in Physiology,

M. Desautels, PhD.

Professor and Head

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)



PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

As per 2010-2013 USFA Collective Agreement Section 17

All information to be included will be up to June 30th.

Please include CV, Teaching Dossier and Form 1

1. Formation of Department Salary 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.

Procedure: During the first Academic Meeting of the current academic year a discussion will be held to determine how members would like to constitute the Salary Committee. Since the Department has both clinical members and scientist-researchers who are not clinicians, representation from each group will be requested. All interested and eligible members will be part of the committee.

2. Preparation of Form 1

The Form I is the basis for Salary review. The following are basic guidelines to help clarify certain areas of the Form I to help with clearer understanding of the work undertaken.

- a. Include annotation in each applicable category which clearly indicates the **percentage of the project** (ie. paper, poster, abstract, presentation, grant) that you were responsible for. This should be discussed with the co-authors.
- b. Indicate **Teaching hours** as follows – do **not** include hours for preparation (refer to Teaching Dossier)
 - i. Teaching done **outside of clinical activity** ie. didactic lectures, tutorials
 - ii. Teaching done **associated with clinical activity** ie. resident/jursi supervision
 1. Resident – 6 month rotation ~ 80 days available for clinic full-time (excluding academic day, holidays, study week, post call)
 2. Jursi – 6 week rotation ~ 20 days available
 - iii. Teaching done **associated with supervision** ie MSc, PhD, PDF

- c. Indicate the **percentage of time spent in clinical work** in section 23 A – Practice of Professional Skills
- d. **Administrative/Committee Work**
 - i. Indicate hours spent in committee meetings and separately in preparation
 - ii. Indicate role in committee – chair or member
- e. **Awards**
 - i. If an award has been given in any category provide a description of the source, local/national, any financial award and the significance.

Documentation for merit can be based on either:

- 1. The past year – based on Form 1
- 2. Cumulative evidence since the last merit award - this will require documentation from prior years.

Merit should preferably be requested based on one category.

2. Determine if there is a category that you feel that you deserve to go forward for merit. The following categories will be considered. A letter or file must be prepared to support the merit award for the specific category.

17.2.1 Teaching. A Special Increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

Requirements: 1) CV 2) teaching philosophy 3) teaching dossier 4) a written description of explanation of the significance of the contributions should be included 5) Evaluations from students and peers 6) Awards/ commendations/publications, course or teaching materials etc if available.

Example: Consistent teaching with student evaluations above average and peer evaluation above average plus hours at/or above the average along with one or more of the following: an award/commendation, course developed, teaching materials, publications on teaching or workshops presented on teaching.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work. (Category 4) 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.

In order for "Accepted" papers to count, letters from the publisher confirming the article has been accepted must be attached.

(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.

Example: The number of PostDoc's, PhD and MSc students will determine an average/expected number of publications. Merit may be awarded for numbers above the average/expected and will include overall contribution, reputation of journal.

Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/competition.

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the practice of professional skills.

Examples:

a) Clinical Practice:

Quality of Care as expected in an academic center, participation in quality assurance process, maintenance of competence, maintain an appropriate service load; willingness to participate in out of hours duties; provision of peer consultation, communication and collaboration; consultation with colleagues beyond the base practice; consultation to service organizations relevant to their program; willingness to participate in multidisciplinary care delivery will be considered the standard.

Merit may be considered for:

- Regional, provincial, national or international recognition.
- Consistent provision over many years of high quality care as defined above including leadership roles ie. Lifetime contributions.

b) Scholarly Work:

- a. Publications: Merit may be award for publications in peer reviewed journals above the average number or a publication that occurs while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- b. Evidence of research funding or institutional support for research as an individual or major member of program based practice – consideration of contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers/adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- c. Scholarship Awards:

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.

A letter commenting on or substantiating meritorious work, from the Chair or another authority needs to be attached. Example: a new program developed, a program proves successful and is adopted by other places.

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

Department of Psychiatry
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.

3. Determination of Ranking within the Department

A spreadsheet will be completed that will record the activities in each category as outlined in each individual's Form I. A relative rating guide will be used that will take into account:

- The individuals full or part-time status
- The individuals rank will help determine where in the range of expected productivity they would fit
- The Career Path and Assignment of Duties will be reflected in evaluation
- Percentage of individual work involved in each project
- Hours for teaching and committee work
- Percentage of time spent in clinical activity (where appropriate)

The results of this algorithm will provide an overall point system which will be averaged among members. Those members who are above the average/benchmark will be considered for the next phase of salary review discussion. There will also be expected guidelines in place for research and teaching categories.

The salary review committee will discuss the individual merits based on the case put forward in writing by the individual.

The Department Head will meet with each Faculty member to review the rationale.

References:

1. USFA Agreement
2. Community Health and Epidemiology Standards for Merit 2010
3. Department of Psychiatry, University of Manitoba, (Sareen, 2010)

Internal Guide for Research Productivity

Documentation:

1. Current CV
2. Grant Support and Current Submissions
3. List of Research Trainees
4. Copies of Publication, Abstracts etc

This will be used for clinical faculty and PhD's depending on the research time allotment.

| MEMBERS RESEARCH | < 20% FTE (2 of 4 categories required) | 25-50% | 50-75% | >75% FTE |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Funding | Local or regional funding to support research assistant or conduct clinical projects | Local or regional funding to support research assistant or conduct clinical projects | One or more national agencies with possible funding from local source | One or more national agencies with possible funding from local source |
| Supervision | Dean's research project MSc or PhD committee | Supervision of full-time or part-time research trainee | Supervision of at least one full-time research trainee | One or more research trainees along with additional part-time trainees |
| Publication | 1-2 per year in peer reviewed journals – should have at least 50% of the role in 1 article | 1-3 per year with at least 1 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant | 2-4 per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant | 3-5 papers per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant |
| Presentation | Poster or paper presentation at local or national level | 1-2 presentations at national level | 1-3 presentations at national level | 1-3 presentations at national level |

September 2011 (Final)

Department of Psychiatry

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

- By:**
- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

Special Increase Process and Criteria Guidelines
School of Physical Therapy

Process:

1. Faculty members may submit documentation to support special increase including:
 - a. Updated curriculum vitae including Form 1 and summary page of Assignment of Duties Form
 - b. Relevant supporting information to demonstrate excellence in any of the categories (e.g. teaching dossier, etc.)
 - c. A summary statement/letter highlighting key activities/performance supporting excellence.
2. The Director, serving as Committee chair, requests volunteers to serve on the special increase committee (17.3.1: eligible employees include those holding probationary, tenured, continuing status, or term appointments if the term is > 1 year and there is still at least one academic year remaining).
3. Committee members are provided with:
 - a. electronic and/or hard copies of faculty information (detailed above #1)
 - b. the School of Physical Therapy standards for promotion/tenure and the special increase process and criteria guidelines
 - c. a ballot with names of all faculty members being considered for special increases
4. Special Increase Committee process:
 - At the first meeting:
 - a. Documents are reviewed and there is opportunity for clarification to be provided if needed. Committee members and the Director then independently complete the ballot indicating whether each faculty member (excluding themselves) should be considered for award of a special increase (Yes or No). Special increases will be awarded on the bases of assigned duties for each individual.
 - b. The results of the ballot are forwarded to the Director who will tabulate results
 - Following the first meeting:
 - a. The Director presents the results of the ballot to all committee members via e-mail
 - b. The Director forwards the ballot listing those individuals recommended for award of special increase to committee members for rank ordering
 - c. Committee members complete the ballot indicating the level of special increase recommended as: 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5 or 3.0 increments. (Special increase limit at the unit level is 1.0 increment, however, greater increases can be recommended at the College level).
 - d. The completed ballot is forwarded to the Director for tabulation and a second meeting is arranged.
 - At the second meeting:
 - a. Based on the tabulated results, the committee determines the special increases that should be awarded at the School level and what should

- be requested for consideration at the College level (i.e., greater numbers of awards or larger size of awards for individuals).
- b. The Director then forwards this information to the College Review Committee for final decision.

Criteria:

There can be considerable variability in the type and nature of activities within each of the defined categories dependent on the individual faculty member's assigned duties and the field of expertise. Examples are provided in each category to guide special increase decisions however the School of PT standards have additional activities that can be referenced. **Both quantity and quality** in each of the categories are considered in determining excellence and should be presented in the supporting information (e.g., notations on Form 1).

All of the following must be met:

- Demonstrated excellence in one or more categories
- Performance may be demonstrated over one-year or over a number of years (accumulated performance since last special increase award was received)

Faculty members must submit the following:

- A current CV including Form 1 and Teaching Dossier
- Relevant information supporting excellence in any of the eight categories noted below

Categories

1. Teaching¹
 - Teaching dossier including peer and student evaluations
 - Innovation – recognition by peers, institution, community (e.g., letters of support)
 - Awards
 - External Funding for Teaching-related projects
 - Invited speaker, invited paper to journal
 - Leader of a conference symposium
2. Research and Scholarly Work¹
 - Publications
 - Funding
 - Invited speaker, invited paper to journal
 - Leader of a conference symposium, Policy/CPG development
3. Practice of Professional Skills¹
 - Letters of support – (CPTe, Health Facilities, professional associations)
 - Awards
 - Clinical service

¹ The list below are samples of evidence that will be considered in making a decision about merit.

September 13, 2011

- Clinical specialization/certification
4. Extra University Work and Public Service¹
[outside assigned duties and work not done for pay (or only nominal fee)]
 - Outreach and engagement
 - Committee work
 - Public service
 - Provincial, national, or international conference organizer
 5. Administrative Work (other than duties associated with a Director/Department Head or Assistant Dean)¹
 - Exceptional leadership
 - Outcome(s) achieved
 6. Improvement in Academic Qualifications
 7. Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution

Example of Process:

1. Supporting documentation submitted by faculty. DATE:
2. Director contacts all faculty members and asks for volunteers to serve on committee. DATE:
3. Meeting set and materials forwarded to committee members. DATE:
4. Committee members forward completed ballots to Director. DATE:

The following walks through examples to describe ballots and summary results.

Assumptions:

- 7 Faculty members volunteer to serve on committee
- 8 faculty members submitted complete documentation to be considered for special increase
- NOTE: Faculty members do not vote for their own merit (in this example there would be 7 individuals voting for each person)

STEP 1: COMPLETE FIRST BALLOT (YES OR NO) PRIOR TO MEETING

Table 1A. Example Individual Ballot
COMMITTEE MEMBER'S NAME:

| Faculty Members Names Alphabetically listed | YES | NO |
|--|-----|-----|
| 1 | X | |
| 2 | X | |
| 3 | X | |
| 4 | X | |
| 5 | X | |
| 6 | n/a | n/a |
| 7 | | X |
| 8 | | X |

STEP 2: DIRECTOR TABULATES RESULTS AFTER MEETING

Table 1B: Summary Results Tabulated by Director based on First Ballot (8 committee members returned ballots)

| Faculty Members Names Alphabetically listed | YES | NO | n/a |
|--|-----|----|-----|
| 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 |

STEP 3:

Final List is developed based on Meeting Discussion (in this example the committee determined to consider top 5 individuals for ranking) List forwarded to members following meeting

Table 2: Example of Individual ballot using the final list

| Faculty Members Names listed alphabetically | Special Increase: Must choose one of: 0, .5, 1, 1.5 or 2 increments |
|---|---|
| 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 1 |
| 5 | 0.5 |

STEP 4: Director tabulates results

Table 3: Example of Summary Results (collated by Director –NOTE: voting by 8 faculty members (maximum of 7 individuals voting on each)

| Faculty Members Names listed alphabetically | increments/7 = merit recommendation (rounded up) |
|---|--|
| 1 | $11/7=1.5$ |
| 2 | $7/7=1$ |
| 3 | $7/7=1$ |
| 4 | $6/7=.85$ rounded 1 |
| 5 | $3/7=.4$ rounded .5 |

Results forwarded by Director to all committee members and to CRC for final decision. (If for example the School is given 3 increments in this example the decision may be to give three 1 increments to first three individuals and recommend that the CRC award the top individual an additional .5)

September 13, 2011

APPENDIX 1 - Timeline

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)

APPENDIX 2 – Worksheet

Note, this worksheet can be used members of the School of Physical Therapy Salary Review Committee to help members summarize their observations ... it is not meant to be used as a score sheet or a ranking sheet.

Salary Review Worksheet - School of PT - Academic Year: x - y

Categories

| | Fac 1 | Fac 2 | Fac 3 | Fac 4 | Fac 5 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Teaching | | | | | |
| • Teaching dossier including peer and student evaluations | | | | | |
| • Innovation – recognition by peers, institution, community (eg, letters of support) | | | | | |
| • Awards | | | | | |
| • External Funding for Teaching-related projects | | | | | |
| • Invited speaker, invited paper to journal | | | | | |
| • Leader of a conference symposium | | | | | |
| 2. Research and Scholarly Work | | | | | |
| • Publications | | | | | |
| • Funding | | | | | |
| • Invited speaker, invited paper to journal | | | | | |
| • Leader of a conference symposium, Policy/CPG development | | | | | |
| 3. Practice of Professional Skills | | | | | |
| • Letters of support – (CPTE, Health Facilities, professional associations) | | | | | |
| • Awards | | | | | |
| • Clinical service | | | | | |
| • Clinical specialization/certification | | | | | |
| 4. Extra University Work and Public Service | | | | | |
| [outside assigned duties and work not done for pay (or only nominal fee)] | | | | | |
| • Outreach and engagement | | | | | |
| • Committee work | | | | | |
| • Public service | | | | | |
| • Provincial, national, or international conference organizer | | | | | |
| 5. Administrative Work (other than duties assoc with admin position) | | | | | |
| • Exceptional leadership | | | | | |
| • Outcome(s) achieved | | | | | |
| 6. Improvement in Academic Qualifications | | | | | |
| 7. Offer of Employment from a Comparable Institution | | | | | |



Department of Surgery

PROCEDURE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

As per USFA Section 17

Process & Department Committee structure will follow Article 17

All information to be included will be up to June 30th.

Please include CV, Teaching Dossier and Form 1

1. Formation of Department Salary Committee

Comment [ZC1]: This section has been added.

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.

Procedure: During the first Academic Meeting of the current academic year a discussion will be held to determine how members would like to constitute the Salary Committee. Since the Department has both clinical members and scientist-researchers who are not clinicians, representation from each group will be requested. All interested and eligible members will be part of the committee.

Comment [ZC2]: Please revise this section to reflect what the Dept of Surgery will do.

2. Preparation of Form 1

The Form 1 is the basis for Salary review. The following are basic guidelines to help clarify certain areas of the Form 1 to help with clearer understanding of the work undertaken.

- a. Include annotation in each applicable category which clearly indicates the **percentage of the project** (ie. paper, poster, abstract, presentation, grant) that you were responsible for. This should be discussed with the co-authors.
- b. Indicate **Teaching hours** as follows – do **not** include hours for preparation (refer to Teaching Dossier)
 - i. Teaching done **outside of clinical activity** ie. didactic lectures, tutorials
 - ii. Teaching done **associated with clinical activity** ie. resident/jursi supervision
 1. Resident – 6 month rotation ~ 80 days available for clinic full-time (excluding academic day, holidays, study week, post call)
 2. Jursi – 6 week rotation ~ 20 days available
 - iii. Teaching done **associated with supervision** ie MSc, PhD, PDF

Department of Surgery

- c. Indicate the **percentage of time spent in *clinical* work** in section 23 A – Practice of Professional Skills
- d. **Administrative/Committee Work**
 - i. Indicate hours spent in committee meetings and separately in preparation
 - ii. Indicate role in committee – chair or member
- e. **Awards**
 - i. If an award has been given in any category provide a description of the source, local/national, any financial award and the significance.

Documentation for merit can be based on either:

- 1. The past year – based on Form I
- 2. Cumulative evidence since the last merit award - this will require documentation from prior years.

Merit should preferably be requested based on one category.

2. Determine if there is a category that you feel that you deserve to go forward for merit. The following categories will be considered. *A letter or file must be prepared to support the merit award for the specific category.*

17.2.1 Teaching. A Special Increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching.

Requirements: 1) CV 2) teaching philosophy 3) teaching dossier 4) a written description of explanation of the significance of the contributions should be included 5) Evaluations from students and peers 6) Awards/ commendations/publications, course or teaching materials etc if available.

Example: Consistent teaching with student evaluations above average and peer evaluation above average plus hours at/or above the average along with one or more of the following: an award, commendation, course developed, teaching materials, publications on teaching or workshops presented on teaching.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work. (Category 4) 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.

In order for "Accepted" papers to count, letters from the publisher confirming the article has been accepted must be attached.

(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.

Examples: The number of PostDoc's, PhD and MSc students will determine an average/expected number of publications. Merit may be awarded for numbers above the average/expected and will include overall contribution, reputation of journal.

Grants will be evaluated based on contribution, value, source and type/competition.

Department of Surgery

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills. A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee for excellence in the practice of professional skills.

Examples:

a) Clinical Practice:

Quality of Care as expected in an academic center, participation in quality assurance process, maintenance of competence, maintain an appropriate service load; willingness to participate in out of hours duties; provision of peer consultation, communication and collaboration; consultation with colleagues beyond the base practice; consultation to service organizations relevant to their program; willingness to participate in multidisciplinary care delivery will be considered the standard.

Merit may be considered for:

- Regional, provincial, national or international recognition.
- Consistent provision over many years of high quality care as defined above including leadership roles ie. Lifetime contributions.

b) Scholarly Work:

- a. Publications: Merit may be award for publications in peer reviewed journals above the average number or a publication that occurs while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- b. Evidence of research funding or institutional support for research as an individual or major member of program based practice – consideration of contribution, value, source and type/contribution while carrying out equivalent clinical and teaching duties to peers/adjusted for junior/senior faculty.
- c. Scholarship Awards:

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.

A letter commenting on or substantiating meritorious work, from the Chair or another authority needs to be attached. Example: a new program developed, a program proves successful and is adopted by other places.

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.

Department of Surgery

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.

3. Determination of Ranking within the Department

A spreadsheet will be completed that will record the activities in each category as outlined in each individuals Form I. A relative rating guide will be used that will take into account:

- The individuals full or part-time status
- The individuals rank will help determine where in the range of expected productivity they would fit
- The Career Path and Assignment of Duties will be reflected in evaluation
- Percentage of individual work involved in each project
- Hours for teaching and committee work
- Percentage of time spent in clinical activity (where appropriate)

Comment [ZC3]: This bullet has been added.

The results of this algorithm will provide an overall point system which will be averaged among members. Those members who are above the average/benchmark will be considered for the next phase of salary review discussion. There will also be expected guidelines in place for research and teaching categories.

The salary review committee will discuss the individual merits based on the case put forward in writing by the individual.

The Department Head will meet with each Faculty member to review the rationale.

References:

1. USFA Agreement
2. Community Health and Epidemiology Standards for Merit 2010
3. Department of Psychiatry, University of Manitoba, (Sareen, 2010)
4. Department of Psychiatry, University of Saskatchewan (2011)

Department of Surgery

Internal Guide for Research Productivity

Documentation:

1. Current CV
2. Grant Support and Current Submissions
3. List of Research Trainees
4. Copies of Publication, Abstracts etc

This will be used for clinical faculty and PhD's depending on the research time allotment.

| MEMBERS RESEARCH | < 25% FTE (2 of 4 categories required) | 25-50% | 50-75% | >75% FTE |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Funding | Local or regional funding to support research assistant or conduct clinical projects | Local or regional funding to support research assistant or conduct clinical projects | One or more national agencies with possible funding from local source | One or more national agencies with possible funding from local source |
| Supervision | Dean's research project MSc or PhD committee | Supervision of full-time or part-time research trainee | Supervision of at least one full-time research trainee | One or more research trainees along with additional part-time trainees |
| Publication | 1-2 per year in peer reviewed journals – should have at least 50% of the role in 1 article | 1-3 per year with at least 1 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant | 2-4 per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant | 3-5 papers per year with at least 2 articles in which there has been >50% input by applicant |
| Presentation | Poster or paper presentation at local or national level | 1-2 presentations at national level | 1-3 presentations at national level | 1-3 presentations at national level |

September 2011 (Final)

Department of Surgery

TIMELINE for SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURE

Comment [ZC4]: Page added to all departments' standards

By:

- June 30 Department Head to advise candidates to provide information they wish to introduce to support their own case (categories in Art. 17.2)
- Sept 1 Candidate to provide the Department Head with information supporting their case
- Nov 30 Department Head to meet with each employee to discuss the salary recommendation (Art.17.5.2)
Department Salary Committee to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- made awards (Art.17.4.1 iii)
- submitted recommendations to the College (Art.17.4.1 iv, v, vi, vii)
- informed employees of the rankings, awards and recommendations along with the reasons for the awards and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.1 viii)
- Jan 31 College Review Committees to have:
- considered all reviews (Art.17.4.4. v and vi, and 17.5.4)
- made awards (Art.17.4.4. vi and vii)
- submitted recommendations to the President's Review Committee (Art.17.4.4.viii)
- informed individual employees of decisions and recommendations (within 1 week following decision) (Art.17.4.4.ix)
- informed Salary Committees of CRC's decisions and recommendations to PRC along with the reasons for the rankings, awards and recommendations (Art.17.4.4.x)
- submitted those decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art.17.4.4.xi)
- Feb 28 Employees wishing to appeal any decision of the Department Salary Committee or the College Review Committee must submit the appeal to the secretary of the President's Review Committee (Art.17.5.5 and Art.17.5.4)
- Mar 31 President's Review Committee to have considered all cases and submitted its decisions to the President for the Board's information (Art. 17.4.5)