

**COLLEGE REVIEW COMMITTEE
STANDARDS FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREMENTS
TO FACULTY IN THE
WESTERN COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE**

The standards described below are used in the determination of the award of special increments for WCVM faculty members.

It is understood that the appreciation of past practices and a corporate memory provides for some continuity and consistency of the process over time.

Please note that the responsibility lies with the individual faculty member to put forward evidence in support of their case.

The USFA Collective Agreement 2010-2013 sets out the general criteria for special increases as they apply to the entire university (USFA 17.2). Therefore, the WCVM need only recognize that such criteria exist and to specifically note any modifications or clarifications that apply to this College.

The primary factor in the allocation of a special increment is the quality of performance in the faculty members' duties. Account will be taken of a faculty member's assigned duties.

The award of special increments may, from time to time, be based on a cumulative performance over a period of several years (USFA 17.1.3) which would not have constituted a clearly superior performance by itself in any one year.

Administrative duties of and by themselves are not a basis for the award of special increment. Superior performance in administration as in other duties would merit consideration.

As a faculty member increases in rank, there is an increase in expectation as to the quality of work and the range of competence in a variety of situations. Hence, more is expected of a professor than of an assistant professor.

The following levels of performance shall warrant consideration for special salary increases:

1. Superior performance or better in at least one of the categories of evaluation, together with competent performance in the remainder.
2. A special increase may be based on accumulated performance over a period of years which, when regarded altogether, may merit a special increase.

Evaluation of performance will take into account any special requirements or restrictions which have been made as a condition of employment.

The following process was determined:

1. The onus is on the faculty members and their departments to present their cases with enough evidence to allow CRC to make a decision

2. Departments should submit their decisions regarding merit awards to the CRC secretary. The departments would submit the following lists:
 - a) faculty receiving departmental merit awards and their ranking (17.4.3 v);
 - b) recommendations from the department committee regarding additional merit (including those who are worthy of merit, but funds did not allow an award) (17.4.3 vi); and
 - c) a list of faculty whose performance was not considered meritorious.
3. Department heads are invited to present information to CRC.
4. Once the CRC has developed its own rankings and recommendations regarding faculty, they will be given the information on what the departmental merit awards. The final CRC merit awards will then be determined. For example, Professor X is recommended by CRC to receive 2 merit increments; the department has awarded 1.5 merit increments. CRC would then award Professor X an additional 0.5 merit increment. Similarly a faculty member whose performance was considered meritorious but was not awarded merit by the department could then be awarded merit by the CRC.
5. Once the reconciliation of the department and CRC awards has been done, CRC would make a final review of cases to determine recommendations for PRC. Those recommended to PRC must have received a merit award from the CRC.

NOTE: The WCVI CRC determined that an open and flexible process is necessary and important. The above process meets that requirement and also the stipulation in the USFA collective agreement 17.4.4 (v) "the CRC shall receive the decisions made by the Salary Committees."

**STANDARDS FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREMENTS
TO DEPARTMENT HEADS IN THE WESTERN COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE**

The standards described below are used in the conjunction with the applicable Departmental Standards for Special Increases in determination of the award of special increments for WCVI Department Heads.

It is understood that the appreciation of past practices and a corporate memory provides for some continuity and consistency of the process over time.

Please note that the responsibility lies with the individual Department Head to put forward evidence in support of their case.

The USFA Collective Agreement 2010-2013 sets out the general criteria for special increases as they apply to the entire university (USFA 17.2). Therefore, the WCVI need only recognize that such criteria exist and to specifically note any modifications or clarifications that apply to this College.

The primary factor in the allocation of a special increment is the quality of performance in the faculty members' duties along with consideration of the Department Head's assigned duties. Administrative duties are a critical component of the department head's accountabilities. The department head is expected to provide leadership and manage the affairs of the department including the academic mission; research enterprise; assignment of duties; oversight of departmental accounts; recruitment, development and retention of faculty and staff; management of the affairs of the department, as well as planning and implementation. The department head is part of the college leadership team and will represent the department mission, faculty and staff at the college level. In addition, the department head will participate in college leadership addressing the wider interests of the college. The department head may at times be asked to take on other duties as needed, and to represent the college externally.

The award of special increments may, from time to time, be based on a cumulative performance over a period of several years (USFA 17.1.3) which would not have constituted a clearly superior performance by itself in any one year.

The following levels of performance shall warrant consideration for special salary increases:

1. Superior performance or excellence in at least one of the categories of evaluation, together with competent performance in the remainder.
2. A special increase may be based on accumulated performance over a period of years which, when regarded altogether, may merit a special increase.

Evaluation of performance will take into account any special requirements or restrictions which have been made as a condition of employment.

JOB PROFILE
Department Head
University of Saskatchewan

Staff Member Name:

College / Unit: Job Family: Job Title: Department Head Date of Review: April 2011
--

Primary Purpose of the Position

University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995 (1195, c. U-6.1, s. 76)

Heads of Departments

*76(1) The head of each department of a college has general supervision over and direction of the work of the department and shall assign teaching duties to the members of the department, following consultation with the department, in committee.
(2) The head of each department of a college is responsible to the dean for the satisfactory performance of the work of the department.*

The department head is a member of the leadership team of the University of Saskatchewan, reporting to the dean. The department head is accountable for contributing to the leadership of the college, recruiting, developing and retaining faculty and staff, and management and administration of the department. Major responsibilities include: full participation in planning processes for both the department and the college; prudent and responsible management of financial resources and the use of those resources to their best advantage for the purposes for which they were intended; provision of a healthy and positive work and learning environment; oversight of the day-to-day work of the department including collegial processes; continued engagement in their own scholarly work; and, other responsibilities that may be delegated or assigned by the dean

Nature of the Work

The department head is responsible for providing leadership and support to faculty and staff and an undergraduate and graduate student body in the academic department. Working in close collaboration with the department faculty and staff, the department head ensures the satisfactory performance of the work of the department including the soundness of scholarly and educational programs, the quality of the undergraduate and graduate student experience, and the provision of high-quality human and physical resources. The department head administers all department resources effectively to ensure outcomes as defined in the Integrated Plan and Strategic Directions.

The department head functions in a demanding environment that requires managing multiple priorities and demands on limited resources. Decisions ranging from the mundane to critical are required on a routine basis.

Accountabilities (Expected Outcomes)

The Department Head is accountable for the following outcomes:

Strategic Planning

- Ensure academic standards and relevancy of programs are maintained
- Ensure the department offers academic programming that attracts high academic achievers
- Contribute to college and university planning processes and ensure department plans are aligned with the university's strategic directions
- Foster effective relationships with internal and external partners, stakeholders and clients to ensure success in meeting the college's and department's strategic and operational goals

People and Environment

- Attract and support the success of outstanding faculty and staff

- Ensure equitable workloads for faculty on an annual basis, taking into consideration research, teaching and service contributions
- Ensure healthy, positive, diverse and inclusive work and learning environments
- Hold people accountable for high standards of performance
- Provide timely and meaningful performance feedback to faculty and staff
- Promote student success

Management and Administration

- Contribute to the development of creative solutions to resource challenges in the department and the college
- Review and oversee all financial activities within the department consistent with the practices established for the college
- Manage within the budget allocated to the department
- Encourage appropriate training so that faculty and staff are knowledgeable about safety and risk management
- Ensure processes and practices that mitigate risk are in place

Teaching, Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work

- Continue to engage in teaching, research, scholarly and artistic work at a level determined in consultation with the dean

Department Specific

- Deans may add accountabilities that are situation and/or department specific

Competencies

Competencies: are attributes, behaviours, manner, and style of how skills and knowledge are applied to the job. Each person brings different combinations of competencies to their position. The competencies below are the desired attributes that support the University of Saskatchewan's Strategic Directions and People Values. All are applicable in varying degrees depending on the expectations of the job. Feedback with respect to the competencies provides a focus for development to ensure an overall balance, so that no particular set of competencies is over or under-demonstrated.

There are six competencies that are core to jobs at the University. They are:

Leadership / Vision
 Support for Progress
 Results Orientation
 Personal Effectiveness
 Communication
 Relationship Building

Leadership / Vision

The demonstrated ability to build a shared, compelling, and credible vision of the future, influencing people to ensure outcomes that support achieving the vision; applicable to all jobs at all levels; a culture of leadership.

- Influences others to share and commit to a common vision
- Fosters positive work and learning environments
- Values and considers differing points of view before making a decision
- Makes timely decisions even when unpopular or difficult
- Anticipates how decisions affect people
- Delegates authority and responsibility
- Holds others accountable for making and meeting commitments
- Provides continuous, honest and supportive feedback
- Supports development and continuous improvement

Support for Progress

The demonstrated ability to initiate, implement, and support innovation and institutional change and enhance programs and services.

- Challenges the status quo
- Advocates innovation and creativity, even when risk is involved
- Adapts and maintains productivity in an atmosphere of changing practices
- Demonstrates an optimistic attitude towards change
- Demonstrates emotional maturity and resiliency in difficult circumstances
- Engages and supports others in the change process
- Works with, rather than resists, forces of change

Results Orientation

Focuses on results and completing objectives within the framework defined by the University's plans and policies.

- Readily accepts and responds to challenges
- Directly confronts problems and persists in finding solution
- Remains optimistic and persistent in the face of adversity
- Demonstrates courage rather than avoidance to resolve difficult issues
- Identifies shared interests to develop positive outcomes
- Focuses on facts and root causes rather than reacting to symptoms
- Celebrates successes and learns from mistakes

Personal Effectiveness

Demonstrates an ability to reflect, clarify, and commit to what is important, take responsibility for growth and development, and contribute to positive and productive work and learning environments.

- Demonstrates integrity and ethical conduct in words and deeds
- Keeps promises and commitments even when unpopular or difficult
- Seeks out and appreciates feedback, demonstrating a commitment to learning
- Accepts ownership and responsibility for outcomes
- Learns and recovers from setbacks / mistakes
- Shares expertise willingly and is sought out as a resource for others
- Forgoes personal recognition in support of success of others
- Takes responsibility for balancing work and personal commitments

Communication

The demonstrated ability to convey information and ideas to individuals in a manner that engages the audience and helps them understand, retain, and respond to the message.

- Communicates clearly and ensures understanding
- Listens actively to understand others' points of view
- Provides useful and valuable information to others
- Demonstrates an awareness of the effects of communications on others
- Understands and demonstrates the need for confidentiality and discretion

Relationship Building

The demonstrated ability to develop the rapport necessary to build, maintain, and/or strengthen partnerships and relationships inside and outside of the University.

- Seeks out and promotes positive relationships
- Builds opportunities through collaboration and partnerships
- Maximizes opportunities to achieve outcomes through or with others

- Demonstrates understanding, respect and concern for others
- Participates willingly and openly supports team decisions
- Proactively deals with conflict by openly addressing problems



Standards for Award of Special Increases in the Department of Large Animal Clinical Sciences

Guiding Principles

- 1) The primary factor in the allocation of a special increase is the quality of performance of the faculty member in conducting his/her duties. Account will be taken of a faculty member's assigned duties.
- 2) The award of special increments may be based on the cumulative performance over a period of at least two years.
- 3) As a faculty member increases in rank and experience, there is an increased expectation as to the quality of work and the range of competencies in the various categories. Hence, more is expected of a professor than of an assistant professor.
- 4) Excellence in at least one of the categories of evaluation, together with competent performance in the remainder is required.
- 5) Over the long term the departmental committee will give approximately 40% of the departmental special increases for teaching, approximately 40% of the special increases for practice of professional skills/research and scholarly activity, and 20% of the special increases for administration/extension
- 6) This is a peer review process and as such it will depend on the reasonable judgement of a committee of elected peers.

Criteria for the Award of Special Increases

17.2.1 Teaching

A special increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching. Special increases for teaching should be made on the basis of quality not quantity of teaching, although heavy teaching duties in excess of the departmental average may be considered noteworthy by the committee. Teaching assignments may include undergraduate teaching in core courses, electives and clinical rotations as well as graduate student teaching and supervision of graduate students, interns and residents. Evidence of excellence in teaching may include but is not limited to:

- Teaching awards
- Strong peer teaching evaluations or student teaching and course evaluations
- Innovative or novel teaching strategies
- Development and/or significant revision of courses, elective courses, or rotations
- Development of new clinical teaching opportunities
- Exemplary graduate student supervision and/or graduate student success
- Development of new course materials
- Quality mentoring of summer students
- Extracurricular teaching in student clubs
- Willingness to accept extra teaching assignments when other faculty are on leave

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work

Only faculty whose letter of appointment has designated them under this category shall be considered for special increases in this category. Evidence of excellence in this category may include but is not limited to:

- Publications or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication
 - Refereed publications
 - Books, book chapters, review articles
 - Non-peer reviewed articles
 - Invited conference presentations
 - Conference proceedings

Note: It is important that the amount of contribution towards the publication should be considered by the committee as well as the quality of the publication. The amount of contribution should be annotated on the CV update by the faculty member.

- Research grants
 - Junior faculty members early in their career may be considered for special increases if they have made exceptional progress in obtaining grants from competitive funding sources
 - More experienced faculty members will be evaluated primarily on their publication record.
 - A substantial leadership role in major new collaborative funding initiatives will be considered for special increases regardless of rank

Note: The allocation of funding associated with major collaborative grants should indicate the relative leadership role and funding for each member. The Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PI's should be indicated.

- Improvement in academic qualifications including board certification

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills

Only faculty whose letter of appointment has designated them under this category shall be considered for special increases in this category. Most faculty members evaluated under "Practice of Professional Skills" will have a significant clinical practice component to their assigned duties. Research and scholarly work are considered as a component of this category as well as the clinical practice component. The committee must take into account the level of assigned duties in the clinical practice component when evaluating the quality of both clinical practice and scholarly publications.

Evidence of excellence in this category would include but is not limited to:

- Publications or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication
 - Refereed publications
 - Books, book chapters, review articles
 - Non-peer reviewed articles
 - Invited conference presentations
 - Conference proceedings

Note: It is important that the amount of contribution towards the publication should be considered by the committee as well as the quality of the publication. The amount of contribution should be annotated on the CV update by the faculty member.

- Research grants
 - Junior faculty members early in their career may be considered for special increases if they have made exceptional progress in obtaining grants from competitive funding sources
 - More experienced faculty members will be evaluated primarily on their publication record.
 - A substantial leadership role in major new collaborative funding initiatives will be considered for special increases regardless of rank

Note: The allocation of funding associated with major collaborative grants should indicate the relative leadership role and funding for each member. The Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PI's should be indicated.

- Improvement in academic qualifications including board certification
- Clinical Practice
 - Evidence of excellence in this component may include but is not limited to:
 - Provision of exemplary clinical service
 - Success in developing new client services or in attracting new clients to the veterinary teaching hospital
 - Delivering quality educational material to clients through the form of seminars or newsletters
 - Evidence of high quality referral and diagnostic services
 - Exemplary mentorship of faculty, interns and residents within the clinical practice
 - Initiatives to utilise clinical material for teaching or scholarly publications
 - High quality participation in college and departmental seminars and rounds
 - Leadership roles in the veterinary teaching hospital and clinical practice
 - Willingness to take on additional clinical service when colleagues are on leave

17.2.4 and 17.2.5 Extra University Work/Public Service and Administrative Work

A special increase may be awarded to a faculty member for excellence in outreach and engagement, service within the VTH, committee work, public service or administrative duties. It should be noted that assistant professors are not required to have significant involvement in administrative work and that rank of the faculty member is an important consideration in these categories. Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in the collegial decision-making processes and to participate in administrative work. The quality of administrative work, the level of contribution and the demands of the administrative work should be taken into account when assessing this category. Extra university work and public service without significant compensation may also be viewed as meritorious under this category. Evidence of excellence in this category may include but is not limited to:

- Quality service in administration in especially demanding roles such as graduate chair, college review committees, admissions committees, university council or other significant contributions to administration
- Quality service in administrative roles within the veterinary teaching hospital such as section heads, service under animal care committees or providing exemplary service in administration and care of teaching animals
- Public service in terms of media interviews, extension talks, committee work, and conference organization may be considered under this category. Wherever possible the quality of the contributions should be assessed as well as the quantity.
- Public recognition and awards
- Public service in administrative/leadership roles in professional organizations

Departmental Committee Recommendations

The departmental committee shall consist of the department head and three additional faculty members elected on an annual basis by a secret ballot.

17.1.31: Each employee will provide a CV update (Form 1 and 2) in order to be eligible for the awards.

In addition, each faculty member will provide a brief self-assessment document to the departmental committee. This self-assessment document is crucial for the committee when evaluating performance. This is the faculty member's opportunity to make a case as to why they deserve a special increase. If the faculty member feels that a particular area should be considered for special increases, then proof should be provided if possible. For example: if substantial changes and improvements in teaching materials have been made, the committee must see examples of the previous and new teaching materials in order to assess if it is worthy of merit. Faculty members wishing to be evaluated on the basis of teaching need to ensure that teaching evaluations are conducted.

17.5.6: The information required in 17.1.1.31 shall be provided to the department head by September 1. Information in the CV update should include achievements on or before June 30th of the current year.

Note: WCVI teaching and research awards announced in September, but based upon performance prior to June 30th will automatically be considered by the departmental committee, despite the fact that these accomplishments would not be included in the current CV update.

The committee will meet to review CV updates for all faculty members in the department. Faculty members who wish to be considered for an accumulated period should indicate this to the department head in writing. The department head will present each case to the committee emphasizing the highlights of the faculty's accomplishments to facilitate committee discussion.

Salary committee members may vote for all faculty cases which they reviewed and for which they participated in committee discussions. Salary committee members will be excluded from ranking their own case or any other case in which there is a perceived conflict of interest.

After discussion of all cases, each case will be scored independently by each eligible salary committee member under 3 categories:

- 1) Teaching
- 2) Research and Scholarly Work or Practice of Professional Skills
- 3) Administration/Extension and Public Service

Each of the 3 categories shall be scored on a scale of 1-10 based on the following rubric. Note that assigned duties and rank of the faculty member must be taken into account when scoring each category. For example, Assistant Professors should not receive a poor score for administrative duties when that is not part of their assigned duties. The weighting of distribution of effort for each faculty member must be considered when deliberating on scores for individual categories.

- Score of 1-2: Below average or poor performance of assigned duties under this category. In most circumstances, a score of below 3 in any one category would disqualify the candidate from receiving special increases regardless of scores received in other categories.
- Score of 3-4: Average performance of assigned duties under this category. The faculty member is performing their assigned duties in a manner that is expected for their rank and experience. NOTE: Full professors who have not undertaken peer or student teaching evaluations in the last 2 years, or who have not provided evidence of meritorious work as listed in 17.2.1 shall be scored 3-4 unless the committee believes there is a compelling reason to justify movement to a higher or lower rank.
- Score of 5-6: Above average performance of assigned duties under this category. The faculty member would rank in the 60th -70th percentile for faculty members in a similar rank.
- Score of 7-8: Excellent performance of assigned duties under this category. The performance of the faculty member in this category would rank in the 70th – 90th percentile for faculty members in a similar rank.
- Score of 9-10: Exceptional performance of assigned duties under this category. The performance of the faculty member in this category would rank in the 90th percentile or higher for faculty members in a similar rank.

The sum of the average scores in each category will be calculated for each faculty member in order to initially rank the faculty members within the department. Two thirds of the funding for departmental special increases must be awarded as full increments. The committee will award special increases to the highest overall ranked individuals and will also consider those candidates with exceptionally high scores in individual categories. The highest ranked individuals will be give full special increments and the remaining high scores will be awarded half special increments. Exceptionally high scores in a single category may be considered meritorious as long as there is reasonable performance in all other categories.

At the discretion of the committee, faculty who have received awards may be forwarded to the College Review Committee with recommendations for further special increases. In addition, faculty members who are deserving of merit but who did not receive a special increase at the departmental level may be forwarded to the College Review Committee for consideration.

Standards for Award of Special Increases in the Department of Small Animal Clinical Sciences

Department member's responsibilities:

Each department member will submit their form 1 and 2 in addition to a self-assessment document. The self-assessment is *crucial* for the committee when evaluating performance. This is the member's chance to make a case as to why they may deserve a special increase. If the member feels that a particular area should be considered for merit, then proof should be provided. For example: if substantial changes and improvements in teaching materials have been made, the committee must see examples of the previous and new teaching materials in order to assess if it is worthy of merit. The self-assessment document should contain subsections that address each area being evaluated e.g. Teaching, Research and Scholarly Work, Practice of Professional Skills, etc.

Standards for special increase (general comments):

- Following is a list of examples that the salary standards committee has developed based on department input as to what should be considered meritorious for a special increase. It should be recognized that for each section there may be additional actions that may be worthy of merit which have not been listed and these will be considered on an individual basis.
- Before a special increase is recommended for an individual the following must be considered:
 - The individual should meet all of the current job requirements before a special increase is awarded
 - A special increase should be awarded for actions that are "special" - i.e. deemed to be worthy of recognition because they are above what is the expected norm or the department

Interpretation of the standards:

Individuals should be judged and compared with the following things in mind:

- Expectations for an Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor differ. This may be especially true under the categories of teaching, research and scholarly work, and administrative work.
- Work that is completed during a medical, maternity, or sabbatical leave may not be as worthy of merit as work that is completed during the course of a faculty member's regular work time.

Process for evaluating faculty:

1. Establish benchmarks

Each faculty member's form 1 and CV will be reviewed and a data matrix will be created to capture relevant information under the following categories: Book chapters, Peer-reviewed papers, Non-peer-reviewed papers, conference presentations (abstracts, invited talks), grants and contracts, teaching hours, students supervised/committee membership, administration/service, and other. Other represents items that do not easily fit in the mentioned categories. For each category a summative score is developed and then an average calculated. These averages serve as benchmark performance for faculty in the SACS department.

Benchmarks are created for faculty at the assistant, associate, and full professor level.

Benchmark calculations will begin in a prospective manner and eventually several years data should be combined for this purpose.

2. Compare performance of faculty to the benchmark

Performance of faculty at each level is compared against the benchmark for that level.

3. Consider qualitative information

Numerical values compared against the benchmark are important in faculty assessment but more qualitative information needs to be taken into account as well.

Examples:

- Publications - time necessary to produce, authors role (% overall contribution as well as specific contributions e.g. concept, primary investigator on funded grant, primary manuscript writing, etc.), academic merit of the work, journal of publication, rank of the type of publication.
- Teaching – awards, nominations, improvements, developing teaching materials, peer reviews.
- Administrative work - time commitment and work involved will differ significantly depending on the committee and must be considered
- Practice of professional skills - this cannot be given a numerical value and therefore must be evaluated for each individual
- "Other" category

4. Make recommendations for special increases

Based on comparisons of each individual faculty member's performance recommendations for special increases can be made. The committee can decide if they want to designate a certain number to teaching, scholarly work, administration, practice of professional skills, etc. This may differ from year to year.

5. The committee should consider past performance

If no special was awarded in the previous year, the performance for that year can be considered in addition to the current year when deciding merit.

Conversely, if a special was awarded the previous year for an "accepted publication" it cannot be considered for merit the following year when it becomes "published".

6. All faculty members will be given a summary of the outcome of deliberations

DEPARTMENT STANDARDS FOR AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASE

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

17.2.1 Teaching. *A Special Increase may be [] awarded to an employee for excellence in teaching.*

- a. Teaching awards received: (ranked highest to lowest)
 - University Master Teacher Award
 - Pfizer Carl J. Norden Award - can only receive every 5 years
 - Stan Olson Clinical Teaching Award /Pre-clinical Teaching Award
 - USSU Teaching Award

- b. Teaching load deemed to be special- above and beyond department norms or expectations: i.e. hourly commitment to:
 - 580 (hours of direct supervision)
 - Undergraduate didactic teaching and laboratories
 - Graduate didactic teaching and laboratories

- c. Other considerations:
 - Nomination for a Master Teacher, Pfizer Carl J. Norden, Stan Olsen/Merial Award of Excellence in Clinical Teaching or Pre-clinical Teaching award
 - Showing great improvement in teaching as indicated by taking measures to improve teaching ability (e.g. teaching courses taken, significant changes to lecture content, style, or teaching materials) and improvement in student and peer evaluation
 - Development of new, high quality teaching materials
 - Substantial revision of an existing graduate or undergraduate course or development of a new course (proof given)
 - Unscheduled teaching which is deemed to be above department expectations or norms: extra-curricular labs and lectures for students, interns, staff, C.E. programs

Notes: Student reviews can be biased (a popularity contest). Peer reviews are considered more reliable. Evaluations over more than one year should be considered. Teaching evaluations can be provided by the faculty member in a supporting binder along with other supporting documents.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work. *A Special increase may be [] awarded to an employee for excellence in the following types of research and scholarly work:*

(i) Publication. *Publication, or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication, are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase. The size of the Special Increase should reflect the amount of time necessary to produce the publication, as well as the academic merit of the work. Please clarify if the work was completed prior to the start of your appointment.*

- a. All refereed scholarly publications* are meritorious and may be considered for an award. When ranking the merit of different publications consideration should be given to:
 - Time necessary to produce the publication
 - Author's role in publications (% overall contribution as well as specific contributions e.g. concept, primary investigator on funded grant, primary manuscript writing, etc.)
 - Academic merit of the work

Suggested rank in order of merit (highest to lowest)

Note: although this is the suggested ranking, the quality of the individual published work and considerations listed under a., above should take priority in deciding merit

- research publication arising from an experimental or clinical applied research
- research publication arising from a retrospective study
- Others (rank in order of merit may be similar for the following but must be determined on an individual basis)

- review article
- description of a technique
- small case series
- case report
- research abstract
- book chapter (note that book chapters are not recognized until book is published)
- solicited editorial
- book review
- publication related to teaching

b. Author or co-author of a book is deserving of merit similar to publication of research articles

c. Editor of a book

d. Research grants

- external grants (principal investigator or Co-PI)
- in-house grants (principal investigator or Co-PI) and contract research can be evaluated in overall consideration but on their own are not meritorious

*Note: publication or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication

- if a special is awarded based on acceptance of a publication, then publication of that manuscript is not eligible for a subsequent special award.

(ii) Unpublished Work. *Unpublished research or scholarly work are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase if it is established that the work has academic merit and that there is no appropriate publication outlet for a particular subject matter, or that the work is of a kind that does not normally lead to publication, such as engineering design and patentable inventions.*

- a. Development of quality tools (computer assisted learning), clinical manuals, template operating protocols
- b. Technical and industry solicited reports
- c. Research excellence award
- d. Peer reviews of scientific articles

(iii) Artistic Work. *Artistic creations and performances are grounds for recommending an employee for a Special Increase, where this is appropriate to a discipline.*

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

- a. Formal recognition e.g. SVMA award, "veterinarian of the year"
- b. Enhancement or development of a specialized clinical skill, technique, or modality (for example by undertaking substantial C.E. courses or training)
- c. c. Acceptance of an excessive (higher than the norm) case load and performance of duties e.g. Increased duties placed on a faculty member due to leave of another

- d. Presentation at specialty meetings - Invited speaker at national or international meetings
- e. Delivery of Continuing Education deemed to be above what is expected of an individual
- f. Community outreach and extension
- g. Documentation of significant work to improve clinical service (e.g. work toward obtaining special equipment, establishment of new services, personal or technician training courses, regulatory approval)

Note: Individuals functioning in single-person services may be given special consideration in this area. Weeks of on-clinic duty during the summer can be included as can weeks of clinical service where there is not a 580 rotation running.

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 that [] the following criteria are met:*

(i) The work is outside the assigned duties of the employee, as specified in the employee's letter of appointment or by best practice. Employees in [] clinical departments would not merit a Special Increase for their assigned extension or clinical work within this category;

- a. Committee work serving a professional body such as the SVMA, CVMA, or specialty board
- b. Serving as an expert witness

(ii) The work is not done for extra pay that is more than a nominal fee. An employee who is paid more than a nominal fee to do extra work by [], government or a public agency would not normally satisfy this criterion [].

17.2.5 Administrative Work *A Special Increase may be awarded to an employee with administrative duties, other than duties associated with a Department Head or Assistant Dean [].*

- a. Administrative duties above the norm (number of committees and hours spent) within the department, college, or university e.g. SAC Assistant director, University Council, Council committees, Ad-Hoc committees

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 [].*

- a. Completing a graduate degree
- b. Obtaining specialty board certification

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 had 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.*

Standards for Award of Special Increases in the Department of Veterinary Biomedical Sciences

The Collective Agreement 2010 – 2013 Section 17.1.3 states that Special Increases may be awarded to an employee who has demonstrated excellence in one or more of the categories described in 17.2 (Basis for the Award of Special Increases).

Each department shall establish standards for the Award of Special Increases. These standards must be approved by the College Review Committee. Section 17.3.1 states that each department shall establish annually a Salary Committee chaired by the Department Head. The Committee shall include a minimum of three additional eligible employees elected on an annual basis by secret ballot.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The primary factors in the allocation of a special increment is the quality of performance in the faculty members' duties. Account will be taken of a faculty member's assigned duties

The award of special increments may be based on the cumulative performance over a period of at least two years.

As a faculty member increases in rank, there is an increased expectation regarding the quality of work and the range of competence in varying situations. Hence, more is expected of professor than of an assistant professor.

Excellence in at least one of the categories of evaluation, together with competent performance in the remainder is required.

Evaluation of performance will take into account any special requirements such as restrictions which have been made as a condition of employment.

DEPARTMENT SALARY COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

The departmental salary committee shall be established according to 17.3.1. The committee shall consist of three faculty members elected by secret ballot for a 3 year term, plus the Department head. Nominations and voting will occur in May or June of each year. One faculty member will be replaced each year to maintain continuity. Faculty members on leave or out-of-scope will be replaced. Broad representation from different disciplines in the department will be encouraged.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL SALARY COMMITTEE

Section 17.4.1

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;

Specific Requirements

Section 17.5.2

Employees shall be provided with a copy (approved) of standards for the award of special Increases for the department.

Section 17.5.6.IV

The departmental committee shall make awards prior to November 30 and inform employees of rankings, the award recommendations and reasons for the awards.

Section 17.1.3.1

Each employee will provide a current CV update to be eligible for the awards.

Section 17.5.6

The information required in 17.1.3.1 shall be provided to the department head by September 1. Information contained in the CV update should include achievements on or before June 30 of the current year. Each department member wishing to be considered for merit shall submit Form 1 and 2. Submission of a self-assessment document with evidence to support the case for merit is strongly encouraged. If the faculty member wishes to be considered for merit based on a cumulative performance over a period of at least two years, the faculty member must provide the departmental salary committee with Forms 1 and 2 from the years to be considered, plus supporting documentation as indicated above.

Note: Teaching and research awards in WCVI announced in late September, but based upon performance prior to June 30 will automatically be included retroactively by the departmental committee according to 17.2.

CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF SPECIAL INCREASES

17.2.1 Teaching

A special increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching. Special increases for teaching will normally be made on the basis of quality not quantity of teaching, although teaching duties in excess of the departmental average for an extended period of time may be considered noteworthy by the committee. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to ensure appropriate student and/or peer evaluations are conducted for the appropriate year. In order to facilitate this, the faculty member should advise the department head by September 1 prior to the academic year for which they would like evaluations to be conducted.

Teaching Awards

Teaching awards are a distinct indicator of excellence and worthy of merit. Peer reviewed teaching awards at the national or university level (3M award, Master Teaching Award) are distinctly meritorious. College awards or university awards should also be viewed as meritorious, (Pfizer, Pre-clinical Teacher, USSU awards, team teaching awards).

Other indicators of teaching excellence may include, in no particular order:

- development of new course material
- preparation of appropriate, original and innovative teaching methods
- involvement in curriculum review
- provision of clinical relevance to basic science instruction.
- letters of support from graduate student, graduate chair, CCSR staff
- involvement in Advisory Committees
- establishment of distant learning or interdisciplinary teaching initiatives
- participation in 990 seminar series.
- commitment to the teaching mandate of the department including a willingness to accept extra teaching assignments when necessary
- positive peer and student evaluations

Over an extended period of time, approximately 40% of the specials should be directed at least in part to teaching excellence.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work

Research and scholarly work is expected from all faculty. This activity is highly varied. Special increases must reflect the nature of assigned duties relating to teaching, research, clinical or administrative activities.

Indicators of scholarly work may include:

- publications both quantity and quality (impact factors)
- citation index
- books, book chapters, review articles
- grantsmanship
 - o Junior faculty members obtaining significant grant funding for the first time will be viewed by the committee as meritorious.
 - o Major new collaborative funding initiatives will also be viewed favorable.

NOTE: The allocation of funding associated with major collaborative grants should indicate the relative funding for each member. The PI or Co-PI status should be indicated. Grants which are administered through other departments, colleges or universities are difficult to evaluate. Official documentation (title page, funding page) should be provided to the committee.

Tricouncil funding, or other competitive national competitions are considered to be more significant in order of priority. The following priority should be considered for merit.

- o tricouncil funding
- o other national competitions
- o international grant competitions
- o provincial competitions
- o external infrastructure grants, e.g. CFI.
- o contract research

- U of S internal competitions

Faculty considered under Category 5 (Practice of Professional Skills) may be recommended for special increases. In addition to publications and grantsmanship, the following criteria should be considered:

- ability to perform professional skills
- professional and peer recognition
- diversity, number and extent of referral cases (local, provincial, national)
- case load
- quality of service
- extension

The above criteria used in clinical departments are described under Practice of Professional Skills (17.2.3). More detailed documentation for evaluation is described in the College standards for tenure and promotion.

Over an extended period of time, approximately 40% of the specials should be directed at least in part to research excellence.

17.2.5 Administrative Work

Administrative activities have often been neglected in many academic units, although efficient administration enhances scholarly and teaching activities. University standards for tenure and promotion recognize administrative contribution as significant, with the contribution varying considerably with rank. It should be noted that the Departmental Salary Review does not evaluate the department head. Therefore, these administrative duties will not be considered under this evaluation process. Faculty are expected to participate in administrative work and to be actively engaged in the collegial decision-making processes.

Assistant professors are not expected to meet any requirements in this category. Serving on committees or related duties would be viewed as exceeding the average. Associate professors are expected to participate in administrative duties. Serving on 3-4 committees would be viewed as an average level of involvement. Serving on more demanding committees such as CRC, Admissions, etc, or as the Graduate Chair would be deemed as significant and potentially worthy of merit. Professors would be expected to contribute in a more substantive manner. An average or typical expectation may be viewed as participating in as few as 3-4 committees, but the committees must be demanding and usually at the university level. Examples may include University Council, URC or certain committees in CGSR. Serving on national and international committees as a university representative would be significant. Participation as the chair or participation in time consuming committees should be viewed as more substantial contributions.

Extra University work and public service (17.2.4) without compensation may also be viewed as meritorious under administration. Examples may include mentorship, USFA participation, SVMA participation, WCVM spokesperson, professional societies.

Improvement in Academic Qualifications (17.2.7) should be viewed as meritorious under Research and scholarly work or teaching.

Over an extended period of time, approximately 20% of the specials should be directed at least in part to administrative excellence.

17.3.1 VOTING PROCESS

Salary committee members may vote for all faculty member cases which they reviewed and participated in the committee discussions. Committee members are excluded from ranking their own cases (conflict of interest described in (4) below). A ballot will be submitted to each committee member to score all eligible faculty. Two thirds of the funding must be awarded as full special increments. The ballot without committee consultation should be submitted to the Departmental Administrative Assistant for tabulation. Committee members will reconvene to finalize the recommendations.

At the discretion of the committee, all ranked faculty members, including those receiving awards at the departmental level may be submitted to CRC for further consideration.

Evaluation System

The new salary review process was developed to ensure a more equitable distribution of resources in an academic unit. To ensure teaching, research, administration and service contributions are given full consideration, the following scoring system for VBMS was developed.

1. There will be 3 categories for evaluation
 - a. Teaching
 - b. Research
 - c. Administration
2. Each committee member will receive a total number of points for each category to distribute.
 - a. Teaching: 5 x number of faculty members
 - b. Research: 5 x number of faculty members
 - c. Administration: 2 x number of faculty members
3. Committee members will distribute their points to the faculty being evaluated
4. Points awarded by all eligible committee members for each faculty for each category will be summed and divided by the number of eligible voting members (to get an average score). In instances of a conflict of interest, the committee member in conflict will not score the faculty member associated with the conflict and will receive an appropriately reduced number of points to distribute.
5. A merit list for each category will be made.
6. Points from 3 categories will be summed to make a new "Overall" category.
7. VBMS will award the merit increases to top researcher (full), top teacher (full) and top "Overall" (full or half) category and keep going down the merit lists, depending upon the funding available to the department.
8. To be awarded a full increment in the teaching or research category, the candidate must obtain a minimum of 20% of the maximum score in the remaining categories. If the candidate does receive less than 20% in a category, the Departmental Salary Committee may only award 0.5 specials to the individual.

An example of how this system would work follows in *Appendix A*.

Following completion of the process, each faculty member will be provided with their numerical score and the cutoff level for merit. If the faculty member is not satisfied with the outcome, they may formally appeal to PRC (Section 17.5.5).

APPENDIX A

Each committee member will get the following points to assign for 15 faculty to be evaluated:

	Teaching	Research	Admin
Dept Head	5 X 15	5 X 15	2X 15
Committee member 1	5 x 14	5 x 14	2 x 14
Committee member 2	5 x 14	5 x 14	2 x 14
Committee member 3	5 x 14	5 x 14	2 x 14

Each committee member can award 0 – 10 points for each faculty for each of teaching and research categories.

Each committee member can award 0 – 4 points for each faculty for the administration category.

An example of the results for an individual faculty member:

Faculty member "K"	Teaching	Research	Admin	Overall
Dept Head	5	5	1	11
Committee member 1	5	6	1	11
Committee member 2	5	4	1	10
Committee member 3	5	3	1	9
Total	20	18	4	42
Average	5	4.5	1	10.5

Once the scores are tabulated for each faculty member, a ranked list will be made for each of categories of research, teaching and overall.

For example:

Rank	Overall	Teaching	Research
1	Faculty Member A = 25	Faculty Member F = 10	Faculty member C = 10
2	Faculty member E = 21	Faculty Member G = 9	Faculty Member M = 8
3	Faculty Member B = 15	Faculty Member H = 7	Faculty Member I = 7
4	Faculty Member L = 12	Faculty Member K = 5	Faculty Member J = 6

The allocation of CDI's each year will be made at the discretion of the committee, based on rankings in specific and overall categories. An individual faculty member will receive a maximum of one full CDI per year from this committee.

**Standards for Award of Special Increases in the
Department of Veterinary Microbiology**

Guiding Principles

- 1) The primary factor in the allocation of a special increment is the quality of performance in the faculty member's duties. Account will be taken of a faculty member's assigned duties.
- 2) The award of special increments may be based on the cumulative performance over a period of at least two years.
- 3) As a faculty member increases in rank and experience, there is an increased expectation as to the quality of work and the range of competence in the various categories. Hence, more is expected of a professor than of an assistant professor.
- 4) Excellence in at least one of the categories of evaluation, together with competent performance in the remainder is required.
- 5) The departmental committee will give merit increases for teaching, practice of professional skills/research and scholarly activity and for administration/extension.
- 6) This is a peer review process and as such it will depend on the reasonable judgement of a committee of elected peers.
- 7) Assessment for merit increases will be based on documentation provided by faculty members. Every member who wishes to be considered for a merit increase must submit completed forms 1 and 2 as well as a self-assessment stating their case for consideration.

Criteria for the Award of Special Increases

17.2.1 Teaching

A special increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching. Special increases for teaching should be made on the basis of quality not quantity of teaching, although heavy teaching duties in excess of the departmental average may be considered noteworthy by the committee. Teaching assignments may include undergraduate teaching in core courses, electives and clinical rotations as well as graduate student teaching and supervision of graduate students. Evidence of excellence in teaching may include but is not limited to:

- Teaching awards
- Strong peer teaching evaluations or student teaching and course evaluations
- Innovative or novel teaching strategies
- Development and/or significant revision of courses, elective courses, or rotations
- Development of new teaching opportunities
- Exemplary graduate student supervision and/or graduate student success
- Development of new course materials
- Quality mentoring of summer students
- Willingness to accept extra teaching assignments when other faculty are on leave

Faculty members wishing to be considered for an award in this category are encouraged to arrange for student and peer evaluations of their courses.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work

Only faculty whose letter of appointment has designated them under this category shall be considered for merit in this category. Evidence of excellence in this category may include but is not limited to:

- Publications or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication
 - Refereed publications
 - Books, book chapters, review articles
 - Non-peer reviewed articles
 - Invited conference presentations
 - Conference proceedings

Note: It is important that the amount of contribution towards the publication should be considered by the committee as well as the quality of the publication. The amount of contribution should be annotated on the CV update by the faculty member.

- Research grants
 - Junior faculty members early in their career may be considered for merit if they have made exceptional progress in obtaining grants from competitive funding sources
 - More experienced faculty members will be evaluated primarily on their publication record.
 - A substantial leadership role in major new collaborative funding initiatives will be considered for merit regardless of rank.

Note: The allocation of funding associated with major collaborative grants should indicate the relative leadership role and funding for each member. The Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PI's should be indicated.

17.2.5 Administrative Work and Other Categories

It should be noted that assistant professors are not required to have significant involvement in administrative work and that rank of the faculty member is an important consideration in these categories. Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in the collegial decision-making processes and to participate in administrative work. The quality of administrative work, the level of contribution and the demands of the administrative work should be taken into account when assessing this category. Extra university work and public service without significant compensation may also be viewed as meritorious under this category. Evidence of excellence in this category may include but is not limited to:

- Quality service in administration in especially demanding roles such as graduate chair, college review committees, admissions committees, university council or other significant contributions to administration

Departmental Committee Recommendations

The departmental committee shall consist of the department head and all faculty who are members of the University Faculty Association. (As an alternative the faculty could vote to constitute a subcommittee of three to four faculty members. The sub-committee would be chaired by the Department Head).

17.1.31: Each employee will provide a CV update (Form 1 and 2) in order to be eligible for the awards.

Note: If desired, a brief letter to the departmental committee from the faculty member may be included with their CV update to highlight meritorious achievements that are not easily identified within the standard CV format.

17.5.6: The information required in 17.1.1.31 shall be provided to the department head by September 1. Information in the CV update should include achievements on or before June 30th of the current year.

Note: WCVI teaching and research awards announced in September, but based upon performance prior to June 30th will automatically be considered by the departmental committee, despite the fact that these accomplishments would not be included in the current CV update.

The committee will meet to review CV updates for all faculty members in the department. Faculty members who wish to be considered for an accumulated period should indicate this to the department head in writing. The department head will present each case to the committee emphasizing the highlights of the faculty's accomplishments to facilitate committee discussion.

Salary committee members may vote for all faculty cases which they reviewed and for which they participated in committee discussions. Salary committee members will be excluded from ranking their own case or any other case in which there is a perceived conflict of interest.

After discussion of all cases, each case will be scored independently by each eligible salary committee member under 3 categories:

- 1) Teaching
- 2) Research and Scholarly Work or Practice of Professional Skills
- 3) Administration/Extension and Public Service

Each of the 3 categories shall be scored on a scale of 1-10 based on the following rubric. Note that assigned duties and rank of the faculty member must be taken into account when scoring each category. For example, Assistant Professors should not receive a poor score for administrative duties when that is not part of their assigned duties.

- Score of 1-2: Below average or poor performance of assigned duties under this category.
- Score of 3-4: Average performance of assigned duties under this category. The faculty member is performing their assigned duties in a manner that is expected for their rank and experience.
- Score of 5-6: Above average performance of assigned duties under this category. The faculty member would rank in the 60th -70th percentile for faculty members in a similar rank.
- Score of 7-8: Excellent performance of assigned duties under this category. The performance of the faculty member in this category would rank in the 70th – 90th percentile for faculty members in a similar rank.

- Score of 9-10: Exceptional performance of assigned duties under this category. The performance of the faculty member in this category would rank in the 90th percentile or higher for faculty members in a similar rank.

The sum of the average scores in each category will be calculated for each faculty member in order to initially rank the faculty members within the department. Two-thirds of the funding for departmental merit increases must be awarded as full increments. The highest ranked individuals will be give full special increments and the remaining high scores will be awarded half special increments. Exceptionally high scores in a single category may be considered meritorious as long as there is reasonable performance in all other categories.

At the discretion of the committee, faculty who have received awards may be forwarded to the College Review Committee with recommendations for further merit increases. In addition, faculty members who are deserving of merit but who did not receive a merit increase at the departmental level may be forwarded to the College Review Committee for consideration.

Standards for Award of Special Increases in the

Department of Veterinary Pathology

Guiding Principles

- 1) The primary factor in the allocation of a special increment is the quality of performance in the faculty member's duties. Account will be taken of a faculty member's assigned duties.
- 2) The award of special increments may be based on the cumulative performance over a period of at least two years.
- 3) Excellence in at least one of the categories of evaluation, together with competent performance in the remainder, is required.
- 4) Over the long term, the departmental committee will give approximately 40% of the departmental merit increases for teaching, approximately 40% of the merit increases for practice of professional skills/research and scholarly activity, and 20% of the merit increases for administration/extension.
- 5) This is a peer review process and as such it will depend on the reasonable judgement of a committee of all departmental faculty or a subset of elected faculty.
- 6) Assessment for merit increases will be based on documentation provided by faculty members. Every member who wishes to be considered for a merit increase must submit a completed CV update (forms 1 and 2) as well as a self-assessment stating his/her case for consideration. If requesting consideration for a period of 2 years or more, corresponding CV updates must be provided for each relevant year.

Criteria for the Award of Special Increases

17.2.1 Teaching

A special increase may be awarded for excellence in teaching. Special increases for teaching should be made on the basis of quality not quantity of teaching, although heavy teaching duties in excess of the departmental average may be considered noteworthy by the committee. Teaching assignments may include undergraduate teaching in core courses, electives and clinical rotations as well as graduate student teaching and supervision. Evidence of excellence in teaching may include but is not limited to:

- Teaching awards
- Strong peer teaching evaluations or student teaching and course evaluations
- Effective innovative or novel teaching strategies
- Development and/or significant revision of core courses, electives, or clinical rotations
- Development of new teaching opportunities
- Exemplary graduate student supervision and/or graduate student success
- Development of new course materials
- Quality mentoring of summer students
- Willingness to accept extra teaching assignments when required

Note: For comparative and scoring purposes, student teaching evaluations provided as evidence of teaching excellence should be either the College-approved or University-approved [Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ)] system.

17.2.2 Research and Scholarly Work

Only faculty whose letter of appointment has designated them under this category shall be considered for merit in this category. Evidence of excellence in this category may include but is not limited to:

- Publications or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication
 - Refereed publications
 - Books, book chapters, review articles
 - Non-peer reviewed articles
 - Invited conference presentations
 - Conference proceedings

Note: It is important that the amount of contribution towards the publication should be considered by the committee as well as the quality of the publication. The amount of contribution should be annotated on the CV update by the faculty member.

- Research grants
 - Junior faculty members early in their career may be considered for merit if they have made exceptional progress in obtaining grants from competitive funding sources.
 - More experienced faculty members will be evaluated on their ongoing success in obtaining grants and on their publication record.
 - A substantial leadership role in major new collaborative funding initiatives will be considered for merit regardless of rank.

Note: The allocation of funding associated with major collaborative grants should indicate the relative leadership role and funding for each member. The Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PIs should be indicated.

17.2.3 Practice of Professional Skills and Scholarly Work

Only faculty whose letter of appointment has designated them under this category shall be considered for merit in this category. Most faculty evaluated under "Practice of Professional Skills" will have a significant professional practice component to their assigned duties. Research is a component of the scholarly work aspect of this category. The committee must take into account the level of assigned duties in the professional practice component when evaluating the quality of both professional practice and scholarly work.

Evidence of excellence in this category may include but is not limited to:

- Publications or receipt of a letter accepting a finished manuscript for publication
 - Refereed publications
 - Books, book chapters, review articles
 - Non-peer reviewed articles
 - Invited conference presentations
 - Conference proceedings

Note: It is important that the amount of contribution towards the publication should be considered by the committee as well as the quality of the publication. The amount of contribution should be annotated on the CV update by the faculty member.

- Research grants
 - Junior faculty members early in their career may be considered for merit if they have made exceptional progress in obtaining grants from competitive funding sources.
 - More experienced faculty members will be evaluated on their ongoing success in obtaining grants and on their publication record.
 - A substantial leadership role in major new collaborative funding initiatives will be considered for merit regardless of rank.

Note: The allocation of funding associated with major collaborative grants should indicate the relative leadership role and funding for each member. The Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-PIs should be indicated.

- Improvement in academic qualifications
- Professional practice
 - Evidence of excellence in this component may include but is not limited to:
 - Provision of exemplary professional service
 - Delivering quality educational material to clients through the form of seminars or newsletters
 - Evidence of high quality referral and diagnostic services
 - Exemplary mentorship of faculty, interns and residents within the clinical practice
 - Initiatives to utilise clinical material for teaching or scholarly publications
 - High quality participation in college and departmental seminars and rounds
 - Leadership roles in the provision of diagnostic services
 - Willingness to take on additional clinical service when required

17.2.5 Administrative Work/Extension and Public Service

It should be noted that assistant professors are not required to have significant involvement in administrative work and that rank of the faculty member is an important consideration in this category. Faculty are expected to be actively engaged in the collegial decision-making processes and to participate in administrative work. The quality of administrative work, the level of contribution and the demands of the administrative work should be taken into account when assessing this category. Extra university work and public service without significant compensation may also be viewed as meritorious under this category. Evidence of excellence in this category may include but is not limited to:

- Quality service in administration in especially demanding roles such as graduate chair, college review committees, admissions committees, university council or other significant contributions to administration

Departmental Committee Recommendations

The departmental committee shall consist of the department head and all faculty who are members of the University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association. (As an alternative the faculty could vote to constitute a subcommittee of three to four faculty members. The sub-committee would be chaired by the Department Head.)

17.1.31: Each employee will provide a CV update (forms 1 and 2) in order to be eligible for the awards.

Note: In addition to the CV update, a brief letter to the Departmental committee highlighting meritorious achievements should be provided.

17.5.6: The information required in 17.1.1.31 shall be provided to the department head by September 1. Information in the CV update should include achievements on or before June 30th of the current year (and previous years, as applicable, if for a cumulative period).

Note: WCVI teaching and research awards announced in September, but based upon performance prior to June 30th will automatically be considered by the departmental committee, despite the fact that these accomplishments would not be included in the current CV update.

The committee will meet to review CV updates for all faculty members in the department. Faculty members who wish to be considered for a cumulative period should indicate this to the department head in writing and materials pertaining to the entire period should be submitted. The department head will present each case to the committee emphasizing the highlights of the faculty member's accomplishments to facilitate committee discussion.

Salary committee members may vote for all faculty cases which they reviewed and for which they participated in committee discussions. Salary committee members will be excluded from ranking their own case or any other case in which there is a perceived conflict of interest.

After discussion of all cases, each case will be scored independently by each eligible salary committee member under 3 categories:

- 1) Teaching
- 2) Research and Scholarly Work or Practice of Professional Skills and Scholarly work
- 3) Administration/Extension and Public Service

Each of the 3 categories shall be scored on a scale of 1-10 based on the following rubric. Note that assigned duties and rank of the faculty member must be taken into account when scoring each category. For example, Assistant Professors generally have minimal administrative responsibilities and should receive a score of no less than 5 in category 3.

Score of 1-2: Below average or poor performance of assigned duties under this category. In most circumstances, a score of below 3 in any one category would disqualify the candidate from receiving merit regardless of scores received in other categories.

Score of 3-4: Average performance of assigned duties under this category. The faculty member is performing assigned duties in a manner that is expected for the rank and experience. NOTE: With regard to teaching, full professors who have not undertaken peer or student teaching evaluations in the last 2 years, or who have not provided evidence of meritorious work as listed in 17.2.1 shall be scored not higher than 4 unless the committee believes there is a compelling reason to justify receipt of a higher score.

Score of 5-6: Above average performance of assigned duties under this category. The faculty member would rank in the 60th - 70th percentile for faculty members in a similar rank.

Score of 7-8: Excellent performance of assigned duties under this category. The performance of the faculty member in this category would rank in the 70th - 90th percentile for faculty members in a similar rank.

Score of 9-10: Exceptional performance of assigned duties under this category. The performance of the faculty member in this category would rank in the 90th percentile or higher for faculty members in a similar rank.

The sum of the average scores in each category will be calculated for each faculty member in order to initially rank the faculty members within the department. Allocation of the number or proportion of full and half increments will be decided when more information on increments allocated to the department is available. Exceptionally high scores in a single category may be considered meritorious as long as there is reasonable performance in all other categories.

At the discretion of the committee, faculty who have received awards may be recommended to the College Review Committee for additional merit increase. In addition, faculty members who are deserving of merit but who did not receive a merit increase at the departmental level may be recommended for an award at the College Review Committee level.

v
*

