

Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry

Guidelines for the Evaluation of Academic Staff for Merit Increments, Tenure, and Promotion

Approved by Department Chairs and Faculty Divisional Directors - October 4, 2006

Reviewed and Accepted by the Provost – November 28, 2006

Approved by Faculty Council – March 20, 2007

Scheduled to be implemented – April 1, 2007

Table of Contents

PART I EVALUATION OF FACULTY

- A. Introduction
- B. General Guidelines
- C. Performance Standards
 - a. Teaching
 - b. Research/Scholarship Expectations
 - c. Administration
 - d. Clinical Practice
- D. Merit Increments
- E. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
- F. Promotion to Professor
- G. Contested Cases and Appeals
- H. Sabbaticals

PART II EVALUATION OF FACULTY SERVICE OFFICERS (FSOs)

- A. Introduction
- B. Performance Standards for Faculty Service Officer Ranks
- C. Merit Increments
- D. Continuing Appointment
- E. Promotion
- F. Documentation Required

PART I EVALUATION OF FACULTY

A. INTRODUCTION

Under the AAS:UA and University of Alberta Faculty Agreement and the FSO Agreement, and in keeping with the University of Alberta's Policies and Procedures Manual regarding Faculty Evaluation Committees (FECs), each Faculty is required to publish guidelines to assist its Department Chairs and the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) in their deliberations regarding merit increments, awarding of tenure, and promotions. These guidelines provide parameters for the assessment of acceptable and unacceptable academic performance for individual Faculty members, including the category of performance classed as "unacceptable academic performance" (Article 14). The 2006 FEC guideline document represents a modification of the 1996 version and was developed after wide internal consultation and examination of similar national and international documents.

The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry is a unique and complex environment, and thus requires skilled individuals who perform a variety of functions. Each Faculty member will have a written job description outlining his/her University responsibilities with clearly defined expectations for teaching, research/scholarship, administration, and clinical practice (if applicable). It is expected that the job description outlining the explicit roles, responsibilities, and duties upon which the Faculty member's performance is judged will be reviewed annually as it represents the joint agreement between the Faculty member and the University. Changes in job description are negotiated by the Faculty member with the Department Chair and are approved by the Dean.

While scholarly work requires diligence, discipline and industry, scholarship¹ refers to the discovery, integration, application, translation, and dissemination of knowledge. The Faculty expects the latter to be reported in peer-reviewed form and/or documented in communication vehicles for the purposes of application, public dissemination and/or translation into practice. It is such scholarship that will represent the standard for evaluation of merit.

Each Faculty member should normally have some responsibilities in each of the categories of teaching, research/scholarship, and administration. Faculty members with clinical skills (e.g. physicians, dentists, dental hygienists, medical physicists) will also have clinical duties. Responsibilities will be discharged according to the Faculty member's job description with, at least, adequate performance in each category. Performance will be assessed using objective criteria whenever possible. The expectations for performance will increase with increasing rank and be commensurate with the Faculty member's seniority. Performance criteria for various job categories (e.g. teaching, research) are provided in this document to guide the Chair and Faculty member during the review process. Although the Chair (and/or designate) is expected to provide career guidance to the Faculty member, the responsibility for performance ultimately rests with the Faculty member.

The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry is committed to the values of scholarship; respect; compassion and caring; integrity; excellence; partnership; and stewardship and has defined behavioral expectations in a Code of Conduct. The Faculty embraces the concept of life-long learning and professional development. Beyond expert knowledge or skilled practice in a given field, there is the expectation that each Faculty member will demonstrate professional behaviors including altruism, collaboration and teamwork, responsibility and accountability, and leadership in all areas of work. Each Faculty member is expected to provide mentoring to those he/she supervises including trainees. All Faculty members are expected to be role models in the Faculty environment.

Each Faculty member is expected to provide some administrative service to his/her discipline, the Department/Faculty/University and the Hospital/Health Authority (if applicable) which is considered an aspect of faculty citizenship. Extra-Faculty activities unrelated to the Faculty member's discipline or academic position are optional and though encouraged as a facet of community citizenship will not be considered as a basis for merit considerations, tenure, or promotion.

1. Boyer, E. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities for the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

B. GENERAL GUIDELINES

FEC MEMBERSHIP AND AUTHORITIES

FEC considers the performance of all academic members in the Faculty except that of the Dean and Department Chairs. Departmental Chairs are evaluated by the Dean and the Dean by the Provost. FECs do not evaluate the performance of APOs (see 4.0 Policies and Procedures Manual regarding Faculty Evaluation Committees (FECs) August 2005). Clinical faculty, at times referred to as part-time faculty, are evaluated within their respective departments.

The composition of FEC shall be: the Dean (as Chair), all Department Chairs, and at least two tenured Faculty members elected by Faculty Council. Ideally, at least one elected representative shall be present at meetings of FEC although quorum shall be 80% of the committee membership. Decisions shall be decided by a majority of those present. The Dean, as Chair of FEC, votes only in the event of a tie.

PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

On an annual basis, each Faculty member's progress will be reviewed by the Department Chair and FEC based on Article 7 (University Responsibilities), Article 8 (Supplementary Professional Activities) and Article 13 (Faculty Evaluation). At appropriate times after the initial appointment, each Faculty member will be considered for tenure and/or promotion (Article 12). If a Faculty member is granted one or more leaves during a probationary period and, if the length or type of leave is such that it materially affects the performance on which the Faculty member is to be assessed, the probationary period shall be extended for one or more years. This extension shall be made by the Vice-President (Academic) on the recommendation of the Dean following consultation with the Department Chair and the Faculty member. It is the responsibility of the Chair and FEC to ensure that the Faculty member is not disadvantaged by such leave(s). Part time continuing tenure track appointments of less than 1 FTE (full time equivalent) will be evaluated based either on proportionally reduced expectations or with an extension of the probationary period(s). The standards of performance are not changed. A special conditions agreement will be negotiated with the Department Chair and Dean pre-employment or, if a change from full time, at least one year before the Faculty member's case is heard at FEC.

In the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, annual reviews of performance will be based on job description and contributions in the following categories: teaching, research/scholarship, administration, and clinical practice (if applicable). Except under unusual circumstances and in the case of FSOs, the minimum research and teaching contributions for any academic appointment should each constitute at least 10% of the assigned duties.

In addition to the Annual Faculty Report, which follows a precisely defined format, objective documentation addressing the Faculty member's contributions may include formal and informal feedback from students, peers, or supervisors; for those Faculty members who are also members of interdisciplinary teaching and/or research groups (e.g. institutes, centres), input from team members outside the Department and/or Faculty will be considered. Administrative contributions may include but are not limited to policy development, major administrative or curricular portfolios, the organization of special events or activities, search and selection committee participation/organization, and/or commitments to major infrastructure proposals or fundraising. It is the responsibility of the Faculty member to provide the appropriate documentation to the Chair.

For the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, the period of performance review shall be the calendar year January 1 to December 31.

C. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

These standards outline guidelines for evaluation in each of the categories of teaching, research/scholarship, administration, and clinical practice. They serve to define minimally acceptable and unacceptable performance and provide examples of “superior” and “below expectation” performance. For tenure and promotion considerations, acceptable/satisfactory performance will be expected in all categories defined in the job description with superior performance in one or more of the components, most often the category accounting for the majority of the job description. Faculty members can perform above expectation in any or all components. It is understood that the range of contributions can be broad with overlap between the elements of teaching, research/scholarship, administration and/or clinical practice.

a. TEACHING

The evaluation of teaching performance will be conducted in accordance with the standards outlined and be influenced by the percentage weighting of teaching in the Faculty member’s job description. Each Faculty member is expected to have a teaching component to the job description (minimum 10%) and is expected to engage in regular professional development for the purpose of enhancing their teaching skills. It is expected that each newly appointed Faculty member will attend at least one teaching enhancement workshop within their first two years of appointment. Documentation of faculty development activities will be requested in the Annual Faculty Report. A teaching dossier will be expected to accompany each Faculty member’s curriculum vitae. Teaching shall include educational efforts directed at undergraduate, postgraduate and graduate students, as well as peers.

1. Superior Performance

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, dental, or biomedical 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 graduate training, residency, or fellowship program; coordination of an undergraduate teaching block in the medical/dental curriculum or an undergraduate course in another Faculty (e.g. Science); or chairing of a major Faculty, departmental or hospital education-related committee.

Superior educators will have published education-related research or experiences in prestigious medical/dental education journals, presented papers or posters at national and international education meetings and encouraged trainees in these endeavors. 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-modeling impact as evidenced by unsolicited testimonials from peers or 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 one of the Faculty’s two annual awards for excellence in mentoring. They will have been recognized as

a superior teacher by invitations to participate as an educator in the Faculty's Teaching Enhancement Workshops (TEWs).

2. Acceptable/Satisfactory Performance

A Faculty member would have met expectations by demonstrating consistently satisfactory performance in all teaching activities. This would include fulfillment of their assigned teaching duties within the context of their job description; satisfactory evaluations of their teaching activities by students; participation in formal evaluations of students such as examination question development, OSCE supervision and/or oral examinations; and demonstrated commitment to personal professional development of their teaching skills by participation in a teaching enhancement workshop. Abstract presentations at educational meetings and participation in local professional development efforts are expected if the individual has a significant clinical educator/administrator role or if they are more senior educators.

3. Below Expectations

A Faculty member would have demonstrated performance below expectation in their teaching activities by inconsistent teaching evaluations with several below average scores; a lack of commitment to professional development in the area of teaching; and/or a paucity of requests by students, residents or other postgraduate trainees for supervision. There will be inadequate evidence of scholarly contributions to local or national educational endeavors.

4. Unacceptable Performance

A Faculty member would have demonstrated unacceptable performance by consistent under-performance in their teaching activities and duties as evidenced by an unwillingness to participate in teaching activities such as undergraduate lectures, small group seminars, clinical bedside teaching, postgraduate supervision, OSCE examinations, or practice oral examinations; consistently poor evaluations of teaching activities such as didactic presentations; poor evaluations of clinical or research trainee supervision; failure to participate in continuing medical/dental education; or no evidence of scholarly contributions to educational endeavors.

Documented unprofessional or unethical behavior in the teaching role would be considered unacceptable, as would unresponsiveness to recommendations for professional development of teaching or supervisory skills.

b. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP EXPECTATIONS

The evaluation of research/scholarship 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/scholarship in the Faculty member's job description.

All Faculty members are expected to allocate a minimum of 10% of their time to research/scholarship. The maximum possible time allocation is 90% as all Faculty members are also expected to allocate at least 10% of their time to teaching.

For individuals with a substantial time allocation to teaching in their job description, scholarship may be represented not only by publication but also by activity enhancing pedagogical 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.

For the purposes of the evaluation of Research Performance, time allocations for research have been divided into three groups based on whether research/scholarship is 10 to 30%, 31 to 60%, or 61 to 90% time allocation in the Faculty member's job description.

In multi-authored publications, grant submissions or position papers, Faculty members are expected to delineate their individual contribution to the work.

Time Allocation to Research/Scholarship - 10 to 30%

To meet expectations of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, a Faculty member who has a 10 to 30% time allocation for research will be able to provide evidence of two or more of the following:

- 1) **Research or Scholarship Productivity** - This will involve 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 will involve presentations at relevant educational or organizational meetings (e.g. Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada - AFMC, Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada - RCPSC, Canadian Association of Medical Education – CAME).
- 2) **Research Funding** - This will involve peer-reviewed funding in collaboration with others internal or external to the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, participation in design and execution of sponsored clinical trials, or contract research.
- 3) **Research Mentoring** – This will involve contributions to the successful supervision of students in the medical and dental 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 at local, provincial, or national meetings.

Time Allocation to Research/Scholarship - 31 to 60%

To meet expectations of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, a Faculty member who has 31 to 60% time allocation for research/scholarship will be able to provide evidence of contributions to three or more of the following:

- 1) **Research Productivity** - This will involve multiple peer-reviewed publications annually that include articles in journals considered prestigious in their field of endeavor, major reviews, or books and book chapters that may be in either paper or electronic format.
- 2) **Research Funding** - This will involve a role as principal investigator (PI) or co-investigator in one or more peer-reviewed operating grant awards; as PI 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 involve the successful research supervision of students in the medical and dental undergraduate programs, and/or in residency, graduate or post-doctoral programs; and/or membership on graduate supervisory committees.
- 4) **Research Administration** – This will include leadership roles (in accordance with rank) in the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry research endeavors 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.

- 5) **Research Dissemination** – This will include presentations at local, provincial, national or international meetings.

Time Allocation to Research/Scholarship– 61 to 90%

To meet expectations of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, a Faculty member who has a 61 to 90% time allocation for research will be able to provide evidence, at a level commensurate with academic rank, of contributions to all of the following:

- 1) **Research Productivity** - This will involve multiple and/or seminal publications annually in journals considered prestigious in their field of endeavor, major reviews, or books and book chapters that may be either in paper or electronic format.
- 2) **Research Funding** - This will involve 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 involve 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 involve acceptance of leadership roles in the Department, Faculty, and/or hospital's research endeavors 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 involve invited research presentations at national and international academic institutions or meetings.

Research/Scholarship Performance Standards:

1. 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

2. Performance will be judged to be “Satisfactory” when it meets expectations. There will be evidence of:
 - continued publication productivity in respected journals in the field
 - success at obtaining adequate funding to support the Faculty member’s work
 - in accordance with rank, an established or emerging national/international reputation with invited presentations
 - invitations to serve on national committees, grant review panels, or as a journal reviewer
3. Performance will be judged to be “Below Expectations” when it fails to meet expectations. There will be evidence of:
 - a record of low publication output, in accordance with job description, over a number of years
 - lack of or inadequate research funding
 - few or no research trainees over a number of years
4. Performance will be judged to be “Unacceptable” if there is insubstantial research productivity in accordance with the job description. There will be evidence of:
 - no publications over a number of years
 - lack of research funding with no annual attempts to obtain funding
 - failure to provide a supportive environment and adequate supervision for trainees; this may be evidenced by trainees being unable to achieve their planned academic goal (e.g. PhD or Master’s) in a reasonable time frame despite commitment and industry on the part of the trainee
 - substantiated deceptive or unethical practices; or academic misconduct

c. ADMINISTRATION

Each Faculty member is expected to provide some administrative service to his/her discipline, the Department/Faculty/University, or the Hospital/Health Authority (if applicable). Administrative service to the discipline includes leadership responsibilities for professional societies (e.g., holding office, chairing committees, organizing meetings), responsibilities for review of research proposals (e.g., *ad hoc* external reviews, grants panels, site visits, advisory committees) and/or review of research publications (e.g., article reviews, editorial boards). Administrative service to the Department/Faculty/University or Hospital/Health Authority includes membership and/or chairing of committees; coordination of teaching blocks, multidisciplinary courses, graduate programs, or residency training programs; and/or leadership positions (e.g., Department Chair, Associate/Assistant Deans, Divisions Directors, Program Directors). 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.

1. Superior Performance

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/Faculty/University or Hospital/Health Authority 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.

2. Acceptable/Satisfactory Performance

A Faculty member would have met expectations for satisfactory performance in administrative service to the discipline by *ad hoc* review of research proposals and articles; serving on a grants panel, editorial board or conference organizing committee; or holding office or committee membership in a professional organization. Satisfactory administrative performance to the Department/Faculty/University or Hospital/Health Authority would include serving on teaching, administrative and/or quality-assurance committees; participating in policy development; and/or organizing departmental/service-unit functions. For a Faculty member whose job description is >30% research, some administrative service to the discipline (e.g., journal or grant reviews, service on grant panels, a research ethics board and/or office in professional societies) is expected.

3. Below Expectation

A Faculty member would be judged to have performed below expectation in relation to administrative contributions by consistently failing to participate in discipline-related activities; by making minimal contributions to the organizational efforts of the Department/Faculty/University or Hospital/Health Authority; and/or by frequent absences from the department/service or its unit meetings.

4. Unacceptable Performance

Unacceptable performance would include refusal to participate in at least one Department/Faculty/University or Hospital/Health Authority committee; to peer review journal articles or grant applications; or to contribute to quality assurance efforts. It would include being asked to withdraw from a review or other committee for ethical reasons (e.g., breach of confidentiality); inadequate supervision of a program resulting in loss of accreditation; or the provision of inaccurate information to the public.

d. CLINICAL PRACTICE

Each Faculty member for whom clinical service represents a portion of the job description 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 job description of over 30% are encouraged to submit a clinical 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 such as the Alberta PAR (Physician Assessment Report) Program could be included.

All clinicians will be expected to provide evidence of their efforts related to maintenance of competence either via the Maintenance of Certification (MOC) program of the RCPSC, Maintenance

of Proficiency (Mainpro) program of the College of Family Physicians of Canada or other nationally recognized professional evaluation systems.

Four levels of clinical practice performance are recognized:

1. Superior Performance

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 behavioral attributes. The Faculty member would be considered by their peers to be a role model of professional integrity.

2. Acceptable/Satisfactory Performance

Satisfactory performance represents the standard of care expected within the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry and is represented by effective patient care and/or clinical service and management of patient problems and/or clinical responsibilities on a day-to-day basis. It is the expectation that each Faculty member would be recognized as a local expert in his/her area of expertise. The Faculty member will not have had upheld any formal complaints about them to the Department, Hospital or regulatory/licensing body and would have demonstrated active participation in a regular maintenance of competence program.

3. Below Expectation Performance

A Faculty member assessed as performing below expectation would have demonstrated difficulties in performance of their clinical duties such as delays or failures to complete medical records or other documents; have had substantiated complaints filed about their communications with patients, families and/or colleagues; and/or would have failed to behave in a collegial manner and/or experienced significant or repeated conflicts with trainees or peers. They would have demonstrated less than expected attention to maintenance of competence activities.

4. Unacceptable Performance

A Faculty member in this category would have demonstrated egregious errors or behaviors. This would include any form of substantiated unethical or unprofessional behavior, failure to maintain competence, persistent failure to complete medical records or other documents, and/or persistent failure to communicate effectively with patients, families and/or colleagues. Persistent, unjustified and significant deviation from generally-accepted practice guidelines, particularly after efforts of a remedial nature have been suggested or provided would indicate that this categorization is appropriate. No evidence of activity dedicated to maintenance of competence would warrant such a designation.

D. MERIT INCREMENTS

Each Faculty member will be assessed annually regarding his/her contributions to teaching, research/scholarship, administration, and clinical activities (if applicable) in accordance with their formal job description. 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. FEC 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 FEC 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 FEC 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

I. Merit Increments

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 job description, and professional development is at 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, i.e. teaching, research/scholarship, administration, or clinical practice.

Outstanding Two, two and a half, or three 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.

II. Zero Increment

Four different categories of zero increment are identified in the Faculty Agreement (13.22). When a Chair recommends and/or FEC awards a zero increment, the designation attached to the increment (i.e., a - d) shall be identified in all meetings and correspondence relating to the award.

0a. Rank Ceiling

“That maximum grid salary for rank has been reached and standards for promotion have not been met, but performance is acceptable notwithstanding.”

0b. Acceptable Lack of Progress

“That performance requirements for an increment have not been met but performance is acceptable notwithstanding;” – e.g. a Faculty member may have had a non-productive year due to serious illness, leave/absence (e.g. parental leave or sabbatical leave).

0c. Unable to Evaluate

“That academic performance while on authorized leave could not be properly evaluated;”
e.g. if a Faculty member is on sabbatical leave and did not file an Annual Report with the Chair.

0d. Unacceptable

“That academic performance is unsatisfactory and unacceptable;” – e.g. the Faculty member performs assigned duties incompetently or significantly below average for the rank held, has breached the Faculty’s Code of Conduct, or his/her professional development has ceased. An “unacceptable” evaluation of any of teaching, research/scholarship, administration or clinical practice (Section C- Performance Standards) warrants consideration of a 0d recommendation.

E. TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

For Faculty members who are employed under the AAS:UA - Faculty Agreement, the acquisition of tenure is a critical academic step. The granting of tenure normally coincides with promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty members whose professional contracts are with affiliated institutions (e.g. the Alberta Cancer Board’s Cross Cancer Institute) and thus not eligible for University tenure, are considered by FEC for promotions by the same criteria and following the same timelines. Each candidate for tenure will be evaluated according to his/her job description and the criteria outlined in Section C (Performance Standards) of this document and will normally require, at a minimum, acceptable/ satisfactory achievement in each of the categories of teaching, research/scholarship, administration and clinical practice (if applicable). The granting of tenure is “based on an indication that the staff member is and will in future be capable of contributing effectively as a staff member given the performance, while on probation, in the responsibilities of a staff member (under Article 7 of the Agreement).” Unlike the situation with promotion from Associate Professor to Professor for which a staff member must apply to FEC, a decision regarding tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is made by FEC after consideration of a recommendation by the Department Chair. Each Faculty member who becomes eligible for tenure shall be so informed in writing at least three months prior to the tenure/promotions meeting of the FEC and must be advised by the Department Chair in writing at least two months before the meeting of the intended recommendation of the Chair. If the Chair’s review indicates that the recommendation will not support the candidate’s tenure, the Chair shall discuss this with the Faculty member and indicate the areas in which improvement is required. The Chair shall also inform the Faculty member of the procedures for contested hearings (Section G - Contested Cases and Appeals).

Timing

(See AAS:UA Agreement, Article 12)

A newly appointed Faculty member will normally be given a probationary appointment as an Assistant Professor for two successive periods. Tenure, which may be considered anytime after the conclusion of the first probationary period (four years), is normally considered in the final twelve months of the second probationary period (two years). The Faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period for parental leave, absence due to illness, or secondment. If

there has been a significant change in the Faculty member's job description, an extension of the probationary period may be requested. In circumstances such as parental leave(s), a Faculty member may request more than one extension of the probationary period. It is the responsibility of the Chair and FEC to ensure that the Faculty member is not disadvantaged by such leave(s).

Early tenure can be considered according to Article 12.11 of the Faculty Agreement but only for a Faculty member who has demonstrated superior performance in two of the four categories of teaching, research/scholarship, administration and clinical practice (if applicable). The criteria for superior performance in each category will be interpreted more generously for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor than for promotion to Professor, with teaching and research/scholarship normally considered of primary importance. Administration will be considered important but secondary, as an Assistant Professor will not normally be expected to carry a heavy administrative commitment.

A staff member appointed without tenure shall also serve one or more probationary periods.

When FEC is considering tenure cases, an elected tenured staff member of the department in which the staff member holds appointment shall serve as an additional member of FEC to hear the case. The decision of an FEC regarding tenure and promotion shall include a review of the candidate's performance over the course of his/her complete career.

Documentation required for tenure hearings:

1. Letter from the Chair.
2. Letter from the candidate.
3. An updated curriculum vitae.
4. Teaching dossier including copies of student evaluations.
5. Five letters from referees concerning suitability of the candidate for tenure with at least three letters from individuals external to the University of which two are to be chosen by the Chair and not have had any mentoring relationship with the candidate. All responses received by the Chair should be considered by the FEC. In soliciting external reviews the Chair should include a copy of the Faculty's Guidelines for the Evaluation of Academic Staff and a statement outlining the candidate's job description(s) including weightings of teaching, research/scholarship, administration and clinical practice (if applicable) during the period under review.
6. For a Faculty member for whom research constitutes > 30% of the job description or superior research performance is the basis for tenure consideration, the candidate's five best papers should be included in the material for evaluation. When the candidate has primarily an educational portfolio, in addition to publications, scholarly activity related to education such as curriculum development, the enhancement of the pedagogical training of teachers, and innovations in educational methods or evaluations will be considered with the expectation of appropriate documentation within a teaching dossier.

Performance Expectations Related to Tenure

I. Teaching - Expectations for Tenure

"Except where a staff member has a reduced teaching assignment, performance as a teacher shall be of major importance in the review" (Article 13.06).

A candidate for tenure will be evaluated according to the criteria outlined in Section C. The teaching load for a Faculty member (e.g. including lectures, seminars and structured clinical teaching) would normally be between 10 to 20 hours annually for each 10% of teaching commitment in the job

description. Considerably more hours would be expected for each 10% of teaching commitment for less structured educational activities such as bedside teaching, graduate student supervision and/or other teaching that requires less preparation. Such time expectations could be altered for a Faculty member with a substantial administrative component to their educational portfolio.

Performance will be deemed acceptable when the Faculty member participates actively and willingly and receives satisfactory reports from students, peers, coordinators and the Chair. The Faculty member will also be expected to demonstrate regular participation in activities that enhance his/her skills as an educator (i.e. professional development).

Superior performance shall be assessed by indicators of superior teaching such as student ratings in the top 10% of instructors of a similar rank; recognition by students or clinical trainees as a superior teacher in receipt of an award (e.g. Rutherford Undergraduate Award); repeated nominations for teaching awards; high course enrollments or frequent selection as preceptors; presentations at teaching workshops; frequent requests for services in continuing medical education; recognition of the reorganization of a weak course to a significantly improved one or, in the case of residency programs, the conversion of a probationary or "notice to terminate" status to full accreditation from the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons/College of Family Physicians; successful introduction of new courses or implementation of innovative teaching methods; and the ability to attract and train a substantial number of summer students, graduate students and/or postgraduate trainees who are subsequently successful. Mentoring of students, postgraduate trainees, graduate students and/or more junior peer colleagues will demonstrate professional maturation.

Unacceptable performance in teaching would include refusal(s) to accept teaching responsibilities commensurate with the job description; consistently poor student evaluations; inadequate communication of information as judged by peer evaluation; high dropout rates for courses or research trainees; poorly organized courses; unresponsiveness to constructive criticism and/or failure to participate in teaching workshops when recommended; inadequate supervision of graduate trainees such that they are unsuccessful in attaining graduate degrees despite reasonable efforts; or substantiated claims of harassment or intimidation.

II. Research/Scholarship - Expectations for Tenure

The evaluation of research will be based on the criteria identified in Section C and will be influenced by the percentage weighting of research in the job description. For a Faculty member for whom research/scholarship constitutes > 60% of the job description, several criteria should normally have been achieved by the candidate:

1. The candidate should have established a national and an emerging international reputation in his/her particular field of research or scholarly activity.
2. If the researcher is a basic scientist, he/she should have demonstrated continued success at a national or international level in peer-reviewed grant competitions as the principal investigator. Other sources of funding will be considered important but are usually given less weight than peer-reviewed funding. Except under unusual circumstances such as an endowed chair, Faculty members will have successfully competed for external peer-reviewed salary awards.
3. If the researcher is a basic scientist, the candidate should have demonstrated independence from his/her previous appointments at other universities and/or postdoctoral positions by publishing articles in respected journals as the senior or corresponding author.
4. The candidate should have demonstrated an ability to attract and successfully supervise graduate students and/or postgraduate research trainees.
5. The candidate's collaborations and contributions to a research group will be considered, particularly with regard to the impact of the work as a whole and their contribution to the effort.

6. The candidate should select his/her five best papers and include them in the documentation. These publications should be accompanied by a statement that clearly delineates the candidate's contributions to the research. Publications must include research that the candidate conducted as a Faculty member at the University of Alberta.

For a Faculty member for whom research/scholarship constitutes 31 – 60% of the job description, several criteria should normally have been achieved by the candidate:

1. The candidate should have established a local and /or national reputation in his/her particular field of research or scholarly activity.
2. If the researcher is a basic scientist, he/she should have demonstrated some success in peer-reviewed grant competitions, either as a principal investigator, co-investigator, or part of a research group.
3. If the researcher is a basic scientist, the candidate should have demonstrated independence from his/her previous appointments at other universities and /or postdoctoral positions by publishing articles in respected journals as the senior or corresponding author.
4. The candidate should have demonstrated the capacity to successfully supervise, co-supervise, or serve on a supervisory committee of graduate students and/or postgraduate research trainees.
5. If applicable, the candidate's collaborations and contributions to a research group will be considered, particularly with regard to the impact of the work as a whole and their contribution to the effort.
6. The candidate should select his/her best five papers and include them in the documentation along with a statement clearly delineating the candidate's contributions to the research. Some publications should originate from research the candidate conducted as a Faculty member at the University of Alberta.

For a Faculty member for whom research/scholarship constitutes 10 – 30% of the job description, demonstrated involvement in research by participation in collaborative research projects is expected. Publications or abstract presentations either as a principal author or collaborator will be considered reasonable documentation. If the candidate has lesser research and greater teaching commitments in the job description, he/she is expected to demonstrate scholarly activities by publishing and/or presenting in academic settings work that is related to teaching, evaluation and/or professional development. Participation in curriculum development, development of data banks and the development of health guidelines and policy are considered scholarly contributions.

Criteria for superior performance in the research/scholarship category represent guidelines, not mandatory requirements (see C. Performance Standards). Superior performance will have been demonstrated if the candidate has published a substantial number of papers in good journals with some (or one landmark paper) making significant contributions to the field; has been successful in obtaining multiple peer-reviewed national grants with substantial funding; has led a successful major group application for peer-reviewed or industrial funding; has received a peer reviewed salary award or renewal; has won a major national or international award; has received invitations to give a keynote address at a major meeting with national or international participation; and/or has served as Chair of a grant review panel, editor of a high impact journal or organizer of a major national/international scientific or educational meeting.

Unacceptable research performance for a candidate with a substantial research/scholarship component (>30%) would include poor publication output (low numbers or poor quality); lack of research funding; few or no research trainees; substantiated deceptive or unethical practices; lack of willingness to collaborate; and /or inferior or inadequate supervision of research trainees.

III. Administration - Expectations for Tenure

The evaluation of administrative contributions of a candidate will be based on the criteria outlined in Section C of this document and will be influenced by the weighting of administration in the job description. Each candidate is expected to provide some administrative service to the Department, the Faculty, the University and, if applicable, the Hospital/Health authority e.g. membership on committees or coordination of departmental/divisional/hospital functions. For a candidate whose job description is > 30% research/scholarship, some administrative service to the discipline (e.g. journal or grant reviews, service on grant panels, and/or office in professional societies) is expected. It is unlikely that a candidate would warrant tenure purely on the basis of administrative contributions as an Assistant Professor will not normally carry a significant administrative commitment. Extra Faculty activity unrelated to the Faculty member's discipline or academic position is optional and though encouraged as evidence of community citizenship, shall not normally be the basis for tenure consideration.

Examples of superior performance in the area of administration would include educationally-related activities such as successful creation or reorganization of undergraduate or post graduate courses or the development and/or implementation of innovative teaching methods; research-related activities such as serving on a national/international grants panel, the editorial board of a significant journal or the organization of a major national/international conference; serving on a policy committee of a professional society or government advisory committee; holding a major office in a professional organization; receiving a service award from a society; effectively chairing a major Faculty, University or Hospital/Health Authority committee; taking chief responsibility for a new initiative or restructuring; or serving in a capacity that has a high positive impact on public opinion or knowledge.

Examples of unacceptable performance would include refusal to participate in at least one Departmental, Faculty, University, or Hospital/Health Authority committee; to peer review journal articles or grant applications; or to contribute to quality assurance efforts. It would include being asked to withdraw from a review or other committee for ethical reasons (e.g. breach of confidentiality); inadequate supervision of a program resulting in loss of accreditation; or the provision of inaccurate information to the public.

IV. Clinical Practice - Expectations for Tenure

All candidates with job descriptions including clinical service will maintain at least an "acceptable" evaluation in this category (see C. Performance Standards). It is unlikely that an individual would warrant early tenure consideration purely on the basis of clinical practice.

Examples of superior performance in the area of clinical practice would include recognition at a national level as an important resource and leader in an area of clinical expertise; introduction of a new procedure or program; discovery of a new diagnostic or therapeutic (procedure or medication) that gains national and/or international recognition; leadership in projects resulting in improved quality of care, safety or cost effectiveness; exceptional recognition by patient groups or peers for exemplary patient care; or national recognition for leadership in health care delivery reforms.

Unacceptable performance would include any form of substantiated unethical behavior; failure to maintain clinical competence; persistent failure to complete adequate medical records; persistent failure to communicate effectively with patients and/or colleagues; persistent unjustified significant deviation from generally-accepted practice guidelines; repeated failure or refusal to adequately meet clinical obligations; or persistent irresponsible use of health-care resources.

F. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Promotion to Professor is an important but not automatic nor mandatory step in an academic career. A long-term career as an Associate Professor is an acceptable and appropriate career path for some academics. Promotion to Professor represents recognition of special merit. Each candidate will normally have achieved national and/or international recognition as a leader in his/her chosen area of expertise as a teacher, researcher/scholar, administrator or scholarly clinician. This will usually be evidenced by the candidate's reputation among peers and by a substantial body of work that contributes significantly to his/her field. The candidate will have met the performance standards outlined in Section C and must demonstrate superior performance in at least one of the categories of teaching, research/scholarship, administration, or clinical practice with satisfactory performance in the other categories. The category in which superior performance is demonstrated should normally constitute a significant part of the job description. Faculty can demonstrate superior performance in all categories. The complete career of the individual will be considered.

Timing

A Faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion when his/her position on the University's salary grid is within one increment or is higher than the minimum for Professor (Article 13). Unlike the case for tenure consideration where a recommendation from the Chair is necessary, consideration of a candidate for promotion to Professor is on the basis of an application by the Faculty member to FEC. The Department Chair shall inform the candidate of his/her support or non-support for the application. A Faculty member who is denied promotion by FEC may re-apply for consideration in subsequent years if the deficiencies identified by the FEC are addressed.

Documentation Required:

1. Letter from the Chair.
2. Letter from the Candidate.
3. An updated curriculum vitae.
4. Teaching Dossier including copies of student evaluations.
5. Five letters from referees external to the University concerning suitability of the candidate for promotion. At least three referees should be chosen by the Chair and not have had any mentoring relationship with the candidate. Additional letters from within the University may be obtained. All responses received by the Chair should be considered by the FEC. In soliciting external reviews, the Chair should include a copy of the Faculty's Guidelines for Evaluation and a statement outlining the candidate's current job description and weighting of teaching, research/scholarship, administration and clinical service (if applicable). The nature and timing of any changes in job description should be clearly described.
6. For a Faculty member for whom research/scholarship constitutes >30% of the job description, or superior research/scholarship performance is the basis for promotion, the candidate's five best papers should be included in the evaluation materials.

Performance Expectations for Promotion to Professor

I. Teaching - Expectations for Promotion to Professor

“Except where a staff member has a reduced teaching assignment, performance as a teacher shall be of major importance in the review” (Article 13).

Criteria for evaluation of teaching will be similar to those for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and include numbers of students and post-graduate trainees; hours spent preparing and delivering education; evaluations by trainees; nominations, awards and other recognition for teaching activities; creativity and innovation demonstrated in teaching methods; requests for services in continuing medical education; and the ability to attract and supervise summer students or post graduate trainees. Expectations of the quality of such contributions shall be greater than for an Assistant or Associate Professor.

For a Faculty member for whom the application for promotion is on the basis of superior performance as a teacher, the candidate must be recognized for major contributions at least locally and, preferably, nationally or internationally. The candidate will be recognized by trainees, as well as peers, as a superior teacher and will have won awards such as the 3M award, the Rutherford award, or repeated “Teacher of the Year” awards from the Medical Students Association. The candidate will have created new knowledge in the realm of education with publication in reputable health care education journals and participated in professional development both as a learner and an educator. The candidate will have contributed to departmental and Faculty activities related to education as an innovator, organizer, and implementer participating actively in curriculum innovation, education advisory committees, and in senior administrative roles related to education. The candidate shall be seen as a Faculty leader in education with scholarly contributions documented in a teaching dossier.

II. Research/Scholarship - Expectations for Promotion to Professor

The evaluation of research/scholarship in consideration of promotion to Professor will be based on the weighting in the job description and the criteria outlined in Section C. For a Faculty member for whom research/scholarship constitutes >60% of the job description, the following criteria will normally have been met:

1. The candidate shall be an internationally recognized expert in their area of expertise.
2. The candidate shall have demonstrated continued success in peer-reviewed grant competitions at a national/international level as the principal investigator. Except under unusual circumstances (e.g. endowed chair), the candidate will have successfully completed for external peer-reviewed salary awards and renewals.
3. The candidate's publications shall have made a substantial contribution to progress in their field. The candidate's five best papers should be included in the documentation along with a description of their significance and the Faculty member's contribution to the work.
4. The candidate shall have demonstrated an ability to attract and successfully supervise graduate students, post-doctoral fellows or other research trainees. After completion of their training, some of these trainees should be pursuing successful careers in industry, universities or research institutes.
5. The candidate shall be recognized as a research leader and have contributed to the enhancement of the Department's and/or Faculty's research progress/reputation by having chaired or otherwise participated on local, national and international research review committees (e.g. grants panels, editorial boards, conference organization) and research policy advisory groups .

For a Faculty member for whom research/scholarship is 31 to 60% of a job description, the following criteria will normally have been met:

1. The candidate should have established a national and emerging international reputation as an expert in his/her particular field with a record of publications contributing significantly to the knowledge base in their field.
2. The candidate shall have demonstrated continued success in peer-reviewed national/international grant competitions as the principal investigator or an integral member of a research group. If an educator, some external funding success will be expected.
3. If superior performance in research/scholarship is the basis for the application for promotion to Professor, the candidate's five best papers should be included in the documentation along with a description of their significance.
4. The candidate shall have demonstrated an ability to attract and successfully supervise graduate students, post-doctoral fellows and/or other research trainees.
5. The candidate shall have provided administrative service by participating on local or national research or education committees.

For a Faculty member for whom research/scholarship constitutes 10 to 30% of the applicant's job description, the application for promotion to Professor will demonstrate involvement in research by publishing independent or collaborative works. Scholarly work related to medical/dental/biomedical education such as curricular development and evaluation, development of data banks or other educational tools, and the development of practice guidelines shall be considered in the research/scholarship category.

III. Administration - Expectations for Promotion to Professor

The evaluation of the administrative contributions of a candidate will be based on the criteria outlined in Section C and will be influenced by the weighting of administration in the job description. Each candidate is expected to provide some administrative service to his/her discipline and to the Department, Faculty, University, and, if applicable Hospital/Health Authority. Extra-Faculty activity unrelated to the Faculty member's discipline or academic position is encouraged as further evidence of community citizenship but is optional and would not be considered a major factor in promotion to professor.

A candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to have taken a leadership role in some part of his/her administrative service to the discipline, Department, Faculty, University or, if applicable, Hospital/Health Authority by chairing one or more committees and/or spearheading efforts relating to policy or procedure development. If administration is a significant portion of the job description, the candidate should have played a major role at a senior level such as Chair, Graduate Coordinator, Assistant or Associate Dean, or Chair of one or more major Departmental, Faculty, University or Hospital/Health Authority committees (if applicable).

While a candidate for whom administration represents a significant portion of the job description (e.g. 30 to 60%) may be promoted with superior performance in administration, it is unlikely that promotion would be warranted purely on the basis of administrative contributions.

IV. Clinical Practice - Expectations for Promotion to Professor

There is an expectation that each Faculty member with a job description that includes clinical service would maintain at least an "acceptable" evaluation in this category (See Section F). Any form of unacceptable performance as described in Section C of the document and including behaviors such as substantiated unethical behavior or malpractice would preclude promotion.

A Faculty member may be promoted to Professor primarily on the basis of clinical work if major contributions to setting national standards, developing new or innovative techniques or interventions, or participating in a leadership role in patient care issues such as quality improvement or patient safety are considered significantly meritorious. As with administration, it is unlikely that a candidate would warrant promotion purely on the basis of clinical service.

G. CONTESTED CASES AND APPEALS -

(See AAS:UA Agreement, articles 13.46, 13.62, 15.09)

I. Contested Cases

A contested case is one where the Faculty member exercises his/her right to appear before FEC with a view to changing a preliminary decision by FEC. A Faculty member has this right if:

- a) the Department Chair recommends less than a single merit increment be awarded, except for a Faculty member who is within one merit increment from the maximum position on the University's salary grid for Associate Professors and has not applied for promotion;
- b) the Department Chair recommends that a secondary probationary or further appointment not be offered
- c) the Department Chair recommends that no further appointment be offered to a staff member
- d) the Faculty member applies for promotion and the application is not supported by the Department Chair;

After initial consideration, FEC may not be prepared to endorse:

- a) a recommendation for a further probationary appointment;
- b) a recommendation for tenure and appointment to Associate Professor;
- c) an application for promotion that has been supported by the Department Chair;

or may be prepared:

- d) to award a recommendation for a merit increment which is less than a single increment or no increment if the recommendation of the Department Chair was greater than the award the FEC is prepared to endorse: or
- e) to cite a recommendation for a zero increment award as unsatisfactory and unacceptable i.e. 0d. when the recommendation of the Department Chair was not so to cite.

Under these circumstances the FEC Chair, the Dean, shall inform the Faculty member in writing of the position of FEC with an offer to meet with the Faculty member to discuss FEC's concerns.

II. Appeals

A Faculty member has the right to appeal the following decisions to the University of Alberta General Appeals Committee (GAC) in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Agreement (Articles 13, 14, 15), provided that the Faculty member has appeared before FEC to present a case or has submitted documentation to FEC to support a case :

- a) the decision of FEC not to offer a further appointment upon the termination of a probationary appointment;
- b) the decision of FEC not to award promotion upon the application of the staff member; and
- c) the decision of FEC not to award an increment or to award an increment, which is less than single in value.

H. SABBATICALS

Tenured staff shall be eligible for a one year sabbatical after serving the University for six years as per Article 9 of the AAS:UA Agreement. Staff members must submit an application for a sabbatical to the Dean through the Department Chair by October 15 in the year prior to the academic year in which the sabbatical will be taken. The Dean shall provide copies of these applications to FEC who, after consideration, will submit a recommendation to the Dean as to which applications shall be approved. Meritorious applications will be ones mutually advantageous to the staff member and the University. The staff member shall submit within three months of completion of the sabbatical, to the Department Chair and Dean, a report describing the activities of their sabbatical and their beneficial academic consequences. This report together with the Annual Report shall represent the documentation on which that year's merit award shall be assessed by FEC. If no report is submitted this shall warrant a 0c merit evaluation.

PART II EVALUATION OF FACULTY SERVICE OFFICERS (FSOs)

A. Introduction

These guidelines and standards have been set by the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry to meet the requirements of the AAS:UA Agreement for Faculty Service Officers (clause 13.03). They are intended for use by the Faculty Evaluation Committee when considering recommendations for merit increments, continuing appointment, and promotion of FSOs. General procedures for performance evaluation by the FEC are described in General Guidelines (Part I, Section C) of this document.

Faculty Service Officers perform diverse duties. Some are involved primarily in research, while others are involved in laboratory/facility management, centre management, research support, teaching, or teaching support. Because of this diversity in function, it is unrealistic to generate a common unique set of criteria for use when considering merit increments, continuing appointment and/or promotion.

Recognizing this variation in responsibilities and duties among FSOs, the department Chair will provide a detailed Position Description for each FSO appointment. This document will list the key responsibilities of the FSO and for each key responsibility; specific performance indicators will be described. Where possible, they will also indicate the required frequency and time commitments of a particular activity and/or the satisfactory standard that will be met in performing that particular task.

Review of an FSOs performance must be based on the duties they have been assigned (AAS:UA FSO Agreement, clause 13.01). Therefore, when recommending merit increments or promotion, a department Chair must relate the evaluation to the specific performance indicators in the job description and to the Standards for Faculty Service Officer Ranks (below).

B. Performance Standards for Faculty Service Officer Ranks

As required in the AAS:UA Agreement for Faculty Service Officers (clause 13.05) standards of performance are greater for individuals in the higher ranks.

Faculty Service Officer I

In accordance with their Position Description, the FSO will:

- Work effectively with supervisors in contributing to Faculty and departmental education, research, and/or administrative activities.
- Be technically and/or professionally competent in their specific area(s) of responsibility.
- Provide timely and useful support and service to faculty and administrative staff.

Faculty Service Officer II

In accordance with their Position Description, the FSO will:

- Work under minimal direction in contributing to Faculty and departmental education, research, and/or administrative activities.
- Demonstrate effective teaching skills (if applicable) through satisfactory evaluations from students, peers, coordinators, and the Chair.
- Maintain technical and/or professional competence in their specific area(s) of responsibility.
- Be pro-active in providing support and service to faculty and administrative staff.
- Work with supervisors to represent departmental and Faculty interests at the University level.

Faculty Service Officer III

In accordance with their Position Description, the FSO will:

- Demonstrate leadership and initiative in contributing to Faculty and departmental education, research, and/or administrative activities as applicable.
- Demonstrate effective teaching skills (if applicable) through satisfactory evaluations from students, peers, coordinators and the Chair.
- Play a significant role in curriculum development, implementation of new courses, and the introduction of new instructional technologies and/or methods of delivery (if applicable).
- Demonstrate increasing technical and/or professional competence in their specific area(s) of responsibility.
- Manage research projects, budgets, services, centre operations, and/or departmental teaching programs competently.
- Supervise other staff members effectively.
- Provide meaningful advice in their area(s) of expertise to faculty and administrative staff.
- Liaise with other University entities.

Faculty Service Officer IV

In accordance with their Position Description, the FSO shall:

- Demonstrate independence of action and judgment consistent with participation in senior management in contributing to Faculty and departmental education, research, and/or administration activities as applicable.
- Demonstrate exceptional teaching skills (if applicable) through outstanding evaluations from students, peers, coordinators and the Chair.
- Play a leadership role in curriculum and program development, implementation of new courses, and the introduction of new instructional technologies and/or methods of delivery (if applicable).
- Demonstrate significant initiative and leadership in managing research projects, budgets, services, centre operations, and/or departmental teaching programs, as required in their Position Description.
- Supervise other staff members effectively.
- Provide significant and outstanding technical support to research faculty.
- Provide substantive advice on curriculum development, research plans, and/or project proposals as applicable to senior faculty and administrative staff.
- Initiate, develop, and improve liaisons with other University entities and with relevant external groups.

C. Merit Increments

Each FSO will be assessed annually by FEC. These performance reviews will be conducted as described in the General Guidelines for Performance Reviews (Section B of this document). Each FSO will be assessed in accordance with the performance indicators in his/her Position Description. The assessment will be based on an Annual Report and any other relevant objective documentation of the FSO's contributions, which the FSO must provide to the Chair. Expectations for performance increase with rank, and performance will therefore come under more detailed scrutiny as the FSO advances through the ranks. Merit increments will be awarded as follows:

One-half merit increment

When the FSO shows a significant deficiency in at least one area of key responsibility, but meets performance indicators in all other areas of key responsibility according to his/her job description.

One merit increment

When the FSO meets performance indicators in all areas of key responsibility according to his/her job description.

One and one-half merit increments

When the FSO meets performance indicators in all areas of key responsibility and exceeds one or more performance indicators in at least one area of key responsibility, according to his/her job

description. One and one-half merit increments may also be awarded if the FSO demonstrates that he/she has successfully executed additional key responsibilities during the year.

Two or three merit increments

When the FSO has made outstanding achievements during the year. This would require exceeding multiple performance indicators in two or three areas of key responsibility.

D. Continuing Appointment

The decision to award a continuing appointment is based on indications that the FSO has contributed, and will continue to contribute, effectively as a staff member (AAS:UA FSO Agreement, clause 13.07). Thus, the FSO's performance during the entire probationary period will be reviewed.

The granting of a continuing appointment requires that the applicant achieves an overall satisfactory performance rating. That is, the FSO must meet the performance indicators in all areas of key responsibility in his/her job description.

E. Promotion

The staff member shall be notified of his/her eligibility for promotion by the department Chair. An FSO is eligible when their salary is within one increment of, or above, the salary minimum for the next higher rank.

When promotion to a higher rank is considered, the candidate's entire record will be reviewed and evaluated. To be awarded a promotion, the applicant must achieve a superior performance rating. This requires that the candidate consistently meets performance indicators in all areas of key responsibility and exceeds performance indicators in at least one area of key responsibility, according to their job description. Alternatively, a superior performance rating may be achieved if the FSO demonstrates that he/she has successfully executed additional and/or alternative key responsibilities and has the potential to continue this level of performance.

F. Documentation Required

The following documents are required for application for continuing appointment or promotion.

- The Position Description, which must include specific performance indicators for each area of key responsibility.
- A letter from the Chair of the department.
- A letter from the applicant summarizing work since appointment.
- An up-to-date curriculum vitae.
- Any materials produced as part of the work done.
- Any publications or presentations, if applicable.
- A teaching dossier, if applicable.
- Letters of reference from three referees who can directly attest to the quality of the individual's performance in an area or areas of key responsibility.

All documents must be submitted to the Chair no less than 15 working days prior to the FEC meeting. All letters of reference should be sent directly to the Chair. The Chair may request written assessments from other Faculty or administrators, as relevant.