

133<sup>rd</sup> COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE

21 May 2020

9:00 AM to 10:30 AM

Virtual Meeting

**Ex-Officio:** M Kalcounis-Rueppell (Chair); D Ali, J Bagwe, T Bayans, D Beaver, W Bedard, J Birchall, S Blake, J Boulter, L Budney, J Cahill, K Chough, D Coltman, G de Vries, C Demmans Epp, R Derda, A Dey Nuttall, T Evans, R Fernandez, B Flanagan, C Frei, S Gannon, T Grant, S Guenette, J Hall, J Harynuk, N Ivanova, K Johnston, S Johnston, R Joshi, N Karpenko, E Koppelhus, C Krauss, B Lanoil, L Li, R Luth, J Maciejko, L Mason, T McGee, M McDermott, R McKay, V Michaelis, P Minev, J Naylor, J Newby, I Nikolaidis, J Pascoe, S Pearson, B Peavey, A Phan, A Pianzola, F Sabac, M Sacchi, A Singhal, G Sivakoff, T Smith, F Sperling, L Stein, E Stroulia, B Sutherland, R Tykwinski, H Wan, F West, C Westbury, L Willis, M Wolansky, V Yaskin, V Zanetic

**Additional Members:** A Ali, A Bernardo, M Carbonaro, G Chan, B Cockburn, M de Montigny, J Hammond, B Kanagala, M Kennedy, K Khan, A Neupane, J Olson, A Rattol, K-A Reid, K Shanebeck, P Thota, J Welchman

# of Attendees: 85

**1. Approval of Agenda**

Be it RESOLVED that the agenda of the 133<sup>rd</sup> Science Faculty Council be adopted as circulated. Moved/seconded by R Joshi/A Pianzola.

CARRIED

**2. Notes for the 132<sup>nd</sup> Faculty Council Meeting, September 10, 2019**

Be it RESOLVED that the notes of the 132<sup>nd</sup> Science Faculty Council be adopted as circulated. Moved/seconded by J Pascoe/L Mason.

CARRIED

**3. Special Guest: President-elect Bill Flanagan**

The President-elect addressed Council and answered questions from the floor.

**4. Matina Kalcounis-Rueppell, Dean of Science**

The Dean spoke to Council about the current state of the Faculty by focusing on teaching and research operations during the COVID-19 pandemic with a reminder about the State of the Faculty address at the March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020, Science Town Hall.

**5.1a) Information Graduands lists**

Information on the Spring 2020 graduand list was provided by the Associate Dean (Undergraduate).

Total Graduands - 1048; BSc Honors - 199 with First Class Honors - 175; BSc Specialization - 307, With Distinction - 126; BSc General (including business minor) – 535, With Distinction - 194; BSc/BEEd combined – 7, With Distinction - 6; Science Internship Program - 58

**5.1 b) Motion to permit addition of names to the Graduand list**

Be it RESOLVED that the Science Faculty Office be empowered to amend or add names to the list of Spring 2020 graduands. Moved/seconded by G de Vries/J Naylor.

CARRIED

## 5.2 Faculty of Science Standards

Be it RESOLVED that the Science Chairs' recommendations for revisions to the Faculty of Science FEC Procedures for Annual Review of Performance, Merit Increments, Evaluation of Probationary Appointments, Tenure Decisions, and Application for Promotion to the Rank of Professor be adopted as circulated. Moved/seconded by W Bedard/D Ali. CARRIED

Be it RESOLVED that the Science Chairs' recommendations for revisions to the Faculty of Science Criteria for Merit Increments, Tenure and Promotion be adopted as circulated. Moved/seconded by L Budney/W Bedard. CARRIED

Be it RESOLVED that the Science Chairs' recommendations for revisions to the Faculty of Science Standards of Performance and Procedures for Merit Increments, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion for Faculty Service Officers (FSOs) be adopted as circulated. Moved/seconded by G Sivakoff/S Johnston. CARRIED

## 6.1 Gold and Silver Medalists

Science Chairs approved the following Gold Medal winners:

**Sarah Morin** (BSc General, Biological Science) receive the Dean's Gold Medal in Science.  
**Farynna Facundo** (BSc with Specialization, Immunology) receive the Gold Medal in Science,  
**Jessica Wang** (BSc Honors, Cell Biology) receive the Lieutenant Governor's Gold Medal.

### Dean's Silver Medals, Spring Convocation 2020

The Dean's Silver Medals are awarded annually to convocating students with superior academic achievement enrolled in an Honors program in the Faculty of Science. Recipients must have had a minimum grade point average of at least 3.7 on a full course load in three Fall/Winter academic sessions while enrolled in the Faculty of Science. This year there are **82** Silver Medalists.

## 6.2 New Academic Staff Appointments

A list of new academic staff appointments was circulated with the agenda for information. The new Faculty of Science HR partner was also introduced.

## 6.3 Academic Staff Promotions and/or Tenure/Continuing Appointments

A list of academic staff promotions and/or tenure/continuing appointments was circulated with the agenda for information.

## Adjournment

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

## **AGENDA ITEM #1**

### **2019/2020 Faculty of Science Council – Additional Members**

Keri Ann Reid	Alumni Affairs
Gavin Chan	APEGA
Charles Holmes	Department of Biochemistry
Bruce Cockburn	Division of Computer Engineering
Martin Davies	Department of Pharmacology
Simon Gosgnach	Department of Physiology
Marc de Montigny	Campus Saint-Jean
Jonathan Curtis	Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences
Jennifer Welchman	Faculty of Arts
Florin Sabac	Alberta School of Business
Mike Carbonaro	Faculty of Education
Samer Adeeb	Faculty of Engineering
James Hammond	Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
Joanne Olson	Faculty of Nursing
Paul Juraz	Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Michael Kennedy	Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
Kyle Shanebeck	Graduate Students' Association
N/A	Graduate Students' Association
Chris Brunelle	Registrar's Office
Natasha Danha	Undergraduate Student
Yomna Elshamy	Undergraduate Student
Rowan French	Undergraduate Student
Christy Kan	Undergraduate Student
Bhavana Kanagala	Undergraduate Student
Alina Lin	Undergraduate Student
Connor Oborn	Undergraduate Student
Kavin Ravichandran	Undergraduate Student
Savannah Weber	Undergraduate Student
Brent Wickware	Undergraduate Student
Harrison Yun	Undergraduate Student
N/A	Undergraduate Student

## AGENDA ITEM #2

### 132<sup>nd</sup> COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE September 10, 2019 9:00 AM T3-36 Tory Building

**Ex-Officio:** M Kalcounis-Rueppell (Chair); D Beaver, J Boulter, D Coltman, A Dey Nuttall, S Desaulniers, R Elio, T Evans, R Fok, A Fyshe, S Guenette, J Hall, C Herd, K Johnston, S Johnston, E Koppelhus, R Luth, F Marsiglio, L Mason, M McDermott, J Naylor, E Nicoladis, I Nikolaidis, S Pearson, B Peavey, A Rissanen, M Spila, G Swaters, F West, M Wolansky

**Additional Members:** S Adeeb, G Chan, B Cockburn, J Curtis, P Jurasz, R Mangukia, C Oborn, A Rattol, J Welchman, B Wong

**Invited Guests:** K Kaminsky, G Moroschan

#### 1. **Approval of Agenda**

It was moved/seconded by M McDermott/F Marsiglio, that the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

#### 2. **Notes for the 131<sup>st</sup> Faculty Council Meeting, May 23, 2019**

It was moved/seconded by F Marsiglio/C Oborn, that the notes of the 131<sup>st</sup> meeting of Council, be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

#### 3.1 **Supplementary Professional Activity**

It was moved/seconded by M McDermott/D Coltman, to approve the Science Chairs' recommendation for the proposed changes to the *Faculty of Science Supplementary Professional Activity* regulations.

CARRIED

#### 4.1 **Academic Teaching Staff Evaluation Committee (ATSEC) – Committee Composition**

Documentation for the ATSEC committee composition was circulated with the agenda. Discussion ensued. Any additional comments are welcomed by the Vice Dean of Science at [vicedsci@ualberta.ca](mailto:vicedsci@ualberta.ca). A vote on ATSEC policies and procedures will take place electronically.

#### 5. **Community Engagement Consultation**

The Office of Government and Community Relations within University Relations has been working on identifying issues and opportunities related to how the university engages with communities within the context of the university's institutional strategic plan, For the Public Good. Emily Ball, Director of Community Relations and Nella Sajlovic, Community Relations Officer engaged Science Faculty Council in a lively discussion. More information about the University of Alberta community engagement consultation can be found at [www.uab.ca/cec](http://www.uab.ca/cec).

#### 6. **Other Business**

An update on vision and accountability road mapping will be presented at a Faculty of Science Town Hall on October 1, 2019, at 9:30 am in Council Chamber, University Hall.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:52 am.

## AGENDA ITEM #5.2

### Faculty of Science Standards

#### May 2020 Updates in Faculty of Science Standards Documents

Best practice is to review, update, and otherwise revise Faculty documents concerning Standards for merit, tenure, and promotion every ten years, if not more often. The current versions were last updated in 2011 or 2012, and the President's Review Committee has recommended a review. In the accompanying documents we have updated to address expired URLs, obsolete or otherwise problematic language, and alignment with the article numbers found in the new Collective Agreement. Changes are highlighted in yellow. Key changes are noted in the lists below. (We are considering more substantive changes, and may revisit these documents in the next year or two to incorporate that content, which will once again require ratification by FoS Council.)

In *Procedures for Annual Review of Performance, Merit Increments, Evaluation of Probationary Appointments, Tenure Decisions, and Application for Promotion to the Rank of Professor*

- Section on “End of Second Probationary Period” was added for clarity and to parallel the Faculty Agreement. The language of the original document confabulated actions at the end of the first and second probationary period, but there likely no substantive changes to actions required because of this addition.
- Section 3: Annual review of performance: includes the statement that chairs have to be advising faculty annually in writing on progress towards tenure. This might be considered a substantive change to practice in the departments, depending on what chairs actually do.
- A footnote has been added noting that FEC duties have been delegated by the Dean to the Vice Dean.
- Not clear whether it is pragmatically important whether a Chair “makes a recommendation” to the Dean vs. to FEC. The agreement certainly changes its language in some cases, and I’ve paralleled those changes.
- An updated NSERC source for best practices in referee selection has been inserted.

In *Criteria for Increments, Tenure, etc*

- 99% changes are not substantive, either updating references to agreement or fixing formatting errors in the original
- Main substantive issue: Whether SPA is or is not considered potentially meritorious, given changes to Science SPA document just approved.
- Colonial language regarding service to developing countries has been removed.
- Also, under the section of Promotion Evaluation, the section starts with the implication that a person has to be as good as current Full professors. I marked this for your attention.

For *Standards of Performance and Procedures for Merit Increments, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion for Faculty Service Officers (FSOs)*

- This was written based on an Engineering document and it also clearly reflects the ‘voice’ of the FSOs who may have been consulted in the past. Their language and voice wasn’t changed.
- Wording has been revised in a structure that a bit more parallels our document for faculty by adding bits from their section of the faculty agreement, mostly out of respect for the FSO position, but didn’t bother going overboard in making it completely parallel to what we have for professors.

- Main substantive change: Section 6 Promotion The agreement for FSOs is silent on whose responsibility it is to notify an FSO that she/he is eligible for promotion. A sentence has been added asserting that it is the Dean's responsibility as per practice for Assoc Professors.....for you to consider. It seems it should be someone's responsibility other than the staff member's.
- Main Substantive change: SPA again and alignment with current SPA doc that removed SPA from consideration in FEC.

University of Alberta  
Faculty of Science

**Procedures for Annual Review of Performance, Merit Increments,  
Evaluation of Probationary Appointments,  
Tenure Decisions, and  
Application for Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

Approved by  
THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE Faculty Council  
24 May 2005  
26 May 2011  
**21 May 2020**

This document entitled  
Procedures for Merit Increments, End of First Probationary Appointments, Tenure and Application for  
Promotion to the Rank of Professor is available on the **Faculty of Science Intranet** at  
<https://sites.google.com/a/ualberta.ca/sci-intranet/faculty/fec>

**Table of Contents**

**1.**

1.	Table of Contents	4
2.	General Comments	13
3.	Annual Review of Performance	13
4.	Increments	8
A.	Responsibilities of the Staff Member	13
B.	Responsibilities of the Department Chair	13
5.	End of First Probationary Appointment	5
A.	Responsibilities of the Department Chair	5
C.	Responsibilities of the Dean	5
<b>6.</b>	<b>End of Second Probationary Period</b>	6
A.	Responsibilities of the Department Chair	6
D.	Responsibilities of FEC	6
7.	Tenure	6
A.	Responsibilities of the Staff Member	7
E.	Responsibilities of the Department Chair	7
F.	Responsibilities of the Dean	8
8.	Application for Promotion to the Rank of Professor	8
A.	Notification to Potential Applicants	8
B.	Basis for Achieving Promotion	9
C.	Responsibilities of the Staff Member	9
D.	Responsibilities of the Department Chair	10

E.	Responsibilities of the Dean	11
F.	Continuation of the Application	12
G.	Withdrawal of the Application	12
9.	Referees	12
10.	Appendix 1 : Documents from the Department Chair	14
A.	Tenure	14
B.	Promotion	14

## 2. General Comments

This document is to be used in conjunction with the *Collective Agreement between the Governors of the University of Alberta and the Association of the Academic Staff of the University of Alberta, July 1 2018 – June 30, 2020*, hereafter referred to as ‘the Faculty Agreement.’

In accordance with the Faculty Agreement (Articles A6.01 (d), A6.12.6), this document contains the Faculty of Science procedures to be followed for a faculty member’s annual review of performance and awarding of increments; for evaluating the first and second probationary periods; and for making tenure and promotion decisions. This document should be used in conjunction with both the Faculty Agreement and the *Faculty of Science Criteria for Merit Increments, Tenure and Promotion* document. The reporting period in the Faculty of Science is July 1 to June 30.

## 3. Annual Review of Performance

As per clause A2.05 of the Faculty Agreement, a staff member shall submit each year an Annual Report on responsibilities during the previous academic year. This report will serve as the basis of a performance review by FEC, which will decide on merit increments, actions to be taken at the end of probationary periods, tenure decisions, and promotion applications to the rank of Professor.

In preparing a recommendation to FEC, each year the Department Chair shall review the annual report prepared by the staff member. Each review shall include a meeting between the staff member and the Department Chair, unless the staff member is not available or refuses to meet (Faculty Agreement Article A6.13). After such a review, the Chair shall complete a Chair’s Recommendation Form for submission to FEC. If the staff member is serving a probationary period, the Chair’s Recommendation Form shall include both the Chair’s review of the current year and the Chair’s review of the entire probationary period (Article A6.14.2). A copy of the completed form must be given to the staff member at the same time as it is submitted to the Dean.<sup>1</sup>

For staff members serving a probationary period, the Department Chair shall also annually advise the staff member in writing on progress towards tenure (Article A6.14.3).

The *Faculty of Science FEC Schedule of Events* document sets forth annually the specific deadlines associated with the submission of materials for each of the decisions described in the sections that

<sup>1</sup> In the Faculty of Science, the Dean has delegated all aspects of faculty evaluation to the Vice Dean.

follow. The Dean shall update and distribute this document annually to Department Chairs no later than <insert date> each year.

#### **4. Merit Increments**

A merit increment means the basic unit by which a staff member's salary is increased (Article 1.18), where there is a recommendation to do so.

In accordance with Faculty Agreement Article 6.09.01, the Department Chair each year shall recommend to FEC whether the staff member should receive increments based on the past year's performance.

##### **A. Responsibilities of the Staff Member**

As specified by departmental deadline, the staff member must provide the following minimum documentation to the Department Chair:

- a) An annual report for the previous academic year, using the Faculty of Science Annual Report system and report template; and
- b) proof of accepted publications for the period under review.

##### **B. Responsibilities of the Department Chair**

Each year the Department Chair shall provide in writing to FEC, with a copy to the staff member, an increment recommendation as per Article A6.14.1 of the Faculty Agreement, based on the staff member's responsibilities under Article A2 and to the standards of performance under Article A6.03. These standards are further detailed in the *Faculty of Science Criteria for Merit, Tenure, and Promotion*. The recommendation is made using the *Chair's Recommendation Form*. Guidelines for pro-rated increments based on the staff member's effective date of appointment are specified in clauses A6.11.1 and A6.11.2 of the Faculty Agreement.

Refer to the *Science FEC Schedule of Events* document for the specific deadline each year..

#### **5. End of First Probationary Appointment**

##### **A. Responsibilities of the Department Chair**

The Department Chair will determine the last year of a first probationary period, using the effective date of appointment and the definitions given in Article A5.02.2 of the Faculty Agreement.

In the last year of a first probationary appointment and by the deadline specified in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events*, the Department Chair shall recommend in writing to the Dean, with a copy to the staff member, one of the following:

- a) that a second probationary appointment be offered to the staff member
  - b) that an appointment with tenure be offered to the staff member
  - c) that no further appointment be offered to the staff member
- ##### **C. Responsibilities of the Dean**

On receipt of the Department Chair's recommendation, the Dean shall take one of the following steps:

- a) approve a recommendation that the staff member be offered a second probationary appointment;
- b) if the recommendation is for a second probationary appointment and if the Dean disagrees with such recommendation, submit the recommendation to FEC for consideration;
- c) refer to FEC a recommendation that an appointment with tenure be offered to the staff member (in which case the procedures under the Tenure section of this document shall apply); or
- d) refer to FEC a recommendation that no further appointment be offered to the staff member (in which case the procedures under the Tenure section of this document shall apply).

## **6. End of Second Probationary Period<sup>2</sup>**

### A. Responsibilities of the Department Chair

By the deadline specified in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events*, in the last year of a second probationary appointment, the Department Chair shall recommend in writing to FEC (Faculty Agreement A5.04.1), with a copy to the staff member, one of the following:

- a) that an appointment with tenure be offered to the Academic Faculty member, in which case procedures under
- b) that no further appointment be offered to the Academic Faculty member; or
- c) that the second probationary period be extended by one year (but only if such an extension had not been approved for an earlier year by FEC or GAC).

### D. Responsibilities of FEC

On receipt of the Department Chair's recommendation, FEC shall recommend one of the following:

- a) that an appointment with tenure be offered to the Academic Faculty member (in which case the procedures under the Tenure section of this document shall apply);
- b) that no further appointment be offered to the Academic Faculty member; or
- c) that the second probationary period be extended by one year (but only if such an extension had not been approved for an earlier year by FEC or the General Appeals Committee).

## **7. Tenure**

When a staff member at the rank of Assistant Professor is granted tenure, the individual will receive the designation of Associate Professor in accordance with clause A6.12.2 of the Faculty Agreement.

### A. Responsibilities of the Staff Member

As specified by departmental deadline, the staff member who is being considered for tenure must provide the following minimum documentation to the Department Chair:

- a) an up-to-date curriculum vitae including a complete publication list, current and expired funding, undergraduate and graduate student mentorship and supervision; internal and external service to the community and profession;
- b) a teaching statement;
- c) the names of at least six (6) internationally recognized scholars who can serve as referees capable of judging his/her research activity; and

<sup>2</sup> This section is new, and is inserted to make more parallel with the Faculty Agreement. Note that the Dept Chair here recommends to FEC and not to the Dean.

d) the names of individuals, if any, who would not be acceptable to the applicant to act as a referee, including the reasons for non-acceptability.

E. Responsibilities of the Department Chair

In preparation for a staff member's tenure consideration, either in the last year of a probationary period or in an earlier year for special tenure considerations (**Article A5.05.1**), the Department Chair shall

- a) develop a confidential list of referees capable of judging the staff member's research activity. This list will be derived from the staff member's recommendations and those of tenured academic staff members in the Department, and will not normally include individuals identified by the staff member as not acceptable.
- b) write to a sufficient number of referees in order to obtain between four and six responses. Staff members are not advised as to which of the referees are being contacted for comments.
- c) Invite **tenured** academic staff members in the Department to review the documentation submitted by the staff member, and to provide **confidential written** opinions as to the merits of the case.
- d) meet with the staff member to discuss the case.
- e) assess the case for tenure, based upon the criteria provided in the Faculty of Science document *Criteria for Merit Increments, Tenure and Promotion*.
- f) Inform the staff member in writing, by the deadline specified in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events*, as to whether he/she intends to recommend tenure.
- g) arrange for the election of one tenured staff member of the department to serve as an additional member of FEC to hear the case from the department. The elected representative(s) for tenure will not normally be direct collaborators of the staff member.

If the Department Chair decides to recommend an appointment with tenure, the Department Chair shall provide the tenure documentation (see Appendix 2) to the Dean by the deadline specified in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events* document.

If the Department Chair decides to recommend no further appointment, the Department Chair shall provide all confidential academic evaluations of the work of the staff member to **the Dean** by the deadline specified in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events*.

F. Responsibilities of the Dean

If the Department Chair decides to recommend no further appointment or if FEC's preliminary decision is for no further appointment, the FEC Chair shall prepare a summary of the confidential material received and provide the staff member and Department Chair with a copy thereof by the date specified in the *Faculty of Science FEC Schedule of Events* document.

The summary statement prepared shall be in sufficient detail to enable the staff member to know the **specific ways in which the application failed to meet the criteria specified in the *Faculty of Science Criteria for Merit Increments, Tenure, and Promotion*.**

## 8. Application for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

### A. Notification to Potential Applicants

The Dean shall notify staff members of their eligibility to make an application for promotion to the rank of Professor, on or before May 15th in the year in which they first become eligible to do so (see Faculty Agreement A6.12.3 (b). There will be no subsequent notification.

On or before the relevant date specified in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events* document, the staff member shall notify the Dean in writing of the intention to apply for promotion to the rank of Professor. At the same time, the staff member will send the Department Chair a copy of the notice. In accordance with Article A6.12.2 of the Faculty Agreement, the Department Chair may inform a staff member in writing that he/she (a) intends to recommend a multiple increment sufficient to bring the salary of the staff member to the minimum of Professor or higher, thus making the staff member eligible for promotion in a particular year, and (b) will support promotion at FEC. Such notice shall be made to the staff member by the deadline as per the *Science FEC Schedule of Events* the year in which the recommendation is to be made to FEC. At the same time, the Department Chair will send a copy of the written notice to the Dean.

### B. Basis for Achieving Promotion

For promotion to the rank of Professor, the Academic Faculty member must demonstrate a strong record of achievement in teaching, research, and service, including excellence in teaching and/or research, or, in rare circumstances, a record of exceptional service.

As described in Article A6.03.3 and detailed in the *Faculty of Science Criteria for Increments, Tenure, and Promotion* document, promotion to Professor can be justified in two distinct ways.

In the first way, promotion is justified on the basis of excellence in research and/or teaching. This is the normal basis for promotion; it gives greater weight to research and teaching, in general, than to service.

Alternatively, promotion is justified on the basis of exceptional service. This basis for justifying promotion is to be used only in rare circumstances.

In both cases, the staff member must demonstrate a strong record of achievement in research, teaching and service.

The procedure for applying for promotion is the same in both cases, except in the details of the number and qualifications of the referees.

### C. Responsibilities of the Staff Member

The staff member shall submit a letter of application, or conditional application<sup>3</sup>, for promotion to the rank of Professor to the Dean of Science by the date specified in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events* document. This letter must clearly state whether the basis of the application is excellence in research and/or teaching, or exceptional service.

<sup>3</sup> undefined. Recommend delete, or define it

At the same time, the following minimum documentation must be given to the Department Chair, along with a copy of the letter of application:

- a) an up-to-date curriculum vitae including a complete publication list, current and expired funding, undergraduate and graduate student mentorship and supervision; internal and external service to the community and profession;
- b) teaching statement;
- c) the names of at least six (6) internationally recognized scholars who can serve as referees capable of judging his/her research activity; and
- d) the names of individuals, if any, who would not be acceptable to the applicant to act as a referee, including the reasons for non-acceptability.

When promotion is justified on the basis of exceptional service, in addition to all of the above, the staff member must also provide the names of at least six (6) persons (not necessarily different from the above six (6) names) who are best qualified to judge one or more of the following:

- a) the demanding nature of the service that is the basis for promotion;
- b) the exceptional quality of the service performed by the individual;
- c) the leadership demonstrated by the individual. For each of (a)-(c), the list of names must include at least two people who are qualified to comment on that aspect of the application.

#### D. Responsibilities of the Department Chair

The Department Chair shall:

- a) develop a confidential list of referees capable of judging the staff member's research activity. This list will be derived from the applicant's recommendations and those of other departmental staff members at the rank of Professor, and will not normally include individuals identified by the applicant as not acceptable.
- b) write to a sufficient number of referees in order to obtain between four and six responses. Staff members are not advised as to which of the referees are being contacted for comments.

When promotion is justified on the basis of exceptional service, in addition to the above, the Department Chair shall develop a confidential list of persons who are best qualified to judge one or more of the following:

1. the demanding nature of the service that is the basis for promotion,
  2. the exceptional quality of the service performed by the individual, and
  3. the leadership demonstrated by the individual.
- c) write to a sufficient number of these persons to ensure that for each of (a)-(c) at least two of the references received comment on that aspect of the application.
  - d) Invite staff members in the Department, who are at the rank of Professor, to review the documentation submitted by the applicant (but excluding letters submitted by external referees?), and provide confidential opinions in writing as to the merits of the application.
  - e) meet with the staff member to discuss the application.
  - f) assess the case for promotion, based upon the criteria provided in the Faculty of Science document Criteria for Merit Increments, Tenure and Promotion.

g) Inform the staff member, in writing, by the deadline specified in the Science FEC Schedule of Events, as to whether he/she intends to support or oppose the application.

The Department Chair shall forward all material for the promotion application to FEC as part of material provided for the staff member's annual review. The Department Chair shall inform the staff member **in writing** of the decision to support or oppose the application at the FEC hearing, **and include a copy of this decision as part of the materials submitted to FEC.**

#### E. Responsibilities of the Dean

If the Department Chair decides to oppose the application or if FEC's preliminary decision is to deny promotion, the Dean shall prepare a summary of the confidential material received and provide the staff member and Department Chair with a copy thereof as per the deadline specified in the Science FEC Schedule of Events. The summary statement so prepared shall be in sufficient detail to enable the staff member to know the **specific ways in which the application failed to meet the criteria specified in the Faculty of Science Criteria for Merit Increments, Tenure, and Promotion.**

#### F. Continuation of the Application

Where the Department Chair has decided to oppose the application, the staff member may continue the application in accordance with clause **A6.17.1** of the Faculty Agreement. The Dean will submit to the FEC, on behalf of the applicant, the material submitted by the Chair (Appendix I – Promotion). The staff member may submit additional information that is relevant to the application as per clause **A6.17.1** by the due date specified in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events*.

Where the staff member requests reconsideration of a preliminary FEC decision (**A6.19.1**), the staff member shall submit to the Dean, with a copy to the Department Chair, documentation as per clause **A6.20.1** of the Faculty Agreement.

#### G. Withdrawal of the Application

The staff member may withdraw his/her application for consideration of promotion at any time prior to the FEC meeting. The Department Chair will maintain a record of the names of external individuals who were asked to and who provided confidential assessments. **Those confidential assessments will be destroyed.**

### 9. Referees

The referees selected for evaluating research for tenure and promotion “should not be from the same university as the applicant, should not have been a research supervisor or graduate student of the applicant within the past six years, should not have directly collaborated with the applicant within the past six years or have plans to collaborate in the immediate future, should not be an employee of a non-academic organization with which the applicant has had collaboration within the past six years and should not be in a potential conflict of interest (e.g., personal, financial)”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Adopted from *NSERC Discovery Grants Peer Review Manual, 2019-2020*. Available at: [https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/\\_doc/Reviewers-Examineurs/CompleteManual-ManualEvalComple\\_t\\_eng.pdf](https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/_doc/Reviewers-Examineurs/CompleteManual-ManualEvalComple_t_eng.pdf).

## 10. Appendix 1 : Documents from the Department Chair

### A. Tenure

The following must be submitted by the Chair to the Dean:

- a) Staff member's Annual Report
  - b) Chair's Recommendation Form
  - c) The Chair's Recommendation Summary Letter that includes an evaluation of the staff member's research, teaching ability and service contributions
  - d) Sample of letter to external referees
  - e) List of external referees
  - f) Four to six confidential letters of reference from external referees relating to research evaluation
  - g) Staff member's Curriculum vitae
  - h) The staff member's teaching statement
  - i) Copies of the publications selected by applicant and sent to external reviewers
- If appropriate, other documentation may be submitted.

### B. Promotion

When promotion is justified on the basis of excellence in research and/or teaching, the following must be submitted by the Chair to the Dean:

- a) Staff member's Annual Report
  - b) Chair's Recommendation Form
  - c) The Chair's Recommendation Summary Letter that includes an evaluation of the staff member's research, teaching ability, and service contributions
  - d) Sample of letter to external referees
  - e) List of external referees
  - f) Four to six confidential letters of reference from external referees relating to research evaluation
  - g) Staff member's Curriculum vitae
  - h) The staff member's teaching statement
  - i) Publications selected by applicant and sent to external reviewers
- If appropriate, other documentation may be submitted.

When promotion is justified on the basis of exceptional service, the following must be submitted to the Dean:

- a) Staff member's Annual Report
  - b) Chair's Recommendation Form
  - c) The Chair's Recommendation Summary Letter that includes an evaluation of the staff member's historical record relating to research and teaching, and focus on "exceptional service"
  - d) Sample of letter to external referees
  - e) List of external referees
  - f) Four to six confidential letters received from external referees relating to research evaluation
  - g) Three to six confidential letters received from external referees relating to service contributions; at least two references received must comment on each of (a)-(c).
  - h) Staff member's Curriculum vitae
  - i) Staff member's teaching statement
- If appropriate, other documentation may be submitted.

University of Alberta

Faculty of Science

**Criteria for Merit Increments, Tenure and Promotion**

**Approved by**

**THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE**

**Faculty Council**

~~**24 MAY 2012**~~

**21 MAY 2020**

Revised 27 May 1993

Revised 25 May 1995

Revised 17 May 2005

Revised 24 October 2006

Revised 20 April 2011

Revised 26 April 2012

**Revised 14 May 2020 (date of Chairs' Council)**

The complete text of the document entitled

*Criteria for Merit, Increments, Tenure and Promotion* is  
available on the Faculty of Science Intranet at

<https://sites.google.com/a/ualberta.ca/sci-intranet/faculty/fec>

-

## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
.....	1
I. Criteria	1
A. General Criteria	1
B. Research and Scholarly Activity	1
C. Teaching	1
D. Service	2
1. Service to the Community at Large	2
2. Service to the Professional Community	2
3. Service to the University Community	2
4. Service to Developing Countries	2
E. Supplementary Professional Activity (SPA)	3
II. Evaluation of Criteria	3
A. Research and Scholarly Activity	3
B. Teaching Activity	3
C. Service Activity	4
D. Supplementary Professional Activity (SPA)	4
III. Merit Increments	4
A. General Statements	4
B. Research	4
C. Teaching	4
D. Service	5
E. Sabbaticals	5
IV. Tenure	5
1. Evaluation	5
V. Promotion	6
A. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor	6
B. Promotion Based on Excellence in Research and/or Teaching	6
1. Criteria	6
2. Evaluation	6
C. Promotion Based on Exceptional Service	6
1. Criteria	6
2. Evaluation	7
VI. Other Ranks	7
A. Faculty Service Officer (FSO)	7
VII. Appendix I	7
A. Policy on Teaching Evaluation	7
B. Questionnaire	7

## Introduction

Under the terms of the *Collective Agreement between the Governors of the University of Alberta and the Association of the Academic Staff of the University of Alberta, July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2020* (hereafter the 'Faculty Agreement'), the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) is required to periodically review guidelines used in determining the award of merit increments, tenure and promotion (**Article A6.03.2**). Such a review must take place at least every ten (10) years. Any guidelines developed by the FEC must be approved by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Faculty Council prior to implementation (**A6.03.7**).

The Faculty Agreement provides for the procedures to be followed in determination of the award of merit increments, tenure and promotion. Particular attention should be drawn to the following article of the Faculty Agreement:

A6.16.3 "All decisions of FEC are by majority vote of the members present and eligible to vote."

This document was approved by the Faculty of Science Faculty Council on **26 May 2011** and a decision was also taken by Council to make the effective date of this document be **1 July 2011**.

---

### I. Criteria

#### A. General Criteria

The Faculty of Science has traditionally used performance in research, teaching, and service in arriving at recommendations regarding the award of merit increments<sup>1</sup>, tenure and promotion.

Achievements in research and teaching should be deemed, in general, of greater importance than service. Competence in service should also be considered in judging an individual's overall performance.

A high level of professional conduct will be expected of all faculty members at all times.

This document describes in detail the principles to be followed in evaluating performance in these three (3) areas.

#### B. Research and Scholarly Activity

<sup>1</sup> "Increment" means the basic unit by which a Staff Member's salary is increased, where applicable.

---

The creative function of the University requires faculty members to devote their time to research and scholarly activity.

There are many measures of the excellence of research and scholarly activities. Evaluation of the achievement of a faculty member in the area of research and scholarly activity will use the following criteria:

- Refereed publications:
  - quality and quantity of published work in refereed journals or other refereed venues;
  - citations in the literature implying a new idea or an important work.
- Non-refereed publications:
  - books and monographs;
  - chapters in books and/or review articles;
  - scholarly/technical reports.
- Technical contributions:
  - computer software or hardware that advances the state-of-the-art;
  - patents where the invention is of a scientific or technical nature.
- **Training of highly qualified people:**
  - supervision of graduate students;
  - supervision of PhDs; • supervision of undergraduate students;
  - supervision of technical staff.
- Invited presentations:
  - invitations to deliver addresses at national-international conferences, summer-winter schools, workshops and/or other institutions.
- Peer group recognition that may take the form of:
  - election to office or committees in national or international scholarly professional organizations;
  - editorship of books or journals;
  - service on conference committees;
  - invitations to consult;
  - invitations to evaluate or review work of others;
  - invitations to membership of grant selection committees or other national committees;
  - awards in recognition of the excellence of scholarly work;
  - election to well-known and respected scholarly societies;
  - invitations to chair sessions at national-international conferences or symposia.
- Research grants and contracts:
  - award of research grants and contracts.

### C. Teaching

One of the major functions of the University is to transmit knowledge. This function cannot be considered in isolation from the function to search for knowledge (research). An effective teacher has to be able to stimulate the intellectual inquisitiveness of the students by bringing to their

attention the latest research findings and professional debates in his/her discipline. Thus, teaching effectiveness is linked with research and scholarly activity. An effective teacher not only transmits knowledge but helps the students develop skills to critically examine and evaluate ideas and arguments and, eventually, to generate ideas of their own.

The concept of teaching is not confined to classroom instruction but includes such **activities** as participation in the supervision of laboratories, seminars, colloquia, tutorials, individual and group discussions, supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, and the development of innovative teaching methods.

In evaluating the effectiveness of a faculty member as a teacher, some of the attributes to be considered are his/her ability and willingness to:

- organize and present lectures at a level appropriate for the course;
- communicate effectively with students;
- stimulate intellectual inquiry and to foster learning in the students;
- present the latest research findings and debates in the discipline (where appropriate);
- make himself/herself available to students;
- participate in activities related to teaching such as advising students in selecting courses and assisting them in defining their long-range goals (see also 'Service');
- produce textbooks of high quality and have them published;
- develop and update course materials (lab materials, course notes, etc.); and,
- teach courses at various levels.

#### D. Service

The functions of the University and professional bodies require that, at sometime or other, the members of the faculty engage in activities outside the scope of research and teaching. These activities may include:

##### 1. Service to the Community at Large

Service to the community is intended to include general service related to scholarly activities and interests. In general, any science-based service with a demonstrable impact on society is regarded as service to the community at large.

Such service can be considered by FEC when it requires special academic or professional expertise. These activities include the transmission of scientific knowledge to the lay public. For example, interviews and articles in the news media, operation of facilities visited by the public, contribution to continuing education and special programs, and professional services to schools and colleges, may be considered.

Another important category of service to the community at large is providing advice to governments or other organizations acting for the public good, on science-based policy or other scientific matters.

## 2. Service to the Professional Community

Such activities include the participation on committees in professional organizations, e.g. grant selection committees, and organizing committees for conferences and workshops, editorship of journals, refereeing for journals and conferences, and reviewing research grant/contract applications.

## 3. Service to the University Community

These services involve participation on committees at various levels within the University community, such as GFC, GFC standing and adhoc committees, Faculty and Department committees. Some of these activities are inseparable from teaching functions, particularly student advising. It is to be recognized that whereas all faculty members should be able to advise students in the choice of courses and their long-term goals, certain members of the faculty are appointed as student advisors and bear the brunt of these duties.

Another form of University service is mentoring and coaching other staff, including mentoring Assistant Professors to tenure.

Faculty members can also serve the University community through leadership roles in preparing large-scale grant applications (e.g. CFI, NCE) or nomination packages for major national and international awards, through activities related to commercialization of research results and/or technology transfer, and through participation in activities related to fundraising, development, and/or alumni relations.

## 4. Service to Developing Countries

Activities in assisting developing countries to establish a research/teaching base may be recognized in awarding merit increments, tenure or promotion. International development activities cannot be delineated very clearly among the three functions: research, teaching and service. However, if the work is clearly of use in assisting governments or scientists in developing countries to set up instrumentation, departments, laboratories or development programs, it should be recognized as service to the international community. If the activity demands that the individual spend some time in the developing country to train and engage scholars in research activities, it should be regarded as both research and teaching activity.

## E. Supplementary Professional Activity (SPA)

SPA includes consulting or contractual professional work performed by a staff member beyond the primary obligations to the University, including employment in any capacity by another employer such as paid teaching at another institution or pay received from another source during a sabbatical leave.

~~SPA during the reporting period shall be reported on the staff member's annual report, and will be taken into account by FEC in the evaluation of performance for its decisions on annual merit increments, tenure, and promotion.~~

---

## **II. Evaluation of Criteria**

### **A. Research and Scholarly Activity**

Of all the criteria listed, the one used most extensively, and generally the most reliable, is the quality and quantity of published work in refereed venues of international stature.

Impact factors and/or acceptance rates of refereed venues are useful measures of venue quality; however, it is the responsibility of the Chair of the Department to evaluate, through consultation with his/her colleagues and the use of expert opinion in the field, the quality of the research and scholarship of an individual.

It is also the responsibility of the Chair to make a judgment (and be able to defend it) as to what constitutes a full-refereed paper. For example, a manuscript that is rigorously refereed in its entirety and appears in a prestigious refereed conference proceedings or edited volume may qualify as the equivalent of a full journal paper. However, a published conference abstract or a manuscript that is only informally refereed in its entirety would not be considered the equivalent of a refereed journal publication.

A scholarly/technical report to a private or government agency, published or unpublished by that agency, may be considered as a publication where the evidence of rigorous peer review is provided. Care must be taken to avoid double counting of scholarly/technical reports or invited talks if either is subsequently published in refereed journals.

Extensive citation of a paper is usually a measure of the importance of the work although a lack of citations does not necessarily reflect on the quality of the work. The use of citations has to be made with care since the number of citations obviously depends on the size of the scientific community in the area of research. Some excellent published works wait to be 'discovered' and recognized as important by workers in a field. It is recognized that citations can also reflect negative opinions of a paper.

In the case of joint authorship of papers, every effort will be made with the assistance of the Chair of the Department concerned to assess the value of the individual's contribution to the team effort.

The authorship of a book, though a time-consuming activity, does not necessarily imply research activity as such. A senior level book, to be used at the graduate level or as a reference book,

generally demands considerable research effort. The quality of the book, just as the quality of other published work, has to be determined and one measure is obtained from post-publication reviews by experts in the field.

The award of sustained and increasing research grants from a peer-reviewed body (for example, NSERC, CIHR, and SSHRC, etc.) may also be a measure of the quality of research carried out by an individual. However, care must be taken not to compare grant values across disciplines or sub-disciplines.

Invitations to deliver scholarly talks or major addresses to one's peers are a measure of leadership in the field.

Peer recognition, which takes various forms (see 'Criteria'), is also a measure of scholarly achievement.

## B. Teaching Activity

There are several ways for a Chair to judge effectiveness in teaching, such as:

- assessment by students through a questionnaire and/or commentaries (i.e., USRI scores and comments; see Appendix I for mandatory USRI questions);
- direct assessment by the Chair, or a designate, of teaching delivery;
- peer assessment of teaching delivery;
- assessment, by the Chair, or knowledgeable colleagues of lecture content, assignments, examinations and other course content;
- assessment of the success of mentoring and/or supervision of graduate students, undergraduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and technical staff;
- assessment of participation and communication effectiveness in seminars, colloquia, and meetings;
- assessment of instructional materials produced by the staff member;
- reviews by administrative officials; and,
- assessment, by the Chair, of the extent to which the educational goals of the department are met.

It shall be the responsibility of the Chair to present evidence of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness using the above as a guide.

## C. Service Activity

The Chair shall make every effort to assess the effectiveness of the service provided by the individual to each of the different communities.

In assessing the value of service activities all reasonable efforts shall be made to secure information on the success of such operations from the relevant sources. For service to developing countries, for example, an obvious source would be the appropriate authorities in the host country. Another

possible source of information would be an umbrella organization (UNESCO, for example) under whose cover the project was carried out.

In assessing accomplishments in the area of International Development the difficulty of the circumstances under which an individual has to work must be considered.

#### D. Supplementary Professional Activity (SPA)

SPA can be regarded as meritorious to the extent that it represents professional development of the staff member or otherwise directly contributes to the university's goals of having tangible positive impact on society. Refer to the Faculty of Science "Guidelines for Supplementary Professional Activities and University Industry Relationship" document for reporting and procedural details related to SPA.

---

### III. Merit Increments

#### A. General Statements

The merit increment has to be earned through meritorious achievements and is by no means an automatic right of the individual or based on the years of service. The award of merit increments is primarily based on an individual's performance during the twelve-month period defined by the Annual Report required in the Faculty of Science. Past performance, regardless of how praiseworthy and meritorious it may be, does not give an individual the right to a merit increment every year in perpetuity.

It shall be the responsibility of the Chair to provide information to FEC on the staff members' activities using the guidelines from Section II, *using the Chair's Recommendation Form*.

<sup>2</sup>At times, circumstances make it difficult to assess an individual's research activity in a twelve-month period. This may happen, for example, if an individual must develop intricate instrumentation, experimental apparatus, or a software package. Such activities may at times result in no refereed publications, even though such activities are imperative and indispensable for the future success of the research. In such cases it shall be the responsibility of the Chair to satisfy the committee that the individual is involved in 'development' work of considerable importance. In addition, other indicators of research activity would be expected to be documented.

Performance over multiple years may merit extra incrementation that recognizes the long gestation of the research results.

The committee must judge the overall performance of an individual without assigning any numerical weights to each activity. Individuals who have reduced teaching loads due to research

<sup>2</sup> This constitutes the document's treatment of criteria for multiyear activities. Is this sufficient?

chairs, awards, or other assigned duties, will not be penalized for having a lighter teaching load. However, they are expected to demonstrate good teaching quality in the reduced number of courses they teach and are expected to achieve higher levels of appropriate research/service productivity than individuals with regular teaching loads.

## B. Research

The best, and most reliable, evidence of research activity is the publication of research papers in refereed journals, conference proceedings, books and book chapters during the reporting period. Works under preparation or papers submitted for publication must not be considered in the award of merit increments for the year in question. Refereed contributions that have been accepted for publication, but have not yet appeared may be considered if the Chair has proof of acceptance.

Other evidence of continued research activity is provided by the individual's participation in national/international conferences/workshops and the presentation of papers at these conferences/workshops.

Invitations to present seminars/colloquia at other universities and talks at national/international conferences may also be recognized as evidence of merit and leadership in the chosen area of research.

Award of a sustained research grant from a peer-adjudicated body is to be accepted as peer recognition of the value of research carried out by the individual.

## C. Teaching

Courses taught and the teaching load and effectiveness as a teacher are to be considered in the award of the merit increment. Where the Chair makes the case for meritorious performance based on effectiveness as a teacher, documentation must be provided.

## D. Service

The service of the individual to the community at large, academic, university and international community will also be considered. Where this service has been of exceptional merit, proper documentation will be provided by the Chair.

Peer recognition through, for example, election to scholarly societies, national/international committees, grant selection committees of peer-reviewed agencies such as NSERC, CIHR or SSHRC, or award of Prizes, Fellowships or Scholarships, or any form of award in recognition of the quality of research or service will be given consideration in the award of the merit increment.

## E. Sabbaticals

In a staff member's application for a sabbatical leave, he/she is required to describe the activities that will be undertaken during the leave and the scholarly outcomes that the activities are expected to generate. If the sabbatical is granted, the staff member shall submit a sabbatical report after the leave has finished, describing the actual activities undertaken and outcomes accomplished. The sabbatical leave application and the sabbatical report shall be submitted as part of the staff member's Annual Report to FEC for reporting period under consideration (Article A4.03.9) These two documents are as important as the annual report itself in determining the merit of a reporting period containing a sabbatical leave. The staff member is expected to have executed the activities described in the sabbatical application, or the deviations from those activities that were explicitly approved in advance by the Dean, and to have accomplished outcomes commensurate in merit with those described in the application.

If the sabbatical leave occupies only part of the reporting period the normal expectations and criteria for research, teaching, and service are applicable to the portion of the period for which the staff member was not on leave.

---

#### **IV. Tenure**

Tenure is not the right of a staff member on completion of the probationary period but must be earned through effectiveness and competence in the three (3) areas outlined in Section I.

The individual must have produced sustained high-quality research and demonstrated continued effectiveness as a teacher during his/her career. There must be a high probability of eventually reaching scholarly standards and maturity expected of a Professor of Science.

The service component of the candidate's career will not be a major issue in granting tenure, but the candidate must have demonstrated that he/she is capable of contributing effectively to service activities. Willingness to participate in the committee structure within the Department will be considered an asset. The candidate is expected to contribute to the overall welfare of the department. It is not expected that an untenured staff member will participate in the Faculty or the University committee structure.

As the granting of tenure commits the University for the rest of the individual's academic career, the decision must not be made in haste. The full duration of the probationary period to the date of consideration should be utilized to assess the past performance and the future promise of the individual. Tenure before the expiry of the probationary period must be limited to exceptional cases. These exceptional cases may result from such outstanding performance that the candidate's quality and promise is beyond doubt, or from prior academic, government or industrial service provided that an accurate evaluation of performance can be obtained from academic peers.

A one-year extension to the second probationary period will only be granted when there is significant evidence that the individual will meet the criteria for tenure by the end of the extension year.

## 1. Evaluation

The individual is expected to take an active part in research and scholarly activities, as evidenced by research publications in refereed venues of international repute, active participation in national/international conferences or the authorship of books or book chapters. The research productivity must be sustained and steady. An individual with a poor research record will not be granted tenure.

Teaching is to be evaluated as described in II-B and, in addition, on the basis of a one-page statement by the staff member on his/her teaching philosophy and experience.

It is the responsibility of the Chair to provide a carefully documented case of the quality of the individual's teaching using these criteria as a guide. An individual with poor teaching/mentoring effectiveness will not be granted tenure.

It is expected that the service aspect of an Assistant Professor's duties will be kept to a minimum to enable him/her to establish an effective research and teaching program. Willingness to participate in the service functions of the Department would be considered an asset.

The Chair of the Department is responsible for providing complete documentation on the individual's whole academic career, including the publication record, grants/contracts, teaching competence, research supervised and administrative service as detailed in Sections I and II of this document.

Confidential letters of reference from authorities in the field of research must be sought to ascertain the quality of research and future promise. The opinion of knowledgeable tenured colleagues within the Department may also be sought regarding the individual's competence and contributions. Evidence from both students and peers (testifying to the individual's teaching effectiveness) may also be provided. Finally, information about the individual's engagement in some of the necessary functions, both academic and administrative, within the Department may be provided.

---

## **V. Promotion**

### **A. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based on the individual's performance in the three (3) areas outlined in Section I. Promotion is neither automatic nor based on the number of years of service.

In considering promotion, the individual's whole record of achievement, to the date of consideration, in each of the three (3) areas is to be scrutinized.

No particular numerical weight or formula can be attached to any of the three (3) areas but, in general, excellence in research and teaching is to be considered more important than service. For promotion to professor, the staff member must demonstrate a strong record of achievement in research, teaching and service and either excellence in research and/or teaching, or, in rare circumstances, exceptional service.

## B. Promotion Based on Excellence in Research and/or Teaching

### 1. Criteria

The individual must demonstrate high quality and mature scholarship as evidenced by international recognition of research contributions.

The individual must demonstrate competence in teaching at all levels, and demonstrate excellence in teaching or mentoring at the undergraduate or graduate level.

The individual must have contributed significant service to the Department, the University and/or professional organizations on the national/international level.

### 2. Evaluation

~~Promotion to Professor requires evidence of scholarly achievements and effectiveness in teaching commensurate with the academic staff in the Faculty who have attained the rank of Professor.~~

The evaluation of the quality of research and scholarship will be done according to Sections IIA and II-B. In promotion to the rank of Professor, confidential letters of reference must be obtained from international experts in the field testifying to the quality of the individual's research and his/her national/international stature. Opinions of knowledgeable colleagues (i.e. Professors) within the Department should also be sought and, where appropriate, from colleagues in other departments.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must be based on information from both students and peers. For the criteria of effectiveness in teaching see Section I-C. The individual must include in the promotion submission a one-page statement describing his/her teaching achievements.

By this stage of the individual's career, significant service to the professional community at the national/international level should be demonstrated.

The individual should have participated in the committee structure within the Department, and/or the Faculty and/or the University.

## C. Promotion Based on Exceptional Service

### 1. Criteria

Promotion to full professor based on exceptional service is reserved for those rare cases where an individual's service activity has required significant continuous time commitment resulting in a substantial reduction in time available for research and teaching for an extended period. The service provided by the individual during this period must have been exceptional in its quality and resulted in significant positive impact, and the individual must have demonstrated strong leadership at a senior level.

The individual's record of scholarly achievement must demonstrate high quality research, mature scholarship, and competence in teaching and mentoring at all levels.

### 2. Evaluation

The evaluation of the quality of research and scholarship will be done according to Sections IIA and II-B. In promotion to the rank of Professor, confidential letters of reference must be obtained from international experts in the field testifying to the quality of the individual's research and his/her national/international stature. Opinions of knowledgeable colleagues (i.e. Professors) within the Department should also be sought and, where appropriate, from colleagues in other departments.

Unlike the evaluation of research when promotion is justified on the basis of "excellence in research and/or teaching", this evaluation may focus on the individual's research and scholarship prior to beginning the extraordinary service, which should be judged in comparison to peers at that career stage and not at the time they were promoted to Professor.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must be based on information from both students and peers. For the criteria of effectiveness in teaching see Section I-C. The individual must include in the promotion submission a one-page statement describing his/her teaching achievements. Unlike the evaluation of teaching when promotion is justified on the basis of "excellence in research and/or teaching", this evaluation may focus on the individual's teaching and mentoring prior to beginning the extraordinary service.

Opinions will be obtained through confidential letters of reference from individuals who are best qualified to judge the demanding nature of the service, the exceptional quality of the service performed by the individual, and the leadership demonstrated by the individual.

## VI. Other Ranks

### A. Faculty Service Officer (FSO)

For further information, please refer to the *Standards of Performance and Procedures for Merit Increments, Continuing Appointment and Promotion for Faculty Service Officers (FSOs) Document*.

---

## VII. Appendix I

### A. Policy on Teaching Evaluation

- a. A teaching questionnaire will be completed for each lecture section, in compliance with General Faculties Council regulations.
- b. The questionnaire will be administered through the Chair's office and the instructor will not be involved or present during the process.
- c. The results of the questionnaire will be provided to the instructor only after the final grades for the course have been submitted.
- d. Written comments are to remain confidential between the Chair and the instructor and will not be directly available to FEC. The Chair may present a synopsis of the written comments to FEC.
- e. Results of the teaching questionnaire will be used by the Chair in preparing the Chair's recommendation to FEC and by FEC.

### B. Questionnaire <sup>3</sup>

The questionnaire will consist of ten required Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questions, and may also include additional targeted questions whose answers will not be used in assessment of teaching effectiveness. The Universal Student Ratings of Instruction questionnaire shall use the rating scale Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree to gather responses to the following questions:

1. The goals and objectives of the course were clear.
2. In-class time was used effectively.
3. I am motivated to learn more about these subject areas.
4. I increased my knowledge of the subject areas in this course.

<sup>3</sup> Vice dean office to determine if this requires updating

5. Overall the quality of the course content was excellent.
6. The instructor spoke clearly.
7. The instructor was well prepared.
8. The instructor treated the students with respect.
9. The instructor provided constructive feedback throughout this course.
10. Overall, this instructor was excellent.

# University of Alberta

## Faculty of Science

### **Standards of Performance and Procedures for Merit Increments, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion for Faculty Service Officers (FSOs)**

1. FSO staff member consultation: February 13, 2012
2. Science Faculty Evaluation Committee approval: February 22, 2012 (via email vote)
3. Provost & Vice – President (Academic) approval: May 3, 2012

Revised May 21, 2020

FSO staff member consultation:

Science Faculty Evaluation Committee approval:

Provost & Vice – President (Academic) approval:

The complete text of the document entitled *Standards of Performance and Procedures for Merit Increments, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion for Faculty Service Officers (FSOs)* is available on the Faculty of Science Intranet at <https://sites.google.com/a/uAlberta.ca/sci-intranet/faculty/fec>

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to set out the standards of performance and evaluation procedures for Faculty Service Officers (FSOs) as required under Articles B6.01 and B6.03.2 of the *Collective Agreement between the Governors of the Board of the University of Alberta and the Association of the Academic Staff of the University of Alberta, July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2020* (hereafter the “Faculty Agreement”). This document is to be used in conjunction with the whole of Article B of the Faculty Agreement, which pertains to Faculty Service Officers.

The responsibilities of FSOs in the Faculty of Science are varied, but all support the Faculty's endeavors in teaching, research, and service. The terms of the appointment and job description shall outline the specific duties in teaching, research, and service (Article B2.01).

## 2. Annual Review of Performance

As per clause B2.03 of the FSO Agreement, a staff member shall submit each year an Annual Report on responsibilities during the previous academic year. This report will serve as the basis for recommendations by the Department Chair to FEC on merit increments, actions to be taken at the end of probationary periods, continuing appointment decisions, and applications for promotion. The format of the report is approved by the Science Faculty Council and shall be based on written job responsibilities of the position (Article B2.03).

In preparing a recommendation to FEC, each year the Department Chair shall review the annual report prepared by the staff member. Each review shall include a meeting between the staff member and the Department Chair, unless the staff member is not available or refuses to meet (Article B6.13).

A copy of the completed form must be given to the staff member at the same time as it is submitted to the Dean.

If the staff member is serving a probationary period, the Department Chair shall also annually advise the staff member in writing on his/her progress.<sup>1</sup>

## 3. Standards of Performance for FSO Ranks

A Faculty Service Officer's performance will be evaluated with respect to the standards set out for each rank. The criteria for competent performance are applied with increasing stringency competence and the ability to meet diverse demands for support in a timely and useful manner are of primary importance, including remaining current with technological changes in the areas designated in the job description. If deemed necessary, persons outside the Faculty may be consulted with regard to assessing the competence of the staff member for merit increment, continuing appointment, and promotion decisions. Assessment of the staff member's performance may be facilitated by formal requests for feedback from individuals with whom the staff member interacts as part of their job. If the FSO's responsibilities include supervision of staff, then the quality of supervision will be part of the performance evaluation.

<sup>1</sup> key addition

## Faculty Service Officer I

- 1.1 The staff member shall become familiar with new techniques, methodologies and approaches in the areas designated in the job description and remain current in his/her knowledge of these areas.
- 1.2 The staff member shall be competent and effective in carrying out the duties in his/her job description.
- 1.3 The staff member shall work effectively with his/her supervisor(s) in teaching, research, and/or service.

## Faculty Service Officer II

In addition to the above,

- 2.1 The staff member shall effectively represent department\* interests at Faculty and University levels.
- 2.2 The staff member shall provide effective supervision as required by his/her job description.

## Faculty Service Officer III

In addition to the above,

- 3.1 The staff member shall provide effective enhancement of the learning/research/working environment.
- 3.2 The staff member shall contribute to effective liaison with University entities and external groups as required by his/her job description.
- 3.3 The staff member shall provide leadership in support of the Department's<sup>9</sup> teaching, research and/or service activities and be capable of managing projects, including supervision of research assistants and other staff as required.

## Faculty Service Officer IV

In addition to the above,

- 4.1 The staff member shall exercise independence of action and judgment consistent with participation in senior management.
- 4.2 The staff member shall provide substantive and meaningful advice to senior administrators regarding teaching, research, and/or service
- 4.3 The staff member shall perform a major role in maintaining and improving liaison with University entities and external groups, as required by his/her job description.

<sup>2</sup> "Department" is the umbrella term used to include units, divisions, or any entity that has a core user group. <this is a footnote from the original document>

4.4 The staff member shall consistently demonstrate a high level of initiative and leadership.

#### 4. MERIT INCREMENTS

An increment means the basic unit by which a staff member's salary is increased (Article 1.18), where there is a recommendation to do so.

In accordance with Faculty Agreement Article B6.09.01 and B6.14.1, each year the Department Chair shall recommend in writing to FEC, with a copy to the staff member, an increment recommendation based on the staff member's annual report, the staff member's responsibilities under Article B2, the standards of performance under Article B6.03, and the standards set forth in this document. The recommendation is made using the Chair's *Recommendation Form*.

If the staff member is in the last year of a probationary period, the Department Chair's review shall cover the entire probationary period (B6.14.2), as well as covering the current year under review.

"Merit" will come under more detailed scrutiny as progress through the ranks occurs; and in the course of the progression, emphasis on the evaluation of performance will shift from a level of competent service to demonstrated initiative and leadership in establishing and executing his/her duties and serving Departmental needs.

#### 5. CONTINUING APPOINTMENT

At least 90 days before the expiry of the FSO Member's probationary appointment, the Dean shall recommend to FEC in writing with a copy to the FSO Member either

- a) that a Continuing Appointment be offered to the FSO Member, or
- b) that no further appointment be offered to the FSO Member.

FEC shall consider a recommendation under Article B5.03.1 and shall decide either

- a) that a Continuing Appointment be offered to the FSO Member, or
- b) that no further appointment be offered to the FSO Member.

A decision to award a continuing appointment is prospective and is based on the staff member's record of performance during the entire probationary period. The staff member shall have demonstrated capability in carrying out responsibilities and the potential for continued high performance in meeting Department requirements in teaching, research and/or service. The recommendation of the Department Chair under clause 12.07 shall cover the entire probationary period, including the year under review.

#### 6. PROMOTION

An FSO Member shall be first eligible to apply for promotion when their current salary is within one increment of, or is higher than, the salary minimum of the next rank (B6.12.1). The Dean <??> will notify the staff member of this eligibility in the first year that this occurs. 3

<sup>3</sup> Our Procedures doc. for professors indicates that the dean notifies associate professors when they are eligible for promotion. The FSO doc was silent on whether this is the dean's office responsibility.

When promotion to a higher rank is under consideration, the staff member's entire career will be carefully reviewed and evaluated by FEC (B6.12.3). Promotion to the next higher rank requires strong performance in all dimensions of that rank and excellence in at least one dimension, and a demonstrated ability to sustain such performance after promotion. Promotion to FSO IV additionally requires demonstrated capacity to effectively contribute in senior management decision making on issues related to teaching, research and/or service in the Department. Appraisal of this capacity will include assessment of the FSO's judgment and leadership qualities, and of the future benefit to the Department from having the FSO participate at a more senior management level.

## 7. SUPPLEMENTARY PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY <sup>4</sup>

SPA includes consulting or contractual professional work performed by a staff member beyond the primary obligations to the University, including employment in any capacity by another employer such as paid teaching at another institution or pay received from another source during a sabbatical leave.

SPA during the reporting period shall be reported on the staff member's annual report, and may be taken into account by FEC in the evaluation of performance for its decisions on annual merit increments, tenure, and promotion.

SPA can be regarded as meritorious to the extent that it represents professional development of the staff member or otherwise directly contributes to the university's goals of having tangible positive impact on society. Refer to the Faculty of Science "Guidelines for Supplementary Professional Activities and University Industry Relationship" document for reporting and procedural details related to SPA.

## 8. PROCEDURES AND DEADLINES

The procedures set out below detail the respective roles and responsibilities of the Faculty Service Officer (FSO), his/her Department Chair, and the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, as well as the deadlines and timing for the submission of materials and notification of decisions. Specific dates for deadlines are updated each year and provided in the *Science FEC Schedule of Events* document, provided by the Office of the Dean and available at <https://sites.google.com/a/ualberta.ca/sci-intranet/faculty/fec>.

### A. Documentation

The staff member will provide annually the following to the Department Chair:

- a) Annual Report
- b) Reports and other material prepared as part of his/her work
- c) Publications, conference presentations, technical reports, creative works

and, when being considered for Continuing Appointment and/or Promotion,

- d) Up-to-date curriculum vitae
- e) List of potential assessors (see section 2 below)
- f) Any other material deemed relevant

<sup>4</sup> Chairs removed the notion that SPA would be considered as meritorious in the revised SPA agreements. This should be omitted.

The Department Chair will provide annually the following to FEC:

- a) Current Position Description
- b) Annual Report of staff member
- c) Chair's Recommendation Form, which contains an evaluation summary and merit recommendation

and, when being considered for Continuing Appointment and/or Promotion

- d) Revised Position Description (if applicable)
- e) Statement of support or opposition of application for continuing appointment or promotion, including a statement of the FSO's overall contribution to the Department
- f) List of assessors (see section 2 below)
- g) Written assessments of performance from internal assessors
- h) Written assessments of performance from external assessors

#### B. Assessments for Continuing Appointment and Promotion

The FSO shall submit to the Department Chair a list of 3-4 individuals who can attest to the quality of his/her work, of which at least two must be from the same department as the FSO under review ("internal assessors") and at least one must be from outside the department ("external assessors"). The latter may be individuals within the University (but outside the department) or from the external community. The Department Chair shall add 3-4 other individuals to this list, with at least two being internal assessors and at least one being external.

Faculty members currently serving on FEC shall not be included on either list. Faculty members on either list must be tenured, and FSOs on either list must have a continuing appointment above the current rank of the FSO under review. From this pool of potential assessors, the Department Chair shall solicit written references from a sufficient number of individuals so that at least four references are received. References must be solicited from at least two of the individuals on the list submitted by the FSO and at least two of the individuals on the Chair's list, and at least one reference must be solicited from an external assessor.

#### C. Confidential Material

In cases where the staff member has a right to contest or have his/her case reconsidered by FEC, the FEC Chair shall prepare a summary of the confidential material received and shall provide the staff member and the Department Chair with a copy at least ten days prior to the FEC hearing. For the specific deadline each year, refer to the *Science FEC Schedule of Events*.

#### D. Timelines for Submission of Materials

The table below provides approximate dates, which are updated each year by the *Science FEC Schedule of Events* document provided by the Dean's office and available at <https://sites.google.com/a/ualberta.ca/sci-intranet/faculty/fec>.

mid - March	FSO notifies Department Chair and FEC Chair, in writing, of intention to apply for promotion.
Date set by Dept Chair	FSO submits application and supporting materials to Department Chair, including list of potential assessors at this time.
Early October	Department Chair notifies FSO, with a cc to the Vice Dean, of support or opposition of application for promotion or continuing appointment. If the Chair opposes an application for promotion or recommends no further appointment, all confidential material and <i>Chair's Recommendation Summary</i> letter are also due at this time to the Vice Dean.
Late October	All annual reports, chairs' recommendations and all supporting documents are due in Vice Dean's Office

FEC reconsiderations are in mid-January of the year following.

## AGENDA ITEM #6.2

### New Academic Staff Appointments

<b>Department</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Hire Date</b>
Biological Sciences	<b>Hall, Zachary</b>	Assistant Professor	Jan 1, 2020
Biological Sciences	<b>Berry, Jacob</b>	Assistant Professor	April 1, 2020
Biological Sciences	<b>Phan, Anna</b>	Assistant Professor	April 1, 2020
Biological Sciences	<b>Rueppell, Olav</b>	Professor	Jun 1, 2020
Computing Science	<b>Santana de Lelis, Levi</b>	Assistant Professor	Jan 1, 2020
Computing Science	<b>Hegde, Nidhi</b>	Associate Professor	Feb 17, 2020
Computing Science	<b>Taylor, Matthew</b>	Associate Professor	Apr 1, 2020
Mathematical & Statistical Sciences	<b>Shen, Zhongwei</b>	Assistant Professor	Jul 1, 2020
Physics	<b>Boettcher, Igor</b>	Assistant Professor	Feb 1, 2021

## AGENDA ITEM #6.3

### Academic Staff Promotions and/or Tenure/Continuing Appointments Effective July 1, 2020

FULL NAME	DEPARTMENT	CURRENT RANK	NEW RANK EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2020
<b>Friggstad, Zachary</b>	Computing Science	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor (Tenure)
<b>LeBlanc, Lindsay</b>	Physics	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor (Tenure)
<b>Maciejko, Joseph</b>	Physics	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor (Tenure)
<b>Mathewson, Kyle</b>	Psychology	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor (Tenure)
<b>Michaelis, Vladimir</b>	Chemistry	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor (Tenure)
<b>Reyes, Alberto</b>	Earth & Atmospheric Sciences	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor (Tenure)
<b>White, Martha</b>	Computing Science	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor (Tenure)
<b>Apelblat, Yoram</b>	Chemistry	FSO II	FSO II (Continuing Appointment)
<b>Criscitiello, Alison</b>	Earth & Atmospheric Sciences	FSO II	FSO II (Continuing Appointment)
<b>Desaulniers, Shawn</b>	Mathematical & Statistical Sciences	FSO II	FSO III
<b>Dey Nuttall, Anita</b>	Earth & Atmospheric Sciences	FSO III	FSO IV
<b>Allison, Ted</b>	Biological Sciences	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Bouchard, Vincent</b>	Mathematical & Statistical Sciences	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Cairo, Christopher</b>	Chemistry	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Dumberry, Mathieu</b>	Physics	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Guay, Nicolas</b>	Mathematical & Statistical Sciences	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Harynuk, James</b>	Chemistry	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>McDermott, Mark</b>	Chemistry	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>McKenzie, Deborah</b>	Biological Sciences	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Morsink, Sharon</b>	Physics	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Ray, Nilanjan</b>	Computing Science	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Singhal, Anthony</b>	Psychology	Associate Professor	Professor
<b>Stafford, James</b>	Biological Sciences	Associate Professor	Professor