

Approved by FoMD Faculty Council – November 29, 2017

Approved by Provost December 14, 2017

Implementation: July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019 review period

Reviewed by Faculty Development Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee (Aug 15/19) Faculty Council (Sept 17/19) & DEC (Aug 26/19) & FSR (Dec. 17/19)

Clarification from Faculty Relations of A6.12.1, March 2020 – updated April 2020 – Faculty Council (May 19/2020)

Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Standards, 2017

Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry University of Alberta

Procedures and Criteria for Tenure, Promotion, Merit, and Sabbaticals

This document was produced after consultation with:

- Academic Faculty members from the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry
- FEC Documents of other faculties of the University of Alberta
- University of Alberta, Faculty Agreement
- Promotion documents from other Canadian Faculties of Medicine

Updated July 17, 2019 to be consistent with the new Collective Agreement, Schedule “A”, Academic Faculty Members, formerly known as the Faculty Agreement. Changes include:

- Faculty Agreement Articles replaced with corresponding Articles from the Collective Agreement
- “faculty members” and “staff” changed to “Academic Faculty members”
- Table added from the Collective Agreement regarding probationary periods.
- Collective Agreement Article A6.03.4 re teaching quality added to section on Evaluation of teaching activities
- Collective Agreement Article A6.03.5 re multi-year research projects added to the Research section

Table of Contents

Part I: FEC Procedures	3
Introduction.....	3
Faculty Evaluation Committee Membership and Authorities.....	5
Performance Reviews.....	6
Awarding of Tenure and Rank of Associate Professor.....	8
Promotion to Full Professor	10
Tenure and Promotion	11
General.....	11
<i>Expectations for Awarding Tenure</i>	12
<i>Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor</i>	12
Part II: Criteria of Performance Standards	14
Criteria for Performance Evaluation.....	14
<i>Teaching</i>	15
<i>Research</i>	17
<i>Service</i>	20
<i>Clinical</i>	21
Merit Increments	23
Contested Cases	24
Sabbaticals	25
Supplemental Professional Activities (SPA)	26

Part I: FEC Procedures

Introduction

This document is an update of the 2006 Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry's Faculty Evaluation Committee Guidelines, and is intended to be a companion document to the Collective Agreement, Schedule "A", Academic Faculty Members of the University of Alberta. The Collective Agreement details the policies and procedures that all Academic Faculty members must abide, including performance standards for tenure and promotion and merit allocation. As there is variability between faculties, each faculty must describe more specifically its expectations for its members. The Collective Agreement, however, will be the authoritative documents in any form of discrepancy/dispute.

Reference Documents:

- 1) The Collective Agreement is referenced throughout this document: <http://www.hrs.ualberta.ca/en/MyEmployment/Agreements.aspx>
- 2) Human Resource Services (HRS) also has links for manuals, template letters and relevant articles from the relevant Agreements for Performance Assessment: <https://www.ualberta.ca/faculty-and-staff/my-employment/performance-assessment>

At the University of Alberta, many people contribute to the success of the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry (FoMD). This document focuses on Continuing Faculty. **Not** included in this document are Faculty Service Officers (they have a unique FEC Standards document) and other academic staff, Academic Teaching Staff (evaluated through the ATS Evaluating Committee standards), Temporary Administrative and Professional Staff (TAPS), and Trust/Research Academic Staff (TRAS).

Definitions

These standards use the following terms defined under Article 1 of the Common Agreement:

“Staff member”: (Article 1.27)

A person who has been appointed under this agreement to a faculty position on the academic staff of the University, in which the person has been or may be granted tenure; this term includes both full-time and part-time staff who hold such positions.

“Tenure”: (Article 1.32)

An appointment to the academic staff without term, which may be terminated only by resignation, retirement, death, or in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

“Continuing Academic Staff”:

Employees whose contracts of appointment are under one of the Board-AASUA Agreements, viz. Faculty, Administrative and Professional Officer, Librarian, or Faculty Service Officer.

Responsibilities of the Department Chair

Performance assessment (merit allocation, tenure and promotion) is based on how the Academic Faculty member is performing according to their position description.

To facilitate success each Department Chair shall:

- review with the Academic Faculty member their written description of responsibilities (“position description”), with clearly defined time-commitment expectations (as expressed as a portion of 1.0 FTE) for research, education, administration and, where applicable, clinical work, when the Academic Faculty member begins their position at the University of Alberta;
- meet with the Academic Faculty member at least annually to
 - review the member’s Annual Report and the alignment of reported contributions with the current position description;
 - discuss their performance quality, progress and trajectory;
 - update the position description with the Academic Faculty member as needed (if a position description changes, it is agreed to and signed off by the Chair and the Academic Faculty member)
 - discuss career goals and offer/refer to mentorship support, and other needed faculty development supports;
 - discuss merit recommendations;
 - briefly review the FEC process and FEC Standards as needed, and
 - review components within the University of Alberta’s Code of Conduct, including the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment disclosures: <https://www.ualberta.ca/faculty-and->

Responsibilities of an Academic Faculty Member

While the Chair (and/or designate) is expected to provide career guidance to the Academic Faculty member, ultimately the responsibility for performance rests with the Academic Faculty member.

Each Academic Faculty member will:

- be responsible for discussing their position description at least annually with their Department Chair;
- comprehensively document their relevant work and achievements using the Annual Report;
- discuss any requested changes to their position description with (their Divisional Director, if applicable and) their Department Chair;
- seek out appropriate faculty development support including but not limited to mentorship support;
- participate in lifelong learning activities pertinent to their position description.

Faculty Evaluation Committee Membership and Authorities

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) exists to promote the standards of each Academic Faculty and to “provide some degree of uniformity among Departments, and consistency in the yearly application of these criteria” (Faculty of Arts, FEC Standards 2014).

FoMD FEC Composition (Article A6.06.1)

Voting Members:

- Dean of FoMD (Chairs the FEC)
- All FoMD Department Chairs
- Total of 8 elected (voting) tenured Academic Faculty members, elected by Faculty Council
- One elected tenured representative of the department for the Faculty member in consideration of tenure or renewal of a probationary appointment
- One tenured Academic Faculty from another Faculty (President’s Review Committee member)
- FSO representative appointed by the Provost whenever an FSO is being heard for both continuation of appointment and merit

Standing (Non-voting) members:

- Vice-Dean, Faculty Affairs

- Vice-Dean, Education
- Vice-Dean, Research
- Associate Dean, Faculty Development
- AHS Edmonton Zone Medical Director or delegate

Voting:

- Quorum= 80% of voting members of FEC
- Decision results by majority of FEC voting members present
- As Chair of the FEC, the Dean only votes in the event of a tie

The FEC evaluates tenure-track Academic Faculty, Faculty Service Officers, and other individuals in the Academic Staff as approved by Faculty Council, the Office of the Provost and the staff association.

Department Chairs are evaluated individually by the Dean. The Dean is evaluated by the Provost. Vice-Deans are evaluated by the Dean.

Performance Reviews

“An Academic Faculty member shall be a scholar, active in teaching, in research, and in service” (A2.01.1).

Annually, the performance of each Academic Faculty member will be reviewed by the Department Chair and FEC, and will be based on the Academic Faculty member’s position description for each position domain:

- Teaching
- Research
- Service
- Clinical (if applicable)

Article A2.04: “The degree of participation in the governance of the University and other service responsibilities may vary from Academic Faculty member to Academic Faculty member and from time to time. Such responsibilities may be assigned by the Department Chair or may be the result of initiative by the Academic Faculty member. An Academic Faculty member shall be actively engaged in service to the university and shall participate in the collegial responsibilities of departmental, faculty and university governance. The Academic Faculty member may also be engaged in service to the staff member’s discipline or profession.”

These annual reviews will assist the Department Chair on how best to guide the career trajectory of their Academic Faculty member, including timing and process for application for tenure and rank designation to Associate, and promotion to Full Professor.

Full-Time Equivalency

The performance standards are not changed for part-time continuing tenure track appointments of < one FTE (full time equivalent). They will be evaluated based either on:

- a. proportionally reduced expectations, or

A variation of duties will be negotiated with the Department Chair and Dean either:

- a. pre-employment, or
- b. if a change from full-time, at least one year before the faculty member’s case is heard at FEC.

Probationary Periods for Tenured-Track Faculty

A5.02.1 A person appointed as an Academic Faculty member (Assistant Professors and Associate Professors without Tenure) without tenure shall serve one or more probationary periods A person who is appointed as an Academic Faculty member without tenure shall serve a first probationary period calculated in accordance with the following:

Effective date of appointment	First probationary period
July 1	4 years
Between January 1 and the next June 30 (including January 1 and June 30)	4 years plus the period between the effective date and the next July 1 (inclusive of both dates)
Between July 2 and the next December 31 (including July 2 and December 31)	4 years minus the period between the effective date of appointment and the preceding July 1 (inclusive of both dates)”

Furthermore:

A5.02.3 The Dean, with the prior written approval of the Provost may, in the initial appointment reduce the length of the first probationary period.

A5.02.4 If an Academic 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 Academic Faculty member is to be assessed, then the probationary period shall be extended for one or more years.

A5.02.5 An extension of a probationary period because of leave shall be made by the Provost on the recommendation of the Dean following consultation with the Academic Faculty member.

A5.02.6 In considering a recommendation for an extension of a probationary period because of leave, the Provost shall take into account the length of the leave period, the time of the year when the leave was taken and the purposes of the leave.

A5.02.7 The decision of the Provost regarding extension of probationary period because of leave shall be final and binding.

A5.02.8 The second probationary period shall be for two years.

Evaluation during a Period of Leave (See article A6.05 for details)

- Leaves longer than six months shall not be considered in the evaluation of performance.
- Leaves six months or less require FEC to extrapolate the performance for work done in that academic year.

Awarding of Tenure and Rank of Associate Professor

“For the award of tenure, the Academic Faculty member must demonstrate a strong record of achievement in teaching and research, and must demonstrate on the basis of performance while on probation that he/she is capable of contributing effectively as a staff member in all areas of responsibility” (A6.03.3 (c))

- The promotion of an Academic Faculty member and the award of tenure shall be decided by FEC following review of the Academic Faculty member’s performance over the complete career. (A6.12.1) (Clarification from Faculty relations: performance during the probationary period is the most important factor. Example: someone who had a great record prior to coming to the U of A but does little during probation should not be granted tenure on the basis of pre probationary performance.)
- Academic Faculty members **MUST** provide materials (referred to below as an “application”) for evaluation initially by the Department Chair and then FEC, for tenure prior to the end of the second probationary period (usually within six years of their start date or later if the faculty member has an extension). Some leaves may also affect when an Academic Faculty member would apply. Most Academic Faculty members apply within their fifth year.
- All Assistant Professors on the tenure track start with a four-year probationary period, and most will be recommended by their Department Chair and FEC to have a second probationary period of two years.
- If the Chair’s review of the application, including letters of reference, does not support the candidate’s tenure application, the Chair **MUST** notify the Academic Faculty member and inform them of the procedures for contested hearings. In addition, the Department Chair must send a letter to the Dean with a copy to the Academic Faculty member. (A6.12.4 and A6.14.1) indicating their decision and rationale for not supporting the tenure application for the faculty member.
- The award of tenure shall also constitute designation as an Associate Professor.

Authority of FEC in Tenure Cases

There are three options at end of *first* probationary period (four years):

1. Offer a second probationary period (two years)
2. Grant tenure
3. Terminate appointment

As per Collective Agreement, Schedule "A" A5.03.2: "On receipt of the Department Chair's recommendation under A5.03.1, the Dean shall take one of the following steps; and shall inform the staff member in writing:

1. approve a recommendation that the Academic Faculty member be offered a second probationary period, which decision shall be final and binding;
2. if the recommendation is for a second probationary period and if the Dean disagrees with such a recommendation, refer the recommendation to FEC for consideration;
3. refer to FEC a recommendation that an appointment with tenure be offered to the Academic Faculty member; or
4. refer to FEC a recommendation that no further appointment be offered to the Academic Faculty member."

There are three options at the end of the *second* probationary period (four + two years):

1. Grant tenure
2. Terminate appointment
3. "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)" (A5.04.2(c))

Documentation Required for Tenure Applications

- Letter from the Department Chair that is copied to the Academic Faculty member
- Letter from the candidate (detailed, organized review that outlines the scope and impact of contributions)
- Current curriculum vitae of the Academic Faculty member
- Current teaching dossier including copies of all student evaluations and a detailed description of graduate student supervision (when appropriate) and an outline of any mentoring activities
- Five letters from referees who have **NOT** had any mentoring relationship with the candidate (any relationship must be disclosed):
 - all are chosen by the Chair, (the Academic Faculty member may suggest names of potential referees or indicate undesirable potential referees who are either at the Associate or Full Professor

- rank)
 - at least three are external to the University of Alberta
 - all responses received by the Chair are considered by the FEC
- For candidates with $\geq 30\%$ research, or where research is the intended major basis of tenure consideration, the candidate's five best peer reviewed papers should be included, **AND**, a statement from the candidate clearly describing their contributions to the research
- For candidates with $\geq 30\%$ teaching, or where teaching is the intended major basis of tenure consideration, educational scholarly activity must be clearly documented within the education dossier

Promotion to Full Professor

“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.” (A6.03.(d)).

Application for promotion to Full Professor is optional and recognizes distinction. The Academic Faculty member's complete career is considered in the application. If applying for Professor: Is the work recognized internationally?* Does the candidate's work have a major national reputation?

*The FoMD is aware that there are many reasons that may physically limit an Academic Faculty member's ability to travel. Therefore, there are different ways to be “recognized” internationally. For example:

- Publishing/editing in renowned international journals
- Influence and impact of scholarly work (influence is the description of who else has used the work; impact is the description of what change has occurred because of the work). The FEC, composed of the Academic Faculty member's peers will determine how best to assess this influence and impact.
- International committee/working group membership with contributions which lead the creation and dissemination of various scholarly activities (this may be achieved through direct (in-person) meetings or via telecommunication

Faculty are eligible to apply when:

- Their current salary is within one increment of, or is higher than, the salary minimum of the Promotion Transition Zone of Professor. See Appendix A.6 Academic Faculty Salary Scales in the Collective Agreement.

Documentation required for Consideration of Promotion to Full Professor

- Letter from the Department Chair copied to the Academic Faculty member
- Letter from the candidate (detailed, organized review that outlines the scope and impact of contributions)
- An updated curriculum vitae from the candidate
- An updated teaching dossier including copies of all student evaluations and a detailed description of graduate student supervision and mentoring activities
- Five letters from referees who have **NOT** had any mentoring relationship with the candidate (any relationship must be disclosed):
 - all are chosen by the Chair (the Academic Faculty member may suggest names of potential referees or indicate undesirable potential referees who hold the rank of Full Professor)
 - all five are external to the University of Alberta
 - all responses received by the Chair are considered by the FEC
- As part of their application, an Academic Faculty member may provide additional letters internal to the University; these are used only for clarification of points of the application, not as formal references
- For candidates with $\geq 30\%$ research, or where research is the intended major basis of promotion consideration, the candidate's five best peer reviewed papers should be included, **AND**, a statement from the candidate clearly delineating their contributions to the research
- Academic Faculty members should indicate leading work that has advanced their field; and/or work that has international recognition
- For candidates with $\geq 30\%$ teaching, or where teaching is the intended major basis of promotion consideration, in addition to publications, scholarly activity related to education must be clearly documented within the teaching dossier

Tenure and Promotion

General

In order to facilitate success, all pre-tenure Academic Faculty members should receive a third year review by their Department Chair. This submission will include an updated CV, a teaching CV and a letter outlining their accomplishments and future plans. It is up to the Chair to decide how to do the three-year evaluation – whether this will be with a departmental evaluation committee or other process.

The evaluation is shared with the Academic Faculty member and a letter outlining the evaluation and discussion must be sent to the member and a copy to the Dean.

Included should be the timeline and necessary documentation needed for a tenure

application. Absence of this notification to the Academic Faculty member by the end of their third year should be discussed with their Department Chair.

To aid the FEC and Department Chair in understanding the scope and impact of the work, it is recommended that for any position domain 30% or greater, that a supplementary dossier for that area be attached to the promotion package.

FEC will evaluate the output/contributions in all areas with particular emphasis in the highest position domain areas based on:

- How has the work been disseminated? Is the dissemination in the most effective and appropriate manner for that field or domain?
- What is the impact of the work?
- Candidates for tenure: Is the work recognized nationally?

Expectations for Awarding Tenure

The whole record of performance (all position domains) over the course of the applicant's entire career, to the date of consideration, will be assessed.

"For the award of tenure, the Academic Faculty member must demonstrate a strong record of achievement in teaching and research, and must demonstrate on the basis of performance while on probation that he/she is capable of contributing effectively as an Academic Faculty member in all areas of responsibility."

(A6.03.3(c))

For the position domain that is the basis of the application for tenure with promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor:

- Documentation of how their major job domain has had an impact at least at a local level, or preferably to an emerging/established national recognition

Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor

The whole record of performance (all job domains) over the course of the applicant's entire career to the date of consideration will be assessed.

"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." (A6.03.3(d))

Exceptional clinical work, like exceptional service, in rare circumstances may be the basis for promotion, but there must be a strong record of achievement in the other domains as well.

The dominant position domain that is the basis of the application to promotion to

Full Professor shall have:

- Established local and national, and emerging international recognition in that domain.

Part II: Criteria of Performance Standards

As per Collective Agreement, Article A2, University Responsibilities, Academic Faculty members must be involved in teaching, research and service. In addition, FoMD Academic Faculty members may have clinical patient care as part of their responsibilities. Merit is an assessment based yearly on the performance of the Academic Faculty members.

The Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry uses four performance standards in all domains:

1. Excellent:
Performance that is: a) functioning beyond commendable for their rank and/or percentage of position description, and/or b) distinguishing and expanding skills/learning opportunities/stewarding our people, our work and service.
2. Commendable:
Performance that is beyond Acceptable will be distinguished for merit.
3. Acceptable:
“that performance requirements for an increment have not been met but performance is acceptable notwithstanding” = 0b. (A6.10(b)) This standard may be recommended when the Academic Faculty member’s performance demonstrates a significant deficiency in one domain of evaluation, but performs well in the other domains, or when the Academic Faculty member overall performs below expected for rank, but remains within the acceptable range.
4. Unacceptable:
“that academic performance is unsatisfactory and unacceptable” = 0d (A6.1.0(d))

Criteria for Performance Evaluation

The FEC expects greater impact from contributions as the percentage allocation increases for each domain. Similarly, FEC expects more impact with progression through the ranks (Assistant vs Associate vs Full Professor) and years in the rank A6.03.3b).

As per A6.03.3(a), “the evaluation of performance shall ensure that, except where an Academic Faculty member has a reduced teaching assignment, performance as a teacher shall be of a major importance in the review.”

FEC assesses the Academic Faculty member’s performance in all domains but performance in the dominant domain will best guide FEC decisions. As such, Academic Faculty members are encouraged to generate and describe scholarly activity in their

dominant domain (the highest percentage domain in their current position description).

Teaching

Academic Faculty members with a lower percentage (10%) teaching are at a minimum expected to provide quality teaching in their assigned teaching duties. The Performance Standards expectations increase as Academic Faculty members' rank (A6.03.3b) and percentage teaching time increases. For Academic Faculty members with a higher percentage in the teaching domain, and/or academic rank, one indicator of teaching performance success is the development of products of teaching scholarship (some examples are listed below).

Many teaching opportunities, to a variety of learners, exist for FoMD Academic Faculty members: Learners/trainees may include:

- Undergraduate FoMD students,
- Undergraduate students from other faculties (e.g. Science),
- Postgraduate medical students,
- Graduate students,
- Postdoctoral fellows,
- Colleagues from FoMD and other faculties and from the community (local, national, global),
- Allied health and administrative colleagues, or
- Other individuals/groups

Teaching opportunities may include (but not be exclusive to):

- Classroom-based (small and large group individual or series),
- Workplace based (ward/clinic/lab),
- Summative opportunities (evaluations, exams such as candidacy and other orals, for example, STACER/OSCEs),
- Formative opportunities (mentoring, supervision, feedback),
- Teaching products (e.g. curriculum, assessment products, course objectives) are best reported within research (if peer-reviewed, disseminated and impact/outcome described or in service/administration), or
- Faculty development and Continuous Professional Learning/Life-Long Learning

Developing products of scholarship opportunities may occur with External Stakeholders including (as examples but not limited to):

- Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada; Royal College of Dentists of Canada; the College of Family Physicians of Canada,
- the Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada,
- the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, and other Faculties of the University of Alberta,

- the Medical Council of Canada,
- regulatory colleges for all clinical disciplines,
- provincial and national organizations for all health professions taught within the FoMD, or
- the general public

Evaluation of teaching activities (Adapted from PUBLIC HEALTH - FEC Guidelines-01July14 Final.pdf)

“The standards for evaluation of teaching performance shall be broadly based, including course content, course design and performance in the classroom. Such evaluation may take into account information such as statistical summaries of responses to student questionnaires, comprehensive reviews of student commentary; reviews by peers, reviews by administrative officials and reviews of teaching dossiers and other materials provided by the Academic Faculty member. Evaluation of teaching shall be multi-faceted and, in particular, shall not be based primarily on any one method of evaluation.” A6.03.4

Quality, breadth, and quantity of classroom and workplace based (wards, clinics, labs) teaching:

- formal evaluations by learners,
- formal/informal evaluations by peers and colleagues and/or administrators (360 evaluations),
- teaching awards,
- complexity, variety and volume of teaching, and/or
- self-evaluation of teaching as evidenced in a well-developed teaching philosophy

Leadership and professional development (note some of these activities may be better assessed in the research domain):

- program improvements as Graduate, PGME or UME program coordinator or director,
- curriculum development or revisions,
- course development or revision,
- adoption of innovative teaching methods, or
- updating teaching skills and education technology.

Quality and quantity of supervision/mentorship of trainees:

- number and supervisory role of trainees supervised/mentored,
- formal/informal evaluations by trainees or peers,
- successful and timely degree completion of trainees,
- joint publications/conference presentations by trainees,
- scholarships or external funding awards for trainees, or
- graduate student mentoring awards.

Quantity and quality of engaged teaching, education and educational leadership, conducted for or in conjunction with external stakeholders:

- engagement with external stakeholders, for the purpose of the development and delivery of courses in the FoMD,
- development or delivery of learning programs or materials for external stakeholders and broader audiences (e.g. webinars, publically-available videos [e.g. YouTube], podcasts, vodcasts, apps), including formal participant evaluations or unsolicited comments, or
- evaluation of learning programs or materials for/with external stakeholders.

Research

Participation in research is expected of all tenure-track Academic Faculty members. FEC expectations increase as an Academic Faculty member moves up in rank (A6.03.3(b)) and/or increase their percentage of research time

“Scholarly Activity”:

Any type of scholarship (Discovery, Integration, Application, or Teaching) that applies Glassick’s criteria of scholarship: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methodology, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

To aid in scholarly achievements, Academic Faculty members are encouraged to transform some of their other activities (teaching, service, clinical) into scholarly work.

Possible research opportunities include:

1. Funding:

Academic Faculty members with a lower percentage of research (10%) are encouraged to apply for at least local funding, and/or collaborative grants.

For Academic Faculty members with a higher percentage of research and/or higher academic rank, one indicator of research performance success, is peer reviewed, competitive, external (e.g. tri-council) funding, and if they have a higher percentage research as they progress through the ranks, become the PI of such funding.

To help account for research activities, Academic Faculty members should describe one of three possible outcomes of any funding application:

- a. Successful and accepted
- b. Successful and declined

c. Unsuccessful

Significant local, provincial and national economic restraint can further limit already competitive funding awards. Academic Faculty members with a significant research portfolio are still expected to apply for funding, which may include a collaborative grant, and in such cases, must describe their role and contribution to the project. Unsuccessful funding applications may be considered for merit depending on the quality/competitiveness of the funding, and the rank and percentage research time of the Academic Faculty member.

2. Products and Processes of Scholarship:

Any product or process of Boyer's Scholarship types (Discovery, Integration, Application, Teaching) that meet the Glassick criteria of scholarship (clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methodology, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique).

Some examples of Products by Domain include:

- Education: exam questions (MCQ, SAQ, OSCE), evaluation forms, new curriculum
- Research: published material as described below in dissemination, patents
- Service: policy documents, accreditation documents
- Clinical: a medical innovation, clinical guidelines

Examples of Processes include:

- a needs assessment that was developed with peer review and reflective technique, or;
- entrepreneurship leading to new employment of others or tangible product of commercialization (e.g. new patent, new company)

3. Dissemination:

An important component of any scholarly activity is dissemination. It is not just an FEC expectation to disseminate our products and processes of scholarship, it is a fundamental responsibility of any Academic Faculty member to share knowledge by making it public, whether via publication, correspondence, presentations or pedagogy. New technologies make such exchange even more widely possible than ever before. As such, some examples of dissemination opportunities include:

- Presentations at various venues: conferences, academic institutions, academic meetings are of higher quality than presentations to the media, lay-community; depending on the field, an oral presentation to a large international audience may have more impact than a publication.
- Social Media: blogs, Twitter, webpage, YouTube, etc. are lower

quality venues, unless peer-review, uptake and impact can be described.

- Public Compendiums: MedEDPortal, MedEDPublish, vodcasts, podcasts.
- Publications (print or electronic): books, book chapters, original research articles, review articles, guidelines, case reports/series, editorial; an abstract as part of a conference proceeding should be listed as a product of scholarship or with presentation.

FEC expects Academic Faculty members with a lower percentage research (10%) and rank (Assistant Professor) to have at least one product or process of scholarship or item of dissemination per reporting year. Academic Faculty members with a higher percentage research and/or higher academic rank, are expected to have more items and/or of increasing quality (broader scope, greater impact) of scholarship.

Many research activities are collaborative; for each category (funding, products and processes, and dissemination), the Academic Faculty member should describe their role and contributions. As well, they should describe the scope (local, national, international, etc.) of their work. To have impact, and if known, Academic Faculty members should indicate how the research had a reported change to target group (e.g. patients, learners, faculty colleagues, government, communities), and for influence, how the work has been used by other groups. For many research activities, it may take more than one reporting year to determine if there are any reported changes to a target group or uptake by others.

As such, these two items can be best assessed for tenure and promotion, but may be reviewed for merit on annual basis.

The FEC considers not just the quantity of scholarly products, but also their quality, which for traditional discovery scholarship offers publication opportunities with reported impact factors and citation indices. Other forms of valued scholarship and innovation (e.g. education scholarship, community engagement, creative academic work, entrepreneurship) presently do not have similar metrics. As such, Academic Faculty members engaged in these activities should describe their role, scope and importantly the use and impact of their work as fully as possible.

Partnerships with industry are a component of scholarly work of many FoMD Academic Faculty members. Funding or dissemination that is sponsored by industry may be viewed as less rigorous than other competitive, peer-reviewed sources.

“Each Faculty’s standards of performance shall include criteria for the assessment of research productivity in the case of multi-year projects” (A6.03.5).

All scholarly endeavors are time consuming activities; some, especially those of higher quality, need development for more than one or more academic reporting years. During

this time, funding, productivity and/or dissemination may appear low. A thorough annual report that describes the potential impact and quality of work may assist the Department Chair and FEC in such cases. However, for FEC to assess work without any tangible *product* of scholarship, the Academic Faculty member must describe the *process* of scholarship and demonstrate appropriate progress. Such work will be assessed at FEC for merit on an annual basis.

Lower Quality Research Activities	Higher Quality Research Activities
Scope is local	Scope is national, international
Work not peer-reviewed (e.g. Presentation at a local Dept. Research Day)	Work is peer-reviewed
Role/contributions poorly defined	Clearly defined role/contributions
Limited impact	Publications with high impact factor, or with description of impact, citations.
Non-competitive selection for research presentation (e.g. industry sponsored talk)	Competitive selection for research presentation; or invited keynote/plenary by major research group

Service

All Academic Faculty members shall contribute to the betterment of the Faculty and University through meaningful service. Assistant Professors need time to focus on their research or teaching portfolio; as such, Assistant Professors have reduced service expectations.

The Performance Standards expectations increase as an Academic Faculty member moves up in rank (A6.03.3(b)) and percentage service time. An indicator of service performance success for Academic Faculty members with a higher percentage service and/or higher academic rank is contributing to activities, products, or processes that have an increasing scope and impact. For example, Assistant Professors at 10% service contribute to a committee at the division level, whereas Full Professors at 40% service contribute in some capacity at the national level.

While a role title is important, the outcome of any role is what FEC assesses. An Academic Faculty member must describe their role, contributions, and any outcomes from their service work, which may include, but are not exclusive to:

Service contributions to FoMD and the University of Alberta:

- Membership and activities on committees or a formal decision-making body,
- Administrative work (e.g., admissions, course coordination, chairing examination committees),
- Liaison or representative functions on behalf of FoMD (e.g. Alberta Medical

- Association, Alberta Dental College and Association, CPSA, AASUA),
- Awards for service, or
- Mentoring peers

Service contributions to academics outside the University of Alberta:

- Participation in grant review panels or *ad hoc* review of grant applications,
- Editorial activities for research publications,
- Support for scientific advisory boards or expert panels, including national exam or specialty committees,
- Peer-review of research publications; or
- Mentoring peers

Service contributions to non-academics:

- Participation on committees, task forces, study groups, advisory bodies,
- Election to formal decision-making bodies,
- Consultation on policy and programs or formal evaluations,
- Development of public health initiatives (e.g. emergency preparedness),
- Awards for service from external stakeholders,
- In activities outside their professional lives, many Academic Faculty members contribute to their community; while valued, FEC does not assess these activities. However, if in a professional role, the Academic Faculty member contributes substantially to capacity building (for example, major global health initiatives), this may be considered by FEC; or
- Mentoring peers

(adapted from PUBLIC HEALTH - FEC Guidelines-01July14 Final.pdf)

FEC expects Academic Faculty members with a higher percentage of research, especially at higher academic ranks, to participate on research-related committees (ethics, grant panels, scientific advisory boards) and/or participate in peer-review (publications, conference abstract selection, grants). Academic Faculty members with a higher percentage teaching, especially at higher academic ranks, are expected to participate on education-related committees and/or participate in peer-review (of a colleague's teaching, of education-related publications, grants). For these higher rank/percentage Academic Faculty members, the FEC may consider such work to be meritorious (Commendable or Excellent) if the Academic Faculty member made a major contribution (not necessarily leadership title) to an activity, product or process, and/or the activity, product or process had a national or international scope.

Clinical

“An Academic Faculty member may be assigned to professional or clinical responsibilities as a condition of their appointment. Such assignment shall be acknowledged in the weighting and evaluation of performance. (A6.04.5) The

evaluation of an Academic Faculty member whose duties include professional or clinical responsibilities shall explicitly take into account both the time required for such responsibilities and the assessments of the quality of clinical performance. (A6.04.6) The Department Chair, in preparing for the evaluation of performance and recommendations of Increments (Article A6.13) shall take these variances into account. (A6.04.7)”

Health service delivery is the provision of clinical care specific to the Academic Faculty member’s discipline. The Department Chair sets the expectations, quantity and scope of clinical care delivery with the Academic Faculty member. Alberta Health Services and the appropriate regulatory body evaluate the outcomes of clinical care delivery. For those Academic Faculty members providing clinical care, FEC evaluates Academic Faculty members’ clinical service based on their clinical performance and contribution to the clinical team. FEC expects Academic Faculty members to:

- a. Maintain or exceed the assigned clinical care delivery, and
- b. Participate in professional development that is relevant to their clinical practice which may also enhance a scholarly approach to teaching and clinical research

To optimize success, clinicians are encouraged to use their clinical practice as opportunities for academic achievement, which includes products and processes of scholarship. FEC will evaluate the scholarly activities within a clinician’s practice, which may include teaching, research and service. Some examples of clinical scholarly activities may include, but are not exclusive to:

- a. Innovation in the provision of clinical care (i.e. specialized multidisciplinary clinics, outreach clinics, new procedures, electronic information systems etc.)
- b. Quality improvement work that is peer-reviewed, implemented, demonstrated to have impact and disseminated (i.e. access, safety, cost-effectiveness etc.)
- c. Clinical guidelines development, dissemination and implementation
- d. Creation of a clinical environment that fosters research and medical education
- e. Active participation in clinical trials
- f. Formal administrative role in clinical care delivery (Dept. or Section Head, Medical Director of an area of specialization, clinic, or Strategic Clinical Network, etc.), with described outcomes
- g. Major administrative role of clinical committee or subcommittee (local, national, international), or a national or international society, with described outcomes
- h. Clinical teaching done in a scholarly manner (e.g. Peer-review, narrative reflections, application of education theories and relevant literature)
- i. Clinical expertise that has impact and recognition at the national or international level (e.g. awards, referral base)

Merit Increments

Merit is not awarded automatically. As per the Collective Agreement, A6.03.2: “Standards of performance shall be based on merit and not on length of service.”

As per Collective Agreement Article A6.09.1:

“Each year, the Department Chair shall recommend to FEC whether an Academic Faculty member should receive an increment based on performance in the preceding year. Such a recommendation shall be submitted to FEC for each Academic Faculty member in the Department, except for the Department Chair. The recommendation shall be one of the following:

- a. a single Increment;
- b. a multiple Increment, which may be one and one-half, double, two and one-half or triple a single Increment;
- c. a one-half Increment, which is one-half of a single Increment;
- d. a partial Increment, which is an Increment that is less than a single Increment but not a one-half Increment and which will bring the salary of an Academic Faculty member to the salary ceiling of the Academic Faculty members present rank;
- e. a special Increment, which is an Increment that is greater than a single Increment but not a multiple Increment, which will bring the salary of an Academic Faculty member to the salary minimum of the next higher rank;
- f. no Increment.”

In addition to the above, Increments may be awarded in quarter Increments ranging from 0.50 to 3.00 (i.e., 0.50, 0.75, 1.00, 1.25, 1.50, 1.75, 2.00, 2.25, 2.50, 2.75, 3.00). An Increment award of less than 1.0 is appealable.

Zero increments may be recommended by the Department Chair (in writing to the Academic Faculty member) under the following situations:

“If a Department Chair recommends that no Increment be awarded to an Academic Faculty member, or if FEC decides that no Increment be awarded to an Academic Faculty member, in either or both cases, the decision shall be cited as one of the following:

- a. “that maximum for rank has been reached and standards for promotion have not been met but performance is acceptable notwithstanding”; after several years at the rank of Associate Professor, Academic Faculty members may reach their merit ceiling. In such cases, Academic Faculty members must still complete an Annual Report, and regardless whether performance is at a minimum of “Acceptable”, or “Commendable” or “Excellent” they will be assigned a 0a. Such

- Academic Faculty members will receive a qualitative comment from FEC.
- b. “that performance requirements for an increment have not been met but performance is acceptable notwithstanding”; (this is a 0b)
 - c. “that academic performance while on authorized leave could not be properly evaluated;” (this is a 0c)
 - d. “that academic performance is unsatisfactory and unacceptable.” (this is a 0d)
- Article A6.10

Merit Assessment and Leave

As per the Collective Agreement, “an Academic Faculty member who is on leave during the period of review will be assessed by FEC as follows (A6.05):

- a. Discontinuance of academic responsibilities during periods of Maternity Leave, Parental Leave, Compassionate Leave, and Medical Leave (when the total of such periods of full-time leave is six months or less or part-time leave of 50% or less over the 12 months of an academic year) shall require the extrapolation of the performance for work done in the year to a full year. Increments will be awarded in accordance with Article A6.09.
 - 1. Example: An Academic Faculty member takes a Medical Leave for the month of August and Maternity Leave from Sept 1 to Dec 31. FEC will evaluate the Academic Faculty member’s performance based on extrapolation of her work done in July and January 1 to June 30 (seven months).
- b. Periods of secondment, disability leave, Assisted Leave and other forms of leave with pay, with partial pay or with no pay of any length (as well as periods of any form of leave, or combination of leaves, which exceed six months of an academic year) shall not be considered in the evaluation of performance.
- c. Notwithstanding A6.05(b), an Academic Faculty member may request the Department Chair and FEC to take into account academic activities while on leave. The onus shall be on the Academic Faculty member in material appended to the Annual Report to demonstrate to the Chair why such activity should be recognized.”

Contested Cases

“A contested case is one where the Academic Faculty member has the right to appear before FEC. An Academic Faculty member has the right where:

- a. the Department Chair recommends that less than a single Increment be awarded, except where the Academic Faculty member is within one Increment

- from the salary maximum of the rank and has not applied for promotion;
- b. the Department Chair recommends that no further appointment be offered to an Academic Faculty member;
- c. the Academic Faculty member applies for promotion and the application is not supported by the Department Chair;
- d. cases arise pursuant to A6.19.1 of the Collective Agreement.”

A6.17 of the Collective Agreement

“At least 10 days before the hearing, the Academic Faculty member shall advise the FEC Chair of the intention to appear or to submit material or both. Should the Academic Faculty member submit materials to the FEC Chair they shall be copied to the Department Chair and shall contain:

- a. a statement in reply to the recommendation of the Department Chair;
- b. any written material relevant to the case; and
- c. a list of names of persons the staff member intends to call before FEC.”

A6.17.2 of the Collective Agreement

“At least 5 days before the hearing, the Department Chair shall submit to the FEC Chair, with a copy to the Academic Faculty member (subject to A6.15.1):

- a. a statement in reply to the Academic Faculty member’s submission;
 - b. any written material relevant to the case; and
 - c. a list of names of persons the Department Chair intends to call before FEC.”
- Collective Agreement Article A6.17.3.

See Collective Agreement Articles A6.18.1 – A6.18.12 for further details on contested cases.

Sabbaticals

Tenured Academic Faculty shall be eligible for a one-year sabbatical after serving the University for six years as per A4.01.1 of the Collective Agreement. Academic Faculty 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 Academic Faculty 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 increment shall be assessed by FEC.

Supplemental Professional Activities (SPA)

SPA Definition:

"Without restricting the generality of the term SPA, this category shall include any of the following:

- a. employment in any capacity by another employer including the carrying out of teaching duties, e.g. summer session at another university;
- b. consulting;
- c. personal services contracts;
- d. private practice of the Academic Faculty member's profession, e.g. medicine, dentistry, law, etc.

SPA may be categorized as major or minor in scope. Each Faculty Council shall decide what constitutes major SPA but all proposals to teach at another institution shall be considered major SPA." (A3.04.1 and A3.04.2)

Administratively:

1. Before giving approval to any SPA, the chair/dean will document their conclusions that:
 - a. the proposed SPA is in the best interest of the individual's career development.
 - b. the department will be able to meet its academic mandate if the individual gives up their other responsibilities in order to undertake the SPA.
2. Prior written approval for SPA ≥ 0.15 and < 0.30 from the chair and the dean will be in the form of a written SPA agreement. It may also require a secondment agreement, depending on the nature of the SPA and the assessed benefit to the FoMD and the University
3. Prior written approval for SPA ≥ 0.30 FTE from the chair, the dean, and the provost, will be in the form of a secondment agreement.

See all of Collective Agreement section A3 for further details on SPAs.