



Department of Educational Studies

Process and Criteria for Recommending Merit and Performance Based Salary Adjustments¹

The Collective Agreement Between the University of British Columbia and the Faculty Association of The University of British Columbia, July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019, sets out procedures and considerations in Part 2: Salaries and Economic Benefits, articles pertaining to Career Progress Increments (CPI), Merit, and Performance Salary Adjustment (PSA) that guide the EDST Merit Committee.

<http://www.hr.ubc.ca/faculty-relations/collective-agreements/salary-agreement/>

Process for Assigning Merit in EDST

Merit is to be recommended by the Head in consultation with Departmental representatives of all ranks of the Department eligible for merit. The period of review in the Faculty of Education currently is January 1 - December 31.

Recommendations for merit use the criteria set out in Part 4: Conditions of Appointment for Faculty of the Collective Agreement for teaching, scholarly activity, and service to the University and community.

A Performance Salary Adjustment (PSA) Award [Part 2 of the Collective Agreement, Article 2.05] is available to address salary differentials beyond those occurring from differential CPI or merit awards. Recommendation for a PSA award is formulated by the Head and is based on three factors: 1) overall performance over a period of time deemed meritorious; 2) the relationship of a member's salary to that of other faculty member's taking into consideration the total years of service at UBC; and 3) market considerations.

The Merit Committee in EDST consists of the Head plus members to represent each of the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors, Senior Instructors, Instructors, and Lecturers. These representatives will be selected by the Head and normally serve for two years, on a staggered basis.

¹ Approved in Principle at the Department meeting January 15, 2009 and revised February 2011 EDST Department meeting Updated in January 2020 to align with UBC Collective Agreement.

The Merit Committee will normally meet first to review the “Guiding Principles” section of this document outlining the criteria for recommending merit. Committee members will be provided with a copy of each faculty member's Summary of Activities (SoA) for the year under review as well as any information about the duties expected of a member in the period in question. SoAs for faculty in the various appointment streams (eg. Professoriate, Educational Leadership, Lecturer) will be each be discussed separately and according to duties expected of a member. According to the Collective Agreement, “a faculty member who is not expected to teach but is expected to carry out research and contribute service should be considered on the latter two criteria. A member whose assigned duties consist of teaching, educational leadership and service (e.g. Instructor) should be considered only on those three criteria.”

The Merit Committee members individually review and assess each SoA document in the appointment streams using the three-point scale described in the “Guiding Principles” section for determining meritorious performance. Members of the committee will be expected to give rationales for their rankings.

During the second meeting of the Merit Committee, members will discuss the rationales for their ranking of SoAs and will agree on a rank ordered list of faculty who are recommended for merit according to the criteria described in the “Guiding Principles” section. As we do so, we should be attentive to ensuring our rationales reflects criteria for promotion and tenure at the Department, Faculty, and Senior Appointments Committee level, so as not to give false promise to work that will not be valued at other levels of review.

Where a faculty member holds a joint appointment, the assessment will focus on the duties expected for the portion of appointment allotted to EDST. The Head will formulate recommendations for merit awards based on the Committee's assessments. After the increases are confirmed, the Head will arrange for all individuals receiving merit and PSA awards to be informed of the type of increase they received.

MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA 2019

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. All proceedings of the Merit Committee meetings are *confidential*, including all *Summary of Activities* (SoAs) forms and notes for and from these meetings.
2. Data on which merit recommendations are made are derived from information provided by each faculty member in their annual *Summary of Activities* report, with student evaluations of teaching added by the Head's Administrative Assistant.
3. Unless there are mitigating circumstances, late submissions of *Summary of Activities* forms will not be considered for merit increments.
4. Faculty members can request that they not be considered for merit although they are expected to hand in their SoA.
5. A faculty member's record of performance at UBC begins at the time of appointment.
6. Merit committee members recuse themselves from discussions of their SoA.
7. Merit considerations are determined on the basis of established records over the calendar year (January – December).

8. If a faculty member has been on UBC approved leave (excluding study leave) during all or part of the year, expectations should be prorated to account for this leave.
9. Anomalies in workload and teaching assignments should be clarified by the faculty member in their SoA report.
10. Faculty members must be evaluated in terms of expectations appropriate to their rank and tenure status.

CRITERIA

When reviewing the SoAS, the following 3-point scale will be used.

1	2	3
Does not meet expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty members who have shown extraordinary achievement (<i>exceeds expectations</i>) in all three areas of teaching, scholarship/educational leadership activity, and service may be recommended for more than one merit increment. 2. Faculty members who have shown extraordinary achievement (<i>exceeds expectations</i>) in two areas, one of which must include scholarship/educational leadership, and who have met expectations in the remaining area (<i>meets expectations</i>), may be recommended for one or more merit increments. 3. Faculty members who have exceeded expectations in scholarship/educational leadership (<i>exceeds expectations</i>), and have met expectations in the remaining areas, may be recommended for one merit increment. 4. Faculty members who have exceeded expectations in one or more areas, but who does <u>not</u> meet expectations in one or more areas, will likely not be recommended for a merit increment. 5. Faculty members who have met expectations in each area, but who have not exceeded expectations in any area, will likely not be recommended for a merit increment. 6. Faculty members who have not exceeded expectations in any area and have not met expectations in one or more areas will not be recommended for a merit increment. 		

Twelve-month/Three year lecturers who are rated as exceeding expectations in their teaching (*exceeded expectations*) may be recommended for a merit increment. Twelve-month/Three year lecturers who have met expectations or whose teaching is rated as below expectations will not be recommended for a merit increment.

The following factors are taken into consideration in determining evaluations in each area.

SERVICE

For faculty in the Professoriate and Educational Leadership stream, 20% of merit is determined by service contributions and activities.

Service evaluations should consider the following:

1. Service to the Program area in terms of committee work and leadership roles.

2. Service to the Department in terms of leadership and administrative roles, committee work, thesis examination committees, including external examiner, completion of peer teaching reviews.
3. Service to the Faculty of Education and the University through committee work and offices held at the department, faculty and university levels, including service as external examiner and/or Chair for PhD exams.
4. Service to scholarly profession, including editorial and reviewing activities, conference organization.
5. Service to communities outside the university, including workshops and non-academic conference presentations, professional development workshops, professional consultations, and media presentations (eg. television and radio interviews, published op-ed pieces in newspapers, blogspots, podcasts).
6. In general, expectations for service should be higher for tenured faculty than for non-tenured faculty and for more senior faculty relative to new faculty. Faculty members at the Associate or Full Professor ranks are expected to demonstrate service leadership in Department, University and/or academic communities.

TEACHING

For faculty in the Professoriate and Educational Leadership stream, 40% of merit is determined by teaching. For lecturers, 100% of merit is determined by teaching.

Teaching evaluations should consider the following (depending on position and rank):

1. Courses taught or developed (with peer and student evaluations that are at least satisfactory), considering such factors as the number of classes, class size, level of classes (graduate/undergraduate), required or elective.
2. Course coordination (for multi-section courses) and oversight of teacher education cohorts
3. Quality of teaching as reflected in teaching evaluations (peer and/or student) and level of contribution to teaching-related activities; quantity of teaching is based on expected/negotiated workload.
4. Quantity and quality of student supervision, advising, and mentorship based on such things as number of students supervised and timely completion rates, publications/presentations with students and awards received by supervisees. It is important to recognize that faculty members in the Educational Leadership stream may also be involved in student supervision and sit on thesis committees, although this is not a part of their expected workload.
5. Authoring of curriculum materials and media.
6. Teaching awards and honours.
7. Continuing Education activities and visiting lectureships

Further considerations:

- a. Teaching assignments vary across positions:
 - Professoriate stream faculty are normally expected to teach 12 FTE (equivalent of four 3-credit courses) per year;
 - Instructors in the Educational Leadership stream are normally expected to teach 24 FTE (equivalent of eight 3-credit courses) per year;

- 12-month/three year lecturers (full time) are expected to teach 30 FTE (equivalent of ten 3-credit courses) per year;
- b. Faculty members can have reduced teaching loads for several reasons, including “course buyouts” for research, a “teaching release” for administrative positions, or for UBC approved leaves (e.g., study leaves, maternity leaves, personal leaves). New faculty may be given an initial course reduction. Expectations for teaching must be adjusted depending on the nature and length of the leave during the given year.
- c. Given that merit considerations are based on the calendar year, teaching assignments (which run from May – April) may be higher or lower in a given year.
- d. In keeping with serious concerns about the validity of student evaluation data, it is important to recognize that student evaluations are often lower in classes taught by women and racialized instructors, in larger classes, in required courses (especially statistics and methods courses, and in those that cover sensitive or controversial material) and in teacher preparation courses.
- e. Student Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT scores) should be taken into consideration when assessing teaching. While these scores cannot be considered to be entirely reliable indicators of teaching quality, at present they are the means that have been formally approved by the University and Faculty for assessing teaching and, therefore, must be considered when assessing merit.
- f. The typical number of students supervised in each degree program (PhD, EdD, MA, MEd) varies across program areas.

Time commitments for graduate supervision also varies across degree programs (PhD, EdD, MA, MEd) and should be considered in evaluating supervision contributions.

SCHOLARSHIP (Professoriate Stream)

For faculty in the Professoriate stream, 40% of merit is determined by research and scholarly contributions.

Scholarship evaluations should consider the following:

1. **Refereed** publications at various stages (published, in press, under review, submitted), including books, chapters, journal articles, research briefs, conference proceedings.
2. **Non-refereed** publications (including journals articles, books, conference proceedings).
3. Conference presentations (including invited/keynote addresses) and academic workshops.
4. Research funding, grant applications (including grant proposals approved but not funded and grants submitted) and current grant support (PI and Co-I).
5. Research awards, honours, and other recognition.

Further Considerations:

- a. Scholarly contributions are research-informed.
- b. Rank and tenure status must be considered in evaluating research contributions (e.g., large grants and PI status are less likely among newer faculty members).
- c. Evaluation of research funding/grants should consider the year awarded, the size and source of the grant, and the faculty member’s role (PI vs Co-I vs collaborator).
- d. Publications count once, that is, when published.

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP (Educational Leadership Stream)

For faculty in the Educational Leadership stream, 40% of merit is determined by evidence of educational leadership, including teaching excellence.

Evaluations of educational leadership should consider demonstrable evidence of activities that advance innovation in teaching and learning with impact beyond one's classroom at UBC, including outstanding performance in the following areas:

1. Pedagogical innovation and enhancements to teaching, learning, and assessment that has impact beyond the faculty member's classroom, department, discipline and/or institution as appropriate, including innovative course design and development;
2. Significant, innovative and sustained contributions to curriculum development and renewal, including authoring and/or production of curriculum materials, educational technology, and media;
3. Activities to advance interdisciplinary, inter-professional and inter-institutional teaching/learning collaborations;
4. Application of / engagement with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning including contributions to the practice and theory of teaching and learning literature in peer-reviewed and professional journals, conference publications, book chapters, textbooks and open education repositories / resources;
5. Organization of, and contributions to conferences, programs, symposia, colloquia, workshop and other teaching and learning events that address the scholarship of teaching at the local, provincial, national and international level, as appropriate;
6. Securing funding or additional resources for teaching and learning innovation or enhancements, and leading the implementation of funded initiatives or activities;
7. Recognition and distinction in the form of awards, fellowships and other recognition for excellence in teaching and learning related activities (internal to UBC and beyond);
8. Capacity building for excellence in education, including mentoring of colleagues, supervision of student research projects in discipline-based pedagogies;
9. Activities undertaken as part of formal educational leadership responsibilities in the candidate's Department/School/Program area/Faculty/UBC, including course coordination and cohort supervision.
10. Development of relationships with other learning units or institutions that foster the exchange and/or development of information and resources on teaching and learning.