

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE REVIEW

CRITERIA

**FOR
GRANTING OF TENURE,
RENEWAL OF TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENT,
& AWARDING OF
SALARY INCREMENTS AND PROMOTIONS**

**For the Review Period
January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREAMBLE.....	2
A. APPOINTMENT CATEGORIES.....	3
B. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW.....	4
B1. TIMEFRAMES FOR CONDUCTING REVIEWS.....	4
B2. DOCUMENTATION.....	5
B3. REVIEW PERIODS, TIMELINES & PROCESS.....	6
C. PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE.....	10
C1. COMPOSITION.....	10
C2. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES.....	10
D. PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES.....	10
D1. TEACHING AND RELATED DUTIES.....	11
D2. SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH OR EQUIVALENT PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES.....	13
D3. COLLEGIAL GOVERNANCE.....	15
D4. SERVICE.....	16
E. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION.....	17
E1. INSTRUCTOR RANKS.....	17
E2. LABORATORY INSTRUCTOR.....	18
E3. LECTURER TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR.....	18
E4. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.....	19
E5. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR.....	19
F. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL OF TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENT.....	19
G. CRITERIA FOR SALARY INCREMENTS.....	20
G1. INCREMENT.....	20
G2. MERIT.....	20
APPENDIX A	
PREPARING MATERIAL FOR REVIEW BY THE PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC).....	22
APPENDIX B:	
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC).....	24

PREAMBLE

It is the mission of the Faculty of Nursing to realize human potential through the power of Nursing. It does this by providing quality nursing education, enhancing the field of nursing through research, scholarship, and knowledge development; advancing practice, and contributing its expertise to professional groups and the community at large. The Faculty endeavours to recruit academic staff who are not only strong teachers and capable of scholarly work but are also conversant with, and involved in, professional practice and can contribute to the development of knowledge and skills.

The Faculty of Nursing is a professional Faculty committed to the ideals of service, outreach, and collaborative processes that flourish in a community of caring and mutual respect. This work is conducted with respect to governing and certification bodies and in reciprocal relationship with communities and with educational partners.

This criteria document has been established in accordance with Section 17.11 of The University of Regina Collective Agreement (hereafter referred to as the Collective Agreement) which states that the Dean of each Faculty must maintain “established criteria and procedures” to guide performance review. It further states in part: *“When establishing review criteria and procedures, the Dean shall consult in committee with the academic staff members of the academic unit. The criteria and procedures shall be reviewed from time to time by the Dean through consultation in committee with the members of the academic unit.”*

The Collective Agreement stipulates that ongoing performance review is part of an academic career at the University of Regina and academic staff members are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with the sections of the Collective Agreement that pertain to performance evaluation.

Effectively applied, performance review is formative. Its purpose is not only to inform career decisions, but to enable those reviewed to develop their skills and move forward professionally. Performance review thus guides career progress through the ranks, and motivates all academic staff to pursue excellence in their assigned duties.

A APPOINTMENT CATEGORIES

The various categories of academic appointments as outlined in Article 13 of the Collective Agreement are provided below along with the array of duties pursuant to Article 16 of the Collective Agreement.

Faculty: Professor
Associate Professor
Assistant Professor
Lecturer

The duties of a faculty member normally include teaching and related duties, scholarship, research or equivalent professional activities; participation in collegial governance; and/or service.

Laboratory Instructor: Laboratory Instructor III
Laboratory Instructor II
Laboratory Instructor I

The duties of a laboratory instructor are to provide support for academic programs and shall normally include one, some, or all of:

- Laboratory Instruction and other appropriate instructional duties;
- Laboratory development, related professional activity, and operational oversight;
- Administration and maintenance;
- Service.

Instructor: Instructor III
Instructor II
Instructor I

The duties of an instructor shall normally include:

- Teaching and related duties;
- Service.

Sessional Lecturer: Sessional Lecturer III
Sessional Lecturer II
Sessional Lecturer I

The primary duty of a sessional is to teach. If other duties are assigned, they must be explicitly stated in the letter of appointment.

B GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Article 16.2 of the Collective Agreement outlines three categories of professional duties:

1. teaching, instructional activities, and related duties
2. scholarship, research or equivalent professional activities
3. service including administrative duties

The performance of academic staff members will be evaluated on the basis of their contributions in these broad areas as well as other Faculty wide priorities which may from time to time be explicated. Every faculty member is expected to act in a consultative, responsible and a professional manner as a matter of course.

B1. TIMEFRAMES FOR CONDUCTING REVIEWS

The normal date of appointment for academic staff is July (based on the academic year from July 1 to June 30); however, reviews are based on the calendar year (January 1 to December 31).

As per Article 17 of the Collective Agreement:

Reviews shall be conducted annually for all academic staff members who:

- hold term appointments
- hold tenure-track appointments (other than an initial)
- have applied for tenure and/or promotion
- have applied for merit
- hold appointments with tenure and have been asked by the Dean in writing by November 30th to be reviewed
- who have had a performance issues explicitly identified on their latest Performance Review Form and who have been informed in writing by the Dean by July 1 of the decision and the rationale for the review
- were eligible for an increment the previous year and did not receive one

Reviews shall not be initiated for academic staff on leave as per the Collective Agreement except under unusual circumstances.

Notes:

Term Appointments – these appointments have a terminal date normally 1 to 5 years from the appointment date. Notification of intent to extend or renew the appointments must be given by the University at least 6 weeks before the current term expires. No academic staff member shall hold a term appointment or series of term appointments for more than 5 years. An appointment in the 6th year shall be with tenure.

Tenure- Track Appointments – these appointments are reviewed during the second academic year (July 1 to June 30) of the initial appointment (which is normally for a period of 2 years). Following the initial 2 years, tenure-track appointments may be renewed annually. This is referred to as the probationary period. Prior to the end of the 5th year, a decision must be made by the University as whether it will allow the appointment to expire, renew the tenure-track appointment for an additional one or two year period, or grant tenure.*

** The extension to the probationary period is to be at the request of the staff member and with the concurrence of the University.*

Appointments with Tenure – these appointments are normally reviewed every third year unless otherwise requested by the staff member or the Dean.

B2. DOCUMENTATION

In accordance with Article 17 of the Collective Agreement, reviews are to be based on the following documents:

- Annual Information Form (A.I.F.) (completed by academic staff member)
- Performance Review Form (P.R.F.) (completed by initial reviewer, Performance Review Committee and Dean)
- Current C.V.
- Material in the official file* relevant to the period under review
- Documents and other works relevant to performance for the period under review
- Student course/instructor evaluations (aggregated and summarized)
- Other relevant forms

- Letters of Reference (for tenure and promotion cases only)**

Note: information not stated on the A.I.F. or P.R.F. or not contained in the official file will not be considered.

(Pursuant to Article 10.7 of the Collective Agreement, the official file is located in Human Resources and a copy may be maintained by the Faculty)*

*(** Pursuant to Article 17.9 of the Collective Agreement, these letters are for the use of the Dean, Review Committee and Campus Promotion Committee. Applications for tenure or promotion by Laboratory Instructors and Instructors may be waived at the request of the staff member and such requests shall not be unreasonably denied)*

See Appendix A: Preparing Material for Review by the Performance Review Committee (P.R.C.)

B3. REVIEW PERIODS, TIMELINES & PROCESS (GENERAL OVERVIEW)

Article 17 of the Collective Agreement stipulates that each year academic staff must submit a completed Annual Information Form (A.I.F.). The Dean may waive this requirement if the staff member is not being reviewed or is absent from campus. In such an instance, 2 forms must be submitted the following year.

REVIEW PERIODS

Increment – Period to be reviewed terminates December 31

Promotion or Tenure – Period to be reviewed covers entire career

Merit – Period to be reviewed covers period since last merit or from the initial appointment if they have never received merit.

TIMELINES

November 30 Applications for Tenure, Promotion & Merit

Application must be made by this date. Application for tenure or promotion to full professor require the names and contact information for three referees from whom the Dean shall request letters of reference.* Up to three additional references may be obtained by the Dean.

**The Collective Agreement states: "The Dean shall retain the letters of reference in confidence. These letters are intended for the use of the Dean, the Performance Review Committee, and in cases of promotion to Professor, the Campus Promotion Committee. The letters are not provided to the initial reviewer ..."*

December 15 Submissions from Tenure-Track Academic Staff

Staff holding tenure-track appointments submit a completed A.I.F. and supporting documentation (including an up-dated curriculum vitae).

January 31 Submissions from Term and Tenured Academic Staff

Staff with term or tenured appointments submit completed A.I.F. and supporting documentation (including an up-dated curriculum vitae).

March 31 Decisions Communicated Regarding Tenure-Track Renewals and Granting of Tenure

Staff in tenure-track positions are to be notified in writing by no later than this date.

June 30 Decisions Communicated Regarding Career Progress

Staff will be notified of all decisions related to increment, merit and promotion in a timely manner and by no later than this date.

Refer to Appendix F of the Collective Agreement regarding deadlines for filing notices of appeals with respect to non-renewal of tenure-track appointment and denials of promotion and salary increments.

PROCESS

- The Dean, following consultation in committee with the relevant academic staff members, determines who shall serve as the initial reviewer. This decision is to be communicated to the staff no later than September 30th.
- The initial reviewer carries out the review in accordance with the established criteria and completes and signs the Performance Review Form (P.R.F.). He/She then communicates his/her recommendation in writing to the staff member and meets with the staff member to discuss the review. At this time the staff member signs the P.R.F. to indicate that the comments and recommendation have been acknowledged (this does not necessarily signify agreement with the review).
- The staff member may add clarifying information to the review which is to be submitted to the Dean within 7 calendar days of signing the P.R.F.
- The Dean forwards the review materials to the Performance Review Committee.
- The Performance Review Committee first meets to review the statements and recommendations from the initial review and any subsequent clarifying information and then meets with the Dean to present its recommendations, with rationale. In the case of a tenure-track staff member, the committee shall provide a written recommendation on renewal of appointment, the rationale for its recommendation, comments on the member's performance, and suggestions to the member on steps to be taken for progress towards tenure and/or promotion. This document shall be part of the member's file.
- The Dean invites (in writing) all academic staff to view their Performance Review Forms. Staff members may meet with the Dean to explain or add to the information on the P.R.F. Special submissions may be added to the P.R.F. but this must be done within 7 calendar days of meeting with the Dean.
- The Dean renders a decision

NOTE:

The Dean may seek advice from the Academic Review and Development Committee before rendering a decision. In the case of promotion to full professor, a Campus Promotion Committee, which is advisory to the Dean, reviews the staff member's file. The Campus Promotion Committee enters its recommendation on the P.R.F. The Dean then notifies (in writing) the staff member of the recommendation and the staff member has 7 calendar days from the time of notification to respond to the Dean regarding the Committee's recommendation, with rationale before the Dean renders a decision.*

**In the event that performance has been deemed below standard, the staff member will be informed in writing by the Dean and the letter shall stipulate what is required for acceptable performance.*

The renewal of tenure-track (probationary) appointments or the granting of tenured (continuing) appointments requires approval by the University's Board of Governors or its delegate. The Dean shall communicate in writing any areas of concern.

Refer to Article 17 of the Collective Agreement for additional information.

C. PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

C1. COMPOSITION

Pursuant to Article 17.13 of the Collective Agreement, the Performance Review Committee (P.R.C.) consists of individuals elected by academic staff members of the unit or by another procedure acceptable to the academic staff and the Dean. Those faculty holding out-of-scope appointments are not eligible to serve on the Committee. The Dean may attend meetings of the Committee as an observer.

Pursuant to Article 17.10 of the Collective Agreement, the Dean shall make every reasonable effort to secure instructor representation on the Committee when the performance of Instructors is under review. The review is to focus primarily on Instructor's duties, which are teaching and related duties and service.

C2. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

In light of the established criteria of the Faculty and pursuant to Article 17.13 of the Collective Agreement, the P.R.C. shall conduct its review on the basis of the documentation provided and enters its recommendations, with rationale on the P.R.F.

The Committee will then schedule a meeting with the Dean to discuss its recommendations, with rationale.

See Appendix B: Terms of Reference for the Peer Review Committee

D. PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES

In accordance with Article 16 of the Collective Agreement, "In accepting an appointment at the University, academic staff members agree to the duties prescribed for their category. Members are responsible to the appropriate Head and/or Dean for the performance of all their University duties assigned or otherwise."

The Article further states that *"each faculty shall develop collegially and include in its Criteria Document a transparent process for the assignment of duties, based on decisions made in accordance with criteria known to members within that Faculty*

and in accordance with Article 17.” Further assignment of duties and expectations shall be made in a transparent process. For instance, faculty will be invited by the Dean to apply to opportunities such as teaching laboratory instructor, Curriculum Liaison and Internationalization Committee. Article 16.2.5 further states that “Criteria documents may elaborate upon, but shall not prescribe outside, the duties identified in Articles 16.1”.

D1. TEACHING AND RELATED DUTIES

Teaching duties are assigned by the Dean or other appropriate person following consultation in committee.

A. TEACHING

In the Faculty of Nursing, teaching includes selecting, preparing, and presenting course materials for lectures, seminars, labs, electronic teaching (e.g. online, videoconferencing, podcast, etc.) and clinical practice education; coaching and mentoring of clinical and classroom faculty; supervision of students; availability to students for consultation; and assessment of student performance.

The Faculty aspires to be regarded highly for its teaching, and expects from members a high standard of performance in this area of responsibility. Teaching can take many forms, and the following activities and qualities are illustrative of teaching:

- thorough, current knowledge of the subject, and enthusiasm for it;
- clear, appropriate presentation of course material;
- establishment of an open, supportive, and respectful learning environment that encourages independent thought;
- fair treatment of students, and availability to them outside class time.

B. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The evaluation and assessment of teaching are important parts of the performance review process. The aims of the assessment and evaluation of teaching performance are:

- to encourage and recognize superior performance in teaching and related duties;
- to assist members to improve teaching;
- to assist in the performance review process.

Information used to evaluate teaching includes some or all of:

- evidence of effective supervision of graduate students, and membership on thesis and project committees;*
- evidence of using the results of one's scholarship and research in teaching;
- evidence of applying knowledge gained from professional activities to teaching;
- peer review evaluation of teaching;
- student evaluations of teaching;
- copies of relevant teaching materials such as syllabi, examinations, and the like;
- evidence of the development of new resources including those in electronic form;
- evidence of the development of new courses or new approaches to teaching;
- evidence of keeping course content current;
- development of a teaching portfolio;
- evidence of coaching and/or mentoring of clinical and classroom faculty;
- evidence of administrative activities (e.g. development, implementation and evaluation) supporting curriculums and related Faculty roles;
- evidence of steps taken to improve teaching and other material an academic staff member may wish to submit.

* Responsibility of professorial tenure-track

The following aspects are important contributions for those involved in practice education teaching processes:

- Knowledge of the teaching/learning process in practice education
- Ability to assess the strengths and limitations of students' practice competence
- Skill in communicating with students, in observation and data collection techniques, and in assisting students in an analysis of their own situation

Student Course Evaluations

The Collective Agreement Article 17.18 allows for the use of student course/instructor evaluations It is agreed that *“course/instructor evaluation do not constitute unequivocal measures of teaching effectiveness and may only be used as part of a more comprehensive*

teaching evaluation system which may include other measures of student impact, peer evaluation, and reflective thought from the member.” Such teaching evaluations systems are to be developed, administered and used following consultation in committee with academic staff. The course evaluations “*will be in an aggregated or summarized form.*” The anonymous student comments’ shall not be included in the aggregated or summarized forms and the full set of comments must be provided if the member so chooses.

Should an academic staff member not wish to make use of the form, a written proposal suggesting an alternative method of course/instructor evaluation is to be submitted to the Dean for consideration.

D2. SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH OR EQUIVALENT PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Research and scholarship are highly valued in the University of Regina and broadly defined in the Faculty of Nursing. Scholarship is interpreted to include the development of knowledge through systematic inquiry, the application of knowledge, and the synthesis of knowledge. Scholarship is also interpreted to include innovative, critical and/or creative approaches to the development of knowledge. It is expected that faculty members will contribute to the scholarly dissemination of knowledge (e.g. refereed articles, books, reports, etc.) within the field of nursing and/or adjacent disciplines. Publications, scholarly papers, sabbatical reports and other evidence of research and scholarship may take the form of any of the following:

Research Criteria

- a. Grants applied for, received and reports produced
- b. Development of proposals for grants, either on one’s own or with others
- c. Development of program proposals including exploration of funding sources
- d. Evidence of research activity, even where such activity is not supported by a funded grant

- e. Evidence of theory development and dissemination (construction, synthesis, application)with or without grant funding
- f. Grants recommended for funding but no funding available

Peer-reviewed Scholarship

These have been reviewed by peers prior to publication and are considered substantial evidence of scholarship. e.g.:

- a. Articles in refereed journals
- b. Books and/or chapters in books published by university or other publishing houses using referees in the publishing process
- c. Peer-reviewed papers or publications
- d. Papers in published conference proceedings, where a peer review process can be documented
- e. Films, videos or computer software where a peer review process can be documented
- f. Book/journal reviews
- g. Papers presented at scholarly or professional meetings
- h. Practice scholarship – impact on patient care, nursing practice, policy development, quality assurance
- i. Open access journals
- j. Evaluation research

Non Peer-Reviewed Scholarship Activities

- a. Newspaper articles
- b. Public press
- c. Media presentations
- d. Web-based presentations
- e. Evaluation research

Equivalent Professional Activities

In the Faculty of Nursing, substantive professional achievements are viewed as activities equivalent to research and scholarship. Such activities are particularly important to members of Faculty, especially insofar as they provide evidence of leadership and innovative contributions to the profession of nursing.

The following are examples, not in order of importance, of the many kinds of evidence which could be submitted as evidence of professional activities equivalent to research and scholarship:

- a. Distinctive and important contributions to one's profession, learned societies or commissions of inquiry, government reviews or panels or expert witness in a precedent-setting case
- b. Awards and fellowships from professional societies
- c. Program development, implementation and evaluation activities which have contributed to the profession, the well-being of society, and/or the development of the field of nursing and/or adjacent disciplines
- d. Editing a professional journal or textbook
- e. Contributions to Faculty, or University development, where the assignment is clearly related to one's professional competencies and standing
- f. Developing a new practice technique, recognized by the profession
- g. Consultant or other activities associated with credentialing examinations
- h. Reviewer for Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing (CASN)
- i. Professional Practice Group(s)
- j. Working with community groups
- k. External referee for tenure and promotion applications

D3. COLLEGIAL GOVERNANCE

As the University of Regina uses a form of consultative governance, it is incumbent upon each faculty member to accept a fair share of responsibility regarding administration and committee work as needed. Such work should not be a major consideration when making recommendations for promotion, but should be taken into account in the overall evaluation.

When assigned administrative duties form a significant part of a faculty member's workload, they should be given commensurate weight. Administrative and

committee work which assists in the development, planning and implementation of curriculum and in providing quality service to students is especially valued.

Administrative contributions should not simply be measured in terms of the number of committees involved. On the contrary, over-commitment to administrative tasks may detract from teaching and scholarship. (This is especially true early in one's career during the honing of scholarship and teaching skills).

The following are examples not in order of importance of the many kinds of evidence which could be submitted as evidence of professional activities relevant to collegial governance:

- Course Coordinator
- University Committees
- Program Committees
- Faculty Committees
- Working Groups
- Faculty Council

D4. SERVICE

The University of Regina values service contributions that reflect the professional skills and expertise of its academic staff. At the same time, it is important to note that a faculty member's obligation is to fulfill University duties (Article 16.1.1).

The following are examples, not in order of importance, of the many kinds of evidence which could be submitted as evidence of service:

- a. Providing professional consultative work to health service programs and projects: i.e. legal consult, insurance consult, expert witness,
- b. Assisting community groups with community health based research
- c. Individually remunerated public and community health service may form a basis for assessment
- d. Engage in service activities that bring public recognition to the individual, the Faculty and the University and that are clearly above and beyond one's normal activities as a private citizen. Such activities may or may not be in the professional field, such as an appointment to a Health Board or government position, Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association (SRNA) and/or service on voluntary boards and committees which is substantial and recognized

- e. Workshops which have had a demonstrated impact on professional practices
- f. Invited addresses to professional groups
- g. Organizing a major conference
- h. Contributions to union work, nursing or otherwise

E. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

In the Faculty of Nursing promotion from one rank or classification to the next results from evidence that the academic staff member has exhibited continual and meritorious growth. Those applying for promotion shall make written application to the Dean no later than November 30. All supporting documentation, including copies of material to be sent to referees, is due in the Office of the Dean by that date.

E1. INSTRUCTOR RANKS (I TO III)

Instructor I to II Promotion normally requires completion of a Master's degree and a demonstrated record of relevant teaching proficiency. An Instructor I with a four-year Bachelor degree or equivalent, and an established record of relevant teaching proficiency plus four years of successful teaching experience may also be eligible for promotion.

Instructor II to III Promotion normally requires completion of a Ph.D. or equivalent and a demonstrated record of relevant teaching proficiency. An Instructor II with a Master's degree and a minimum of five years of demonstrated relevant teaching proficiency may also be eligible for promotion.

A candidate for the Instructor III rank should be considered a master teacher, with a demonstrated

ability in all aspects of course development and instruction, and a record of continued professional development in pedagogy.

A demonstrated record of relevant teaching proficiency should include strong student evaluations, an ability to develop new courses or adapt existing courses, an understanding of, and the ability to use, new and emerging teaching methodologies. Mentoring, coaching and support of clinical and classroom faculty may be evident. Contributions to administrative processes or service should also be evident.

E2. LABORATORY INSTRUCTOR I TO III

Laboratory Instructor I to II Promotion requires a demonstrated record of teaching proficiency and a demonstrated ability to modify existing laboratory projects/experiments/fieldwork. The Laboratory Instructor should be ready to participate in laboratory program development. Ability to contribute to administrative processes and service should be evident.

Laboratory Instructor II to III Promotion requires demonstrated ability to contribute to all aspects of laboratory development. Contributions to administrative processes at the Faculty and University levels should be evident.

E3. LECTURER TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Promotion normally requires completion of a Ph.D. (or equivalent) and a demonstrated record of teaching proficiency at assigned levels as well as clear evidence of the initiation of research. Evidence of contributions to administrative processes and service are expected.

E4. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Promotion requires a strong record of teaching proficiency at assigned levels and an established, sustained productive program of research and scholarship, and/or equivalent professional activities. Contributions to administrative processes at the Faculty and University levels and service must be present.

E5. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR

Promotion requires the demonstration of productivity that is normally expected for progression through the ranks, including a strong record of teaching effectiveness and a national or international reputation in research and scholarship, and/or equivalent professional activities. In addition, substantial contributions to administrative processes at the Faculty and University levels and a commitment to service must be present.

F. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL OF TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE

A tenure-track appointment shall be renewed where evidence of satisfactory performance exists, in accordance with the individual's rank and position, and where it is judged that appropriate progress is being made with respect to any special conditions attached to the appointment.

The granting of an appointment with tenure implies that during the probationary period, the candidate has normally performed at or above the satisfactory levels in all areas of duties. In particular, the candidate must have a strong teaching record, and have established a program of research and scholarship. Contributions to administrative processes and/or service should also be evident.

G. CRITERIA FOR SALARY INCREMENTS

Salary increments are subject to the limitations of the salary ranges for the category and rank of appointment as specified in Appendix A of the Collective Agreement.

G1. INCREMENT

Pursuant to Article 18.2 of the Collective Agreement, an Increment shall be awarded annually subject to satisfactory performance in recognition of the member's demonstrated contributions to the Faculty's objectives of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service appropriate to the member's rank, level, and assigned duties.

It is the member's responsibility to provide appropriate documentation of her or his contribution. In addition to the teaching materials noted in section B above, this documentation may include (see also Section "D" of the Criteria Document):

- publications (include offprints);
- list of conference presentations;
- details of grants and contracts or equivalents;
- details of applications for external funding;
- details of equivalent professional activity;
- details of mentoring, coaching, and support of clinical and/or classroom faculty;
- research plan.

If an increment is not granted, the Dean will provide the member with an explanation that will include suggestions for improving performance. The initial reviewer and P.R.C. should be made aware of any specifics to be taken into account during the evaluation process.

G2. MERIT

Merit increases are awarded as per Article 18.3 of the Collective Agreement.

In evaluating applications for merit, only accomplishments since the last merit, or if the member has never received a merit, since initial appointment will be considered relevant.

A merit may be granted to members who, given their rank and level as well as consistently good performance in all areas, clearly exhibit exceptional service in one or more of the areas of assigned duty during their review cycle, or who have presented evidence of sustained above average performance in two or more areas of assigned duty.

Merit based on scholarship or teaching will be considered only if the member demonstrates commitment to administrative duties and service. Outstanding performance in administrative duties or service activities may form the basis for a merit if there is also evidence of strong contributions in teaching and scholarship, but not necessarily in the same period as the bulk of the administrative work.

APPENDIX A: PREPARING MATERIAL FOR REVIEW BY THE PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (P.R.C.)

These guidelines are intended to help members prepare the materials sent forward to the Performance Review Committee (P.R.C.) so that a fair and complete assessment of their performance can be made.

Recommendations are made on the basis of an assessment of all the material provided. The P.R.C. can ask that more material be provided and has access to information in the member's official file.

1. Ensure that citations of published work are detailed and complete, and include specific page references. Offprints or copies of work published during the period under consideration should accompany the file. In listing published work, place the most recent publications first. Distinguish clearly between refereed and non-refereed publications.
2. Remember that the amount of material the Performance Review Committee must read and annotate each year is very large. If members choose to submit teaching dossiers, the dossiers should be carefully organized and clearly labelled. **Section D1 of the Academic Performance Review** criteria document outlines some of the materials that should be included in teaching dossiers; other relevant material is welcome. In preparing a dossier, remember that judicious selection and careful organization is preferable to submitting reams of material.
3. Student evaluations of teaching should be included in the teaching dossier. If evaluation summaries are included, make clear who has prepared them. Ensure that original forms are organized and readily available should the P.R.C. wish to see them. Especially when requesting special consideration, members should consider commenting on evaluations in a covering letter or memo, pointing out strengths and addressing concerns noted by students. Bear in mind that student evaluations of teaching are assessed in the broad context of a member's teaching throughout the period under review.
4. It is required that members provide an up-to-date and complete (see point 1 above) *curriculum vitae* for each performance review.

5. When members make application for a merit a letter must be included, stating clearly the grounds on which the application is to be judged. Specific reference to the requirements set out in Section G2 of the *Academic Performance Review* criteria document is essential.
6. Instructors are reviewed on the basis of assigned duties, which according to Article 16.1.3 and 17.10 of the Collective Agreement are defined to normally include “*teaching and related duties and service.*” The onus is on the individual Instructor to explain how activities in the period under review, as, for example, scholarship or administrative work, contribute to the performance of teaching, related duties and service.
7. Career planning for Tenure-track Members as outlined in Article 17.22 supports the members “*development of research, teaching, and service.*” The intent is to mentor the member by helping to “*identify courses of action that will lead to the achievement of tenure and promotion.*” The Initial Reviewer shall meet with the member within six months of their appointment, to discuss performance, process and condition for performance review career decisions, and to provide advice.

The Dean shall also meet yearly with tenure-track academic staff to provide mentoring, recognizing the member’s achievements, performance, and feedback. The Initial Reviewer will be also be present for the meeting. It is the right of the academic staff member to be accompanied by a faculty colleague or Association representative. “*No records emanating from career planning meetings shall become part of the member’s official file.*”

APPENDIX B

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (P.R.C.)

Purpose

The committee is advisory to the Dean

In accordance with Article 16.7, 17 and 18 of the *Collective Agreement*, this committee exists to review the academic performance and sabbatical application of all members of the academic staff of the Faculty, and to determine whether members have met the criteria for the decision under consideration. The committee makes a recommendation to the Dean, both the recommendation and the number of committee votes for and against the recommendation are recorded on the member's annual information form.

Composition

Ex-Officio Non Voting Member:

- Dean, The Faculty of Nursing, University of Regina
The Dean may participate as an observer and only provides information for process clarification. The Dean cannot influence the decision-making of the committee.

Voting Members:

A call for nominations will be placed for PRC members in September or October annually at a Consultation in Committee Meeting. Committee members will be voted in by Faculty. Out of Scope faculty are not eligible for membership.

- 3 elected members from the Faculty of Nursing, Professoriate at the University of Regina, and 1 elected alternate.
- 2 elected members from the Faculty of Nursing, Instructors at the University of Regina, and 1 elected alternate.

** The PRC, whenever possible, shall have a balance of: tenured/non tenured faculty; experience/new faculty and site representation. Further, there must be 5 members, as composed above, for the meeting to occur.

Non-Voting Resource Members:

The alternates may attend any meetings but not participate as a voting member unless replacing a member of the 5 member committee.

- An alternate will take the place when a committee member is the subject of review or cannot attend the meeting.

Term of Office for Voting Members:

- The term of office is two years, covering two review cycles (November 1 – October 31). The terms shall be staggered to ensure continuity, with two new members elected one year and then three elected the following year.
- Alternates will be voted each year for a one year term.

Conduct of Meetings

- The committee chooses a chairperson from among its elected members each year.
- Meetings will be held as required and/or at the call of the Chair.
- The chairperson shall keep a record of decisions or recommendations from the meeting.
- Voting shall be shown by hand and the number of votes recorded with no names.
- Members are to review all material before meetings.
- The chair will sign the required documents on behalf of the committee.
- Discussions regarding deliberations of the committee are strictly confidential.
- The committee shall be guided by the Collective Agreement and the Faculty of Nursing Criteria document (the approved document for the year of review).
- The committee will schedule a meeting with the Dean to provide recommendations (Collective Agreement).
- Members should attend at least one joint UofR and URFA annual information session regarding the review process.
- A member of the PRC must declare a real or perceived conflict of interest, wherever possible prior to the meeting (See UofR policy on Conflict of Interest).
- These terms of reference will be reviewed annually by the elected committee members.

November 22, 2011
Consultation in committee.

Motion to adopt this criteria document as basis for faculty performance review,
Faculty of Nursing – Ann Marie Urban, seconder – Joan Wagner CARRIED

Amended September 18, 2012 – Wagner/Urban CARRIED

Amended February 27, 2013 – Wagner/Evans CARRIED

Amended December 5, 2013 – Donnelly/Arvidson CARRIED

Approved at Interim Faculty Council Dec 18, 2013 - Evans/Clune CARRIED
Motion 13-3-5

Approved at Consultation in Committee Meeting November 25, 2014
Secret Ballot CARRIED

Approved at Consultation in Committee Meeting November 13, 2015 CARRIED

Approved at Consultation in Committee Meeting November 21, 2016 CARRIED