

## MERIT AWARDS/PSA Review Procedures for faculty members

### PREAMBLE

UBC and UBC Science are committed to ensure a fair and uniform process for Merit awards and Performance Salary Adjustments (PSA) for faculty members in all its units (departments and research units) and for faculty jointly appointed in two or more units.

To ensure robust review procedures and transparency, particularly on expectations and criteria for the review process<sup>i</sup>, each unit should have written merit/PSA guidelines (“policy”) which must be based on the UBC policy/the Collective Agreement.\*

The unit policy has to:

- outline the review procedures and review committee’s structure,
- explain the processes underlying merit/PSA determination, and
- provide a template for the annual activity report each faculty member has to submit annually.<sup>ii</sup>

### PRINCIPLES Procedures

In each unit, faculty members should be given the opportunity to provide input into the policy prior to ratification by the department.<sup>iii</sup>

Heads and directors must provide sufficient notice including distribution of the written procedures/instructions to eligible faculty members.<sup>iv</sup> A list of those members who are awarded merit/PSA – and faculty members who are awarded retention – shall be distributed individually to all members of the unit.<sup>v</sup>

The following components should be included in each unit policy:

#### Eligibility

- All full-time faculty members, including Lecturers but not Sessional Lecturers, who are continuing members of the bargaining unit<sup>vi</sup> and active during the period reviewed are eligible to be considered for merit and PSA<sup>vii</sup>, including faculty on study or administrative leave. Faculty on maternity/parental/adoptive/medical etc. leave should be evaluated based on duties and accomplishments during the part of the period they were not on leave.

#### Review committee

- The composition of the review committee should be, as much as possible, representative of
  - the ranks<sup>viii</sup> (for example, including representatives of all of the teaching (Lecturers), educational leadership and the research streams, and of both junior and senior faculty),
  - the unit’s sub-disciplines, and
  - the demographic diversity of the unit’s faculty.
- The size of the review committee will depend on the unit’s size.
- Usually the review committee membership will be shared with the faculty at the time that awards are announced, if not before. In the case that the membership is not announced, the reasons will be communicated to the faculty.
- Membership on the review committee should rotate periodically (typically annually or biannually) to provide an opportunity to all faculty to experience and understand the process. The length of service should be communicated to faculty.
- The committee members review all faculty activity reports and CVs or a set number thereof.

#### Review process

\* <https://hr.ubc.ca/managers-admins/managing-and-leading/faculty-compensation-administrative-processes/salary-0>

- The committee members rank faculty performance – consistently between faculty peers and from year to year – based on a concrete, specific and transparent assessment of combined, weighted duties appropriate for research-stream, educational leadership-stream and teaching-stream faculty. Criteria and weights are set and communicated prior to review. The weighting can be distributed unequally (e.g. for research stream: 25% research, 35% teaching, 40% service) or equally (e.g., based on five marks given on each of research, teaching and service contributions). Alternatives include providing one mark on a merit scale that is based on a consistent combined weighting scheme for all appropriate contributions.
- The ranking must be based on the duties expected of a faculty member in the period in question (e.g. research and service, or service, teaching and educational leadership) including those faculty members exempt from part of the criteria typically reviewed (e.g. teaching). This requirement necessitates taking factors such as leaves, differences in research, educational leadership and teaching streams, and the distribution of workload into account.<sup>ix</sup> Ranking of faculty on, or recently on, maternity/parental/adoptive/medical etc. leaves may need to be adjusted by the Head as details cannot be shared with the committee in all cases.
- Exceptions and additions to assessment rules set above should be spelled out; e.g.,
  - If merit is assigned for someone excelling in one area such as service (e.g., significant advising, mentoring or leadership duties);
  - If contributions outside the unit are taken into account.
- Information on ranking procedures should include whether
  - the review committee members submit individual marks to unit head or
  - the review committee meets to discuss rankings;
  - the members of the review committee will be ranked by the unit head or by each other.

**Annual  
Activity  
Report**

- The merit review template (for activity report) should include a common form (set questions) and an open section for further explanations.
- There should be three types of merit review templates, one for educational leadership faculty, one for research faculty and one for Lecturers.

**Joint  
appointments**

- The departmental policy must address the process for joint appointees. Primary responsibility for ensuring that the process is properly followed for a joint appointee rests with the head/director of the home unit.\*
- Joint-appointed faculty (cross-appointed within and outside of Science) should be evaluated by each of their units and in consultation with the other unit's head.
- Each year the faculty member should only be required to prepare one activity report.
- Whether annual sharing of merit awards or alternating between unit award pools from year to year, the process should be pre-arranged and communicated to joint appointees at time of appointment. In addition, the format of the activity report (e.g. always following the home department or alternating) should be specified. If the process is not outlined in the appointment letter an MOU should be establishing detailing the process to be followed.
- For all faculty including for joint appointees, merit awards can be composed of 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2, 2.5 or 3 units.<sup>x</sup>

**Teaching  
evaluations**



- When considering teaching performance, the review must be based on formal procedures, such as student and peer evaluations.<sup>xi/\*</sup>
- Student Experience Of Instruction (SEOI) reports should be considered from past and current year if necessary to alleviate timing issue with second-term evaluations of current year.
- Sharing student scores from SEOI with the committee is common practice. The policy should outline if student comments will be seen by the committee as well, and whether faculty's permission will be required for that.
- All departments should notify their faculty annually and post their written, clean and transparent Merit Review and PSA procedures ("policy") on the inter-/intranet.
- The policy should be filed with the Dean's office. Any new or revised departmental policy should be provided to the Dean's office for review with Faculty Relations (on compliance with the Collective Agreement) and approval before implementation in the department.

### **References to the *Collective Agreement Between The University of British Columbia and The Faculty Association of The University of British Columbia July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2022 (CA)***

- <sup>i</sup> Departments should be reminded of the criteria for Performance Salary Adjustments (PSA)  
CA, Part 2, Art. 2.05: "Recommendations for PSA awards are made having regard to overall performance. (...) Factors that should be taken into account include: i) performance over a period of time which is worthy of recognition; ii) the relationship of a member's salary to that of other members taking into consideration total years of service at UBC; and iii) market considerations."
- <sup>ii</sup> From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.04.e/2.05.c:  
"All members eligible for consideration for merit/PSA shall submit to the Head a summary of their relevant scholarly, teaching and service activities and may include an indication of the nature and significance of the activities."
- <sup>iii</sup> From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.04.c/2.05.a  
"Prior to finalizing the unit's policy on allocation of merit/PSA, the Head shall consult with a reasonable number of colleagues reflecting diverse perspectives and ranks in the unit."
- <sup>iv</sup> From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.04.d/2.05.b:  
"Once finalized, the policy and the procedures, including procedures for members holding joint appointments, to be used within a unit for making recommendations by the Head on the award of merit/PSA shall be distributed annually to all members of the unit."
- <sup>v</sup> From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.04.f/2.05.d:  
"A list of those members who are awarded merit/PSA shall be distributed individually to all members of the unit. "  
From CA, Part 1, Art. 15.03:  
"(...) A list of those faculty members who are awarded retention shall be distributed individually to all members of the unit."
- <sup>vi</sup> From CA, Part 2, Art. 1.01.a:  
"Continuing member of the bargaining unit' means a person who was a member of the bargaining unit on <June 30 of the year> and who continues to be a member of the bargaining unit (after <July 1 of the year>) (...) but does not include any Sessional Lecturer."
- <sup>vii</sup> From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.04.b:  
"Each continuing member of the bargaining unit shall be considered for a merit award, taking into consideration the criteria set out in Article 4 of Part 4: *Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*, namely teaching, scholarly activity, educational leadership, and service to the University and to the community (...)"

From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.05:

“(….)The salary of each continuing member of the bargaining unit shall be considered to determine whether PSA is appropriate. (….)”

viii From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.04.b:

“(….)The Head shall consult with a reasonable number of colleagues reflecting diverse perspectives and ranks in the unit before making a recommendation on the award of merit. (….)”

From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.05:

“(….) Heads shall take advice on individual's performance from a reasonable number of colleagues reflecting diverse perspectives and ranks in the unit before deciding whether or not to recommend PSA. (….)”

ix From CA, Part 2 Art. 2.04.b:

“(….) Judgments shall be based on the duties expected of a member in the period in question and shall not be based on activities in which the member had not the opportunity to engage. (….)”

x From CA, Part 2, Art. 2.04.a:

“Merit awards shall be comprised of 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, or 3 units, the value of 1 unit to be the same as that of a CPI unit (….)”

xi From CA, Part 4, Art. 4.02:

“The methods of teaching evaluation may vary; they may include student opinion, assessment by colleagues of performance in university lectures, (…), course material and examinations, the calibre of supervised essays and theses, and other relevant considerations. When the opinions of students or of colleagues are sought, this shall be done through formal procedures.”

