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Following the submission of its report to the two principals on 22 November 2013, the Renaissance Committee had brought to its attention a contradiction between a passage of text and one of its 79 recommendations. Subsequently, both principals accorded the committee opportunity to revise the report, so the committee undertook to present its work in more consistent and clear fashion without altering its content.

Readers of both the November and December versions will notice several other aspects about the latter:

- It bears the date of 9 December 2013.
- It contains small changes of grammar (for example, the grammar of all recommendations is aligned), of punctuation, of capitalization, and of style.
- The contradiction that prompted this revision is as follows: in the November version, some text – “The committee could find justification for comparative brevity of the probationary period for librarians” (88) – contradicted recommendation 3-27 – “That the timing and process for tenure be harmonized for all eligible groups.” The contradiction has been addressed by a correction of the text: “The committee could find no justification …” (9 December, 88; the same recommendation in the revision now bears the number 3-25).
- Numerically, this revision consists of six fewer (73) recommendations than the version of 22 November (79). This reduction represents only the elimination of duplication, repetition, and redundancy. Missing from the December version are November 3-5, 3-24, 3-29, 3-33, 4-17, and 5-3, for the following reasons.
  - November 3-5 – “That any individuals with direct authority with respect to a scholar’s work be exempted from the AASUA during their administrative posting. The committee suggests that this apply to all departmental chairs and higher administrative positions” – appeared as well in and was thus rendered redundant by November 2-16 (which remains, unchanged, as December 2-16), so November 3-5 has been deleted. December 2-16 reads thus: “Exclude academic staff with administrative appointments (from the level of departmental chair up) from AASUA for the duration of their administrative appointment, and provide them with adequate protections and means of representation for all of their administrative activities (their scholarly activities remaining within the ægis of the AASUA).”

  - November 3-24 – “Create several multi-faculty evaluation committees to award RoSEs in order to ensure a broader definition of Scholarship” – has been deleted because the same point was made in November 3-4 and the last portion of 3-18, which are December 3-3 and 3-17. November 3-4 reads as follows: “That there be greater consistency in the size of comparator groups used for evaluation, at both the small and large unit levels.” December 3-17 (November 3-18) reads thus: ‘... and nominate colleagues to compete for RoSE
awards. Eligibility for the RoSE award would be no more frequent than every other year, and adjudication would be by committees comprising several faculties.”

November 3-29 – “That the tenure and promotion process have increased oversight until data are available” – was deleted because the same recommendation appeared in November 3-23. December 3-22 retains it: “… provide the provost, and exhort him/her to use, more authority in oversight in the evaluation processes related to Tenure, Promotion, and the awarding of RP and Recognition of Scholarship Excellence (RoSE) awards …. “

November 3-33 – “Accord the provost, and exhort him/her to use, more authority in oversight in the evaluation processes related to tenure, promotion, and RP and RoSE awards” – was deleted because the same point is made in November 3-23 (December 3-22), quoted just above.

November 4-17 – “Reduce the number of faculties as a means of reducing many of these problems.” – was a relic proposal and should have disappeared when sections of the report were collated. In greater detail, the same recommendation appears in November and December 4-11: “Reduce the number of departments and faculties on campus….. “

November 5-3 – “Ensure that the broad range of compensation and details of the relevant “Agreement” are reviewed by new faculty members; this may be accomplished by a required orientation session for new staff and/or on-line modules that must be completed” was redundant because of the wording in November and December 2-7: “Organize through a joint exercise (Administration and AASUA) workshops for all new faculty and librarians to provide information on the key elements of their collective agreements, on the concepts and definitions of Academic Freedom and Tenure, and on the meaning and expectations of Ranks within their appointments.”
Genesis of the Renaissance Committee and its Report

The Renaissance Committee is pleased to provide this report to the Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta and the Governors of the University of Alberta in accordance with its terms of reference and for information as the culmination of its studies and consultations. The report contains analyses and a series of recommendations that the committee regards as non-binding on the principals. The committee advances them on the understanding that they will be widely discussed and may provide negotiators for the principals with a basis for upcoming and subsequent rounds of negotiations. The committee is of the firm belief that many aspects of academic work undertaken and accomplished at the University of Alberta require and would benefit from regular, wide discussion by the community.

Purpose:
The Renaissance Committee came into being as one of two dual, inextricably linked proposals ratified by AASUA and the University of Alberta’s Board of Governors in late May – early June 2012. One proposal dealt with matters of compensation extending forward two years from the then existing two-year (1 July 2011 to 30 June 2013) settlement to cover 1 July 2013 through 30 June 2015. A second proposal recognized that recent rounds of negotiations seldom extended beyond discussions of compensation to address systemic aspects of the terms and conditions of the work performed by the University of Alberta’s (approximately) 4430 academic staff. The Renaissance Committee was a unique initiative, without precedent at this University or elsewhere in Canada, and therefore not altering the terms of negotiation called for in the collective agreements. Thus, although the report aims, at a minimum, to meet the committee’s terms of reference, it is anticipated that it will have broad impact in the Canadian university system.

The occasion seemed propitious to clear compensation from the negotiations table for the length of the Province of Alberta’s three-year commitment of funding to the post-secondary education sector: 2% increases per year for each of three years, 2012–13, 2013–14, and 2014–15. Exploiting this first-ever multi-year commitment to higher education from an Alberta government appeared to be in the interests of both principals. No one foresaw that the government’s Ministry of Advanced Education and Technology (now Enterprise and Advanced Education) would choose to forego this commitment, a commitment made in the government’s 9 February 2012 budget and confirmed following the provincial election of 23 April 2012.

The AASUA and the University’s Administration (on behalf of the Board of Governors) sought to discuss how compensation pressures manifested themselves in the University’s operating budget and would constrain the University in the future if Alberta were to follow recent patterns of decreasing levels of support for public higher education by other first-world jurisdictions. The need for such a discussion arose from the Administration’s statement that 2% increases per year fell short of the 4.4% increases calculated as being needed in order for the University to continue its operations without having to require faculties to make cuts. The Alberta government’s multi-year commitment was comparatively stronger than most other governments’, but would herald an age of austerity in the Albertan post-secondary education sector unless new revenue streams emerged.

Structure of the Renaissance Committee:
It was agreed that a committee of jointly appointed members and a co-chair representing each of the two principals (AASUA and the Board) would resemble the highly effective Academic Benefits Management Committee, which came into being in the middle of the previous decade and successfully managed the costs of benefits to AASUA’s members. In impartial fashion and with a view to “negotiate terms” that might, if accepted, be ratified by the membership of AASUA and by the Board, the Renaissance Committee was mandated to study this topic of compensation. In addition, it was given permission to
consider other matters during the course of its work. The work was to continue through to the submission of a draft report on 1 November 2013 and a final report on 10 January 2014.

Concern from AASUA’s Academic Faculty Association that the process that brought the Renaissance Committee into being was coloured by ulterior motives, together with the AASUA’s need for adequate procedures by which to seek self-nominations and have them approved through Executive and Council delayed the joint appointment of members to the committee. This prevented the committee from starting until December 2012 and thus left it less than twelve full months to do its work, but it ultimately brought new faces and opinions to the initiative.

Professors Chris Cheeseman (then Associate Vice-President Human Resource Services; Department of Physiology, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry) and Ian MacLaren (then President, AASUA; Department of History and Classics, and Department of English and Film Studies, Faculty of Arts) were identified as “core members” in the document entitled “The Role of the Joint Committee called the Renaissance Committee” (May 2012; Appendix 1). They assumed co-chairship of the committee in the summer of 2012. Joining them at the end of November by Administration’s appointment and AASUA Council’s approval were

- Professor Jason Carey, Associate Chair (Undergraduate), Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering
- Professor Florence Glanfield, Chair, Department of Secondary Education, Faculty of Education
- Professor Lili Liu, Chair, Department of Occupational Therapy, Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine
- Associate Clinical Professor (CAS:T) Lu-Anne McFarlane, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology, Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine

The Office of the Provost had identified these and other possible nominees and, after ranking them, approached them. Those who agreed to let their names stand then formed Administration’s slate. Self-Nominations were sought by the AASUA for its slate of nominees; the slate was then determined by AASUA Executive and approved by AASUA Council. The two slates were then exchanged and their names approved by the two principals. AASUA’s approved slate comprised

- Professor James (JC) Cahill, Department of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Science
- APO Terra Garneau, Research Facilitator, Research Facilitation Office, Faculty of Engineering, Research Service Office
- Assistant Professor Kisha Supernant, Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Arts
- Professor Imre Szeman, Canada Research Chair, Department of English and Film Studies, Faculty of Arts

Soon after beginning to organize the many aspects of academic work on campus, the Renaissance Committee determined that the committee-of-the-whole would benefit from three subcommittees. Weekly meetings of the full committee thus occurred while the subcommittees held weekly or bi-weekly meetings, with as many members as possible attending.

- Governance was headed by Lili Liu and Terra Garneau
- Systems of Compensation was headed by James (JC) Cahill and Chris Cheeseman
- Forms of Scholarship was headed by Jason Carey and Ian MacLaren.

1 It may be noted that, although this lists includes no associate professors, both professors Carey and Glanfield had that rank when identified by Administration for service on the Renaissance Committee. Professor Carey was promoted as of 1 July 2012, before the committee began its work, and Professor Glanfield as of 1 July 2013, while the committee was in the midst of its work. The committee thus benefitted from their very recent experience at the associate rank.

2 A flood of personal crises prevented Professor Szeman from participating in the regular work of the committee. He served a valuable role as a sounding board when the report was being compiled.
A manager for the committee, Jeremy Wilhelm (APO, Human Resource Services), was also appointed in this early stage of work.

Approach:
Each sub-committee approached its work by determining what if any problems (whether they exerted monetary pressures or not) could be identified in the University’s governance structures, compensation system for academic staff, practice, or recognition of Scholarship. If there were problems, with whom on campus did the subcommittee need to meet to gain various understandings of their cause to elicit possible solutions? Moreover, could any data be collected that would help throw light on any particular problem that had been identified? What sources internal and external to the University could be identified as requiring consideration? The goal throughout the exercise was the identification of any alterations in the terms and conditions of employment of academic staff that would expedite the University of Alberta’s aim to excel as one of Canada’s top universities.

Many standing committees, vice-presidents, deans of the University, and both standing and constituency committees of AASUA were asked to meet or asked to meet with the Renaissance Committee, and members of the committee took up any invitations it received to attend regular meetings of existing committees. Some of these were AASUA’s Research and Scholarly Activities Committee; the Senate of the University; IGNITE! Ideas for Post-Secondary Education (the Alberta post-secondary education students’ conference 21–22 February 2013); and Chairs’ Council Executive. Four members of the committee participated in Faculty Evaluation Committee meetings during the course of the committee’s work.

The sub-committees invited the assistance of committees of advisors (other colleagues), which met at least once with each sub-committee during the course of their work. In all, the committee held or attended at least 138 meetings of one or another group or committee of University of Alberta academic staff (see Appendix 2). In addition, single meetings were held with the Students’ Union, Graduate Students’ Association, and a representative from each of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (Peter Simpson) and the Canadian Association of University Business Officers (Glen Harris). The need for this pace of meetings quickly grew apparent, given the scope of the work to be undertaken; indeed, the approved terms of reference in “The Role of the Joint Committee” anticipated that “the spirit and intent are that this committee meet on a very regular basis (e.g. every 7 days – 2 weeks). This pace might have sufficed had the committee formed and started in September 2012; the delay to December required an acceleration of the pace as well as an extension of the 1 November 2013 deadline. In an effort to gain as clear and broad an understanding of how the University carries out its academic mission, the Renaissance Committee consulted more people than any previous task force or other AASUA/Administration joint committee.

In terms of outreach to members of the community with whom the Renaissance Committee did not hold meetings, two town halls were held, on 13 December 2012 and 5 April 2013. The work of the subcommittees and some of the ideas being discussed by the committee of the whole were presented at four ninety-minute public fora, held on 24 September, and 1, 9, and 17 October 2013. The committee’s website was used more occasionally than regularly to update the community, and suggestions were received through its email address: rencom@ualberta.ca. The co-chairs reported to meetings of the Board of Governors Human Resources and Compensation Committee on 2 October, 27 November 2012, and on 22 January, 7 February, 11 February, 30 April, 31 May, and 1 October 2013. Ian MacLaren provided reports while AASUA past-president to the association’s monthly meetings of Council through June 2013, and, with fellow committee member Kisha Supernant, provided an oral report to Council’s October meeting.
In terms of wider consultation, the Renaissance Committee studied information and data made available by other universities, especially with respect to one of its mandates, the advisability and feasibility of “the introduction of a permanent teaching-intensive category of academic staff.” In addition, it familiarized itself with academic literature pertinent to the various topics it studied, ranging from Scholarship (teaching and research) through academic administration and relations between public universities and governments, to data collection and analysis, the efficacy and reliability of impact factors as measures of the quality of research, and the use of USRIs as a measure of the evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching.

Further Notes:
• The committee’s work was conducted intensively and without interruption during the summer months. In order to meet its extended deadline (22 November 2013), the committee limited itself to thorough studies and widespread consultations, and the development of advisable and defensible recommendations. It did not “negotiate terms” for the AASUA and Administration to ratify as direct alterations of the wording found in the existing collective agreements for the seven constituencies of academic staff. Room having been made for flexibility in the committee’s interpretation of its terms of reference – “These terms of reference will doubtless undergo change in order to maximize the efficiency and extent of the work undertaken by The Renaissance Committee” (Appendix 1) – the committee apportioned its twelve months in order to provide a solid groundwork for the negotiation of terms.
• The committee’s report represents the committee’s consensus; it is not two-sided. The principals are encouraged to accept the report on the understanding that the report’s non-binding recommendations have the support of all members of the committee.

The Renaissance Committee found some past reports particularly timely and useful:

Remarks contributed in the Winter and Spring terms of 2012 to the website of The Umbrella Committee (TUC) pertaining to one or another aspect of the Renaissance Committee’s mandate were forwarded by TUC’s recording secretary to the committee to form part of its information.

The Renaissance Committee thanks all colleagues who contributed to this comprehensive process. The extent and range of this input afforded committee members a rich education in the diverse activities that academic work comprises at this university, and has left them thinking that the perspectives they have gained are ones that all committed colleagues deserve to have. It acknowledges with gratitude the logistical and other support provided at different times during the twelve months by Kimberly Schultz, Jeremy Wilhelm, Diane Mirth, and Carol Reid. The data gathered and provided by Mary Persson and her staff in the Strategic Analysis Office during a period of upheaval after the provincial budget of 7 March 2013 is particularly appreciated, as are the timely responses to requests for data by others, especially deans.

---

3 When AASUA and Administration learned of this constriction of its mandate, they decided on 30 October to accept as final the version of the report submitted on 22 November, thereafter to take it upon themselves the circulation and discussion of the report and, subsequently, the negotiation its recommendations.
As well, the Renaissance Committee thanks both the principals, AASUA and the Board of Governors (through the University's Administration) for giving the committee arm's-length status during the entirety of its work. By not exerting pressure or influence on it, both principals embarked on the leap of faith that this unique initiative required. The committee sincerely hopes that The Report of the Renaissance Committee will indeed serve as a catalyst for renaissance at the University of Alberta.

Structure of the Report of the Renaissance Committee:

The report's principles and recommendations may be found beginning on this page and also at the beginning of sections 2 through 5.

Section 1. Current Realities, Goals, and Importance of the University of Alberta page 15
Section 2. What is, and Who Performs, Scholarship and Administration? page 20
Section 3. Evaluation, Recognition, and Reward for Performance of Scholarly Activities page 53
Section 4. Expenditures and Revenue page 120
Section 5. Other or General Issues page 153
Concluding Remarks page 164
Appendix 1 The role of the Joint Committee Named The Renaissance Committee page 167
Appendix 2 Meetings Held by the Renaissance Committee page 170
Appendix 3 Definitions of Administration page 172
Appendix 4 A recommendation for Harmonizing Scholar’s Reporting Forms and the CCV page 175
Appendix 6 Examples of Faculty Reorganizations page 203

Renaissance Committee Guiding Principles

- Scholarly activities form the heart of a university, and they are conducted by the academic staff.
- Leadership, administration, scholars, and support staff must be highly valued and recognized for their roles in and contributions to the mission of the University of Alberta.
- The evaluation and reward of excellence in Scholarship is the core act of accountability for academic staff.
• A definition of Scholarship and its various elements must be inclusive and broadly interpreted. The evaluation of achievements of Scholarship must include broad but clear, peer-reviewed, and rank-specific performance measures.

• Academic staff require well-defined, constituency-tailored, and risk-based protections in order to undertake fully and disseminate their Scholarship. Such protections must form part of collective agreements and have equitable performance measures.

• The University of Alberta recognizes itself as an institution excelling in all aspects of Scholarship. Teaching and research are equally important to the mission of the University.

• Academic Staff hired to fill a continuing need are provided with a continuing appointment. (This is not current practice for teaching-focused staff.)

• All continuing academic appointments require consistent and rigorous practices for hiring and evaluation.

• The teaching needs for departments and faculties differ and require flexibility in hiring practices, including fixed-term, part-time, and continuing appointments.

• Policies governing a teaching stream should focus on the quality of teaching, not on its expense.

• The existence of a probationary/promotion structure provides teaching-focused staff time both to develop pedagogical expertise and to demonstrate skills in Scholarship in order to meet criteria deployed to reach decisions on their promotion and continuation of appointment.

• The content of courses at a research-intensive university will be supported by a scholarly environment that is informed, stimulated, and enriched by research. This support requires tenure-track faculty and teaching-focused staff to maintain currency in and examine the effectiveness of their teaching (pedagogy), which requires time for and commitment to Scholarship. A Scholarship component should be included in teaching-focused positions.

• Only academic staff can evaluate, represent, and defend the interests of their peers.

• Scholarly activities, broadly defined, form the heart of the University of Alberta, and they are conducted by the academic staff.

• The support of Scholarship4, including administrative activities performed by different constituency groups, is critical to the effective functioning of the University. However, there is a critical distinction between supporting and conducting Scholarship.

• The evaluation and reward of excellence in Scholarship is the core act of accountability for academic staff.

• All who perform Scholarship must be rewarded equitably, recognizing both the developmental progression within their rank, and for the excellence of their specific scholarly activities.

• All facets of Scholarship should be recognized, evaluated, and rewarded in proportion to the contribution to an individual’s required job duties.

• Scholarly activities, regardless of who performs them, should be evaluated and rewarded using a single system.

• Rigorous and multi-faceted evaluation of teaching is important for all academic staff.

• Evaluation of teaching should include all aspects of teaching in a staff member’s assignment, including a variety of instructional contexts (courses/seminars/labs/studio work); graduate student supervision and supervision of fieldwork; mentoring in research labs; course development, teaching innovations; curriculum design, and other teaching responsibilities.

---

4 Defined in section 2.
• Best practice in teaching evaluation advises that evaluation have multiple sources of information, collected through a variety of methods and assessed at multiple points in time.\textsuperscript{5}

• Evaluation of teaching will consider the effectiveness of teaching, but also the Scholarship of teaching (rigorous examination and generation of knowledge about how specific content is best taught and how learning occurs within specific disciplines).

• Evaluation of teaching will examine the connections between teaching and research and how it is realized in course design, teaching approaches, and student learning.

• The evaluation of an individual’s scholarly activities should be compared to broad international and national standards; it should not be influenced by the performance or rank of other individuals within an administrative unit.

• Required non-scholarly job duties, such as administrative work,\textsuperscript{6} should be recognized and rewarded, but through a separate evaluation system.

• Individuals in the same constituency should have consistent job expectations, evaluative systems, and opportunity for rank and salary advancement. Although individual units should have input on the academic directions of the unit, issues related to evaluation and promotion should be not be left to the discretion of unit heads.

• A system of evaluation and reward must avoid structural and procedural biases associated with cultural and demographic differences among faculties, departments, and individuals; it must account for differential expectations and opportunities among ranks; it must be consistent and fair in the handling of leaves.

• A deferred salary structure has the potential to inflict disproportionate hardship on junior faculty.

• An effective system of evaluation and reward will require, to the extent possible, limited expenditures of time, money, and emotions of the employer and employee.

• The University should be a vibrant institution contributing to the Edmonton, Albertan and Canadian culture, community, and economy, focusing on its Scholarship strengths while ensuring financial viability through innovative practices and renewal.

• The net revenues of the University must be sufficient to allow it to meet its institutional priorities.

• If net revenue is unlikely to be obtained to meet institutional priorities, and efforts to alter the bottom line fail, institutional priorities should change.

• The organization of the institution into faculties and departments imposes costs and results in benefits. Consequently, it is important that any organizational choice be consciously made, based on sound logic rather than accepted because of tradition. Costs should be clearly identified and acknowledged, as they are offset by benefits. No one aspect of the University balance sheet caused the so-called structural deficit or is “primarily responsible.” All decisions related to costs and revenue generation deserve equal attention.

• The relationship between the Government of Alberta and the University of Alberta, including the latter’s heavy reliance on provincial funding as well as non-market driven limits to tuition, restricts the ability of the Board of Governors to generate revenue. This financial reality is unlikely to change in the near to medium term.

• Terms such as “administrative bloat,” and comments regarding excessive salaries of professors or leadership have great potential to be divisive and decrease community engagement. These issues must be discussed in an open and safe environment, but such a discussion is difficult to have in the current climate on campus.


\textsuperscript{6} As defined in section 2 and Appendix 3.
• Suggestions to rethink the organization of academic units will feel threatening to many and would be disruptive to the institution. These issues must be acknowledged but not be a reason not to ask “what if?”
• The key academic mission of the University of Alberta relies on efficient and effective management, which requires an understanding of the current status of the University and past trends.
• Consistent collection and timely reporting of, reliable data support decision-making at all levels of the University.
• Appeal mechanisms and disciplinary processes function most effectively when guided by policies and procedures that are fair, transparent, and timely and are implemented in a collaborative interaction between the Office of the Provost, Human Resource Services, and AASUA.
• The University of Alberta and its staff benefit when all members of a constituency have a full understanding of their own constituency and the terms of their agreement.
• A full understanding of the rights and responsibilities in each agreement can prevent some of the situations that result in appeals or disciplinary procedures.
• Mentorship is a key to good working conditions for students and staff.
• Investing in resources to support staff development in mentorship, leadership, administration, and Scholarship is an investment in the future of the University of Alberta.

Renaissance Committee Summary of Recommendations

2-1 Revise the current mission statement and vision of the University of Alberta to reflect its determination to be the best teaching- and research-intensive institution in the Province of Alberta. Achievement of this determination will also make the University a major national and international institution.

2-2 In order to meet the University’s mission statement, adopt the Renaissance Committee’s definition of Scholarship as well as the various recommendations of the elements and performance measures of Scholarship, all of which have been developed from current literature and through extensive consultation, evaluation, analysis of data, and deliberations. The recommended definitions reflect principles of equity, recognize the value in the variability and intended purpose of Scholarship, and aim to make the University a leading international institution of Scholarship.

2-3 Regularly revise these definitions, and adapt them to the times, but retain and maintain the principles by which they were developed.

2-4 Adopt the following elements of Scholarship for the determination and recognition of Scholarship excellence: research, teaching, mentorship, internal service, service to the community and profession, and contributions that go on to have an impact in a variety of ways (for example, a patent, a frequently republished article or book; also known as a translational contribution).

2-5 Define Tenure and Continuing Appointment differently in the collective agreements.

2-6 Add the Renaissance Committee’s recommended Definition of Tenure and Statement of the Responsibilities of Tenure to the applicable collective agreements.

2-7 Organize through a joint exercise (Administration and AASUA) workshops for all new faculty and librarians to provide information on the key elements of their collective agreements, on the concepts and definitions of Academic Freedom and Tenure, and on the meaning and expectations of Ranks within their appointments.
2-8 Provide similar, regular workshops for other AASUA constituencies with continuing appointments in order to ensure that key elements of the collective agreements are universally understood.

2-9 Commit through AASUA and the Board of Governors to acknowledging the key roles played by AASUA, Administration, and NASA. Identify the University’s resources and infrastructural characteristics and explain how they are intended to perform and/or support Scholarship to fulfill the University’s mission statement, specifically with respect to creating and sustaining “a vibrant and supportive learning environment that discovers, disseminates, and applies new knowledge through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, community involvement, and partnerships.”

2-10 Commit, through AASUA/Board of Governors negotiations, to invest funds and efforts in the creation of a University community truly conducive to Scholarship and supportive of staff and students, to strengthen the feeling of belonging imperative to building a strong and long-lasting Alumni base, and to aid in the aim of greater work-life balance, the achievement of all of which will lead to improvements in morale and to better workload-work life balance.

2-11 In the tenure track constituencies, create a career progression structure for teaching-focused staff that accommodates variances within the Faculty Agreement to allow for emphasis on teaching, and that encourages and allows for promotion by means analogous to the current structure for tenure-track faculty.

2-12 In the continuing appointment (non-tenure-track) constituencies, create permanency with ranks and benefits (including sabbatical leaves), ensuring that the evaluation of Scholarship determines eligibility for consideration for such permanency.

2-13 Provide faculties the necessary flexibility by permitting both tenure-track and continuing appointments.

2-14 Create two Scholarship-focused AASUA constituencies for six of the current seven.

2-15 Discuss, to a greater extent than the Renaissance Committee had time for, the advisability of the Board of Governors’ creation of a distinct association for APOs, with adequate protections and means of representation.

2-16 Exclude academic staff with administrative appointments (from the level of departmental chair up) from AASUA for the duration of their administrative appointment, and provide them with adequate protections and means of representation for all of their administrative activities (their scholarly activities remaining within the ægis of the AASUA).

2-17 Agree that future negotiations between each of the two associations and the Administration (on behalf of the Board of Governors) involve both wording of agreements and compensation.

2-18 Arrange for negotiations between the Administration and each of four constituencies – a reconstituted AASUA, APOs, Specialized Scholars, and Academic Administrators – to be held separately. (There is no assumption that negotiators for the four constituencies would begin with identical proposals regarding compensation.)

3-1 Disband the current FEC system, but retain salary reward for scholarly activities (currently called merit). The new system must use external standards for evaluation rather than the current practice of relativistic measures of performance.

3-2 Arrange for all scholars to be evaluated using the same evaluation structure, with constituency-specific evaluation committees. Non-scholarly activities should be evaluated separately.

3-3 Substantially reduce the number of committees evaluating the excellence of scholarly activities to anywhere from 3 to 6. Such committees will be formed around scholarly discipline, not faculty
boundaries. Cultural practices within a unit should not be allowed to influence the salary trajectories nor the process by which scholars are evaluated.

3-4 Enhance consistency in the size of comparator groups used for evaluation, at both the small-unit and large-unit levels.

3-5 Assign all scholars an explicit ratio of expected duties, to be included in all annual reporting forms, either as a codification of a 40%–40%–20% Research-Teaching-Service ratio, or, in more individualized fashion, a negotiated outcome allowing for concentration or specialization in different aspects of Scholarship. The average of these amongst all scholars within a faculty would give an indication of differential scholarly emphasis in that unit.

3-6 Through negotiated agreement between the scholar and appropriate administrators (e.g. chair, dean), allow for variance over time of an individual’s ratio of expected job duties in order to accommodate evolving interests and abilities. Such changes must be in the best interests of both the employee and the employer and cannot be imposed by either.

3-7 Evaluate all scholars, including tenure-track faculty, librarians, and specialized scholars, in accordance with the broad definition of Scholarship provided in section 2 of this report. These constituencies should be evaluated equitably based on the Scholarship performance measures and the extent to which Scholarship comprises a part of their duties.

3-8 Evaluate all scholarly activities using more than simple metrics (e.g. Impact Factors, USRI); apply multifaceted evaluations to all scholarly activities to allow for identification of scholarly excellence.

3-9 Require all academic faculty seeking a Recognition of Scholarship Excellence (RoSE) award to detail quantitative and qualitative attributes of their individual Scholarship in their report. The committee recommends minimizing redundancy in the reporting of scholarly activities, and therefore recommends that the form required by all three of the Tri-Councils – CCV – be adopted for the quantitative aspects of reporting. Qualitative aspects could include the following:

- one-page summary of the Scholarship objectives, efforts, and obstacles
- further details (250 words) for each of the critical aspects (e.g. research, teaching, mentorship) of that reporting period’s Scholarship, focusing on impact and audience as defined in section 2.

3-10 Establish a Teaching Strategy for the University of Alberta that reviews and updates the teaching and learning policies currently in place in the GFC Policy Manual, and determines implementation of those policies.

3-11 Create specific, transparent policies for teaching evaluation to guide annual reviews, contract renewal decisions, and decisions on tenure and promotion. (As, for example, delineated in the CAUT model policy on the evaluation of teaching performance, create policies and procedures that allow recognition of all aspects of teaching duties performed by academic staff.)

3-12 Establish a committee to redesign the USRI questions, ensuring a reliable and valid tool that meets international standards for summative evaluation, provides a degree of formative feedback, minimizes the potential for derogatory feedback, ensures value to the students who participate in

---

7 Section 2, above.

8 Section 2, above.

9 In which case, if excellence is more difficult to determine because of job descriptions and limitations, the level of reward should be provided mostly through rank progression, not through RoSE.

10 Appendix 4 comprises information gathered for reporting purposes.
the process, and aligns with the University’s Teaching Strategy. To ensure movement on this recommendation, establish a two-year limit on implementation.

3-13 If changes to the USRI are not accomplished within two years (end of Fall term, 2015), declare in a joint AASUA/Admin announcement a moratorium on their use.

3-14 Provide leadership, support, and resources further to encourage teaching development and teaching Scholarship at the University of Alberta.

3-15 Standardize reporting periods for all evaluation committees.

3-16 Through the evaluation of scholarly activities, adjust salary for both recognition of rank progression (RP award) and recognition of Scholarship excellence (RoSE award).

3-17 At the departmental or other small-unit level, by means of a committee that includes the chair, perform annual RP evaluations and nominate colleagues to compete for RoSE awards. Eligibility for the RoSE award would be no more frequent than every other year, and adjudication would be by committees comprising several faculties.

3-18 Scrutinize the process of recognition and reward for the performance of non-scholarly activities (e.g. administration), and, separate from the negotiated pool available to recognize scholarly activities, negotiate a pool of money to reward and recognize such activities.

3-19 Evaluate members of separate constituencies by separate committees; following the recommendation for two Scholarship constituencies for a reconstituted AASUA, create structures for tenure-track scholars, and for specialized scholars.

3-20 Award salary increases related to scholarly activities by deploying a binned system (by rank) to ensure equity in the awarding of RoSEs.

3-21 Require all scholarly evaluation committees to use external standards for the assessment of Scholarship, reaching decisions by reference to agreed-upon external standards rather than to colleagues’ performance.

3-22 If the recommendation to disband the President’s Review Committee is adopted, provide the provost, and exhort him/her to use, more authority in oversight in the evaluation processes related to Tenure, Promotion, and the awarding of RP and Recognition of Scholarly Excellence (RoSE) awards (the committee believes strongly that variance in the expectations for salary increases, tenure, and promotion should be minimized).

3-23 For the awarding of RoSEs, use a binned system to ensure that all aspects of Scholarship be rewarded in proportion to the expected achievement/attainment/performance of them.

3-24 Treat leaves centrally, with an aim of equivalence across all committees evaluating scholarly performance.

3-25 Standardize the timing and process for tenure for all eligible constituencies. Require external letters to allowing external standards to be considered during evaluation. (If the required job duties do not allow for external assessment, the committee questions why protection of academic freedom is needed.)

3-26 Establish a mandatory and centralized approach to the collection of data related to tenure and promotion for all scholarly constituencies. As this is a core aspect of the academic functioning of the University, the Renaissance Committee suggests that this not be left to Human Resource Services for management.

3-27 Evaluate rank progression (RP) and scholarship excellence (RoSE) separately.

3-28 Replace the current salary trigger for promotion to Full Professor with a time-based trigger; the committee suggests six years, with consideration for early promotion with approval by the provost.

3-29 Disband the PRC.
3-30 Ensure regular communication from the Office of the Provost, with specific feedback to individual evaluation committees and general feedback to academic staff regarding best practices and areas of emerging concern.

4-1 Commit the University of Alberta to an ongoing and aggressive monitoring program based on demographic trends in the academic staff. This commitment would allow for adjustment to programs, both from academic and human resources perspectives, prior to the occurrence of significant and unexpected shifts.

4-2 Open a dialogue in the University community about the relative proportions of professors and specialized scholars necessary to ensure a vibrant culture and allow the University to meet its mission. The absence of such a discussion will likely result in infighting and decreased collegiality as groups stake out turf. This outcome would be exacerbated if conditions among faculties differ substantially, such that connection to the wider institution diminishes.

4-3 Commit to ensuring that assistant professors represent a certain proportion of the professoriate through time. This balance can be achieved through retirement incentives as well as shifts in hiring strategies. For example, in periods in which the total number of hires declines, it is critical that a greater proportion of hires be made at the level of assistant professor to offset the natural decrease of assistant professors through promotion.

4-4 To simplify and clarify the hiring process, disband the hiring grid and the use of market supplements, and replace them with starting salaries negotiated with the deans within ranges approved by the provost.

4-5 Simplify the hiring process further by reducing the number of constituencies in AASUA (see section 2 of this report).

4-6 Encourage retirement through the introduction of a system of incentives, such as the one deployed at Stanford University. This type of incentive would mitigate the need for voluntary severance packages in times of unpredicted fiscal cutbacks. The incentive would allow faculty to plan for transition into retirement. Triggered by rank progression, this incentive would treat women and men equitably.

4-7 Invest at all levels – central administration, faculties, and departments – in emeritus professors so that this talent pool can be encouraged to continue to contribute. Office space on a shared basis, small research stipends, and/or other incentives, need to be provided to them. The wealth of experience and skills could be used in the review of potential grant applications, etc. This small investment would yield enormous dividends for the University in terms of both continuing to access a significant talent pool and releasing senior salaries to enable the recruitment of junior faculty in order to expedite the renewal of the academy.

4-8 Search both in Administration and AASUA for a mechanism to engage the community in an open and safe discussion about the costs of administering the organization. The discussion must include such sacred cows as the salaries of central administrators, hiring priorities among constituencies, and the division of the University into its decentralized form. The committee suggests that trusted senior members of the institution lead such discussions, and this may be a role for some emeriti.

4-9 Commit to an ongoing process for the quantification of the costs and values allocated to the scholarly and support aspects of the University. All principals must work together to define terms and establish a robust monitoring program.

4-10 If there is a desire to reduce administrative costs, centralize as far as possible administrative services currently provided by faculties (for example, registration, research services, graduate student admissions).
Reduce the number of departments and faculties. The committee suggests a minimum department size of 40, with each faculty consisting of no fewer than 160 tenure-track or tenured individuals (and four departments). This restructuring does not imply reducing the total size of the professoriate. This would allow the University to reorganize its existing faculty complement in a more effective structure, one that enhances both Scholarship and opportunities for students.

Require that the indirect costs of research (ICR) be collected on all eligible grants. Work with funding agencies to permit ICR gradually to be introduced. In some cases, make it University policy to refuse to support grant applications to agencies that appear not to have legitimate reasons to exclude ICR.

Implement a single and transparent policy for the distribution of ICR, regardless of its source. In recognition that ICR are borne at all levels of the institution, include disbursements to central administration, faculty, department, centre/institute, if appropriate, and PI.

Do not permit industrial research to be supported with the ICR that comes to the University as a result of grants obtained from the Tri-Councils.

Shift the Research Service Office’s emphasis towards the scholar’s experience of the grant process. Anything that causes professors what they perceive to be unnecessary extra work will likely result in reduced grants being written and received and could result in increased administrative costs associated with journal vouchers having to be completed in order for the grant holder to access funds.

Work to improve the relationship between personnel in faculty development offices and those in the Office of the Vice-President (Advancement) with a view to encouraging everyone to feel part of a single institution, rather than of an individual unit.

Create meaningful, reliable data sets that can be collected from every department and faculty across campus and that, when analyzed, provide key information related to academic Scholarship, human resource management, and important initiatives.

Lead a push to collect and share uniform data among Alberta and Canadian institutions, within or outside CAUBO.

Develop an Annual Total Compensation Letter to each member of the academic staff, detailing her/his total compensation for the past year (salary, salary supplements [annual, not added to base], benefits, pension, vacation entitlements).

Make leadership programming seminars and orientation (e.g., Chair School and Decanal training) mandatory for all academic administrators, and have AASUA involved in the programming to ensure that human resources and other roles and responsibilities of academic administrators are well understood.

Recognize mentorship as a University priority, and ensure that assistant professors receive mentorship for all aspects of Scholarship; best practices currently underway in decentralized departments should be applied campus-wide.

Review the structure of appeals processes for promotion and tenure, with a view to serve both the faculty member and the institution better, ensuring due process while minimizing the time, effort, and cost to the appellant and the University administration.

Review the structure of appeals and disciplinary processes. Notwithstanding issues that fall under tenure and academic freedom, include any issues related to appeals, academic dishonesty, or disciplinary and dismissal processes. Conduct this review with due process while also considering the cost to the University.

Establish an on-going arm’s-length committee to continue the focus on employment and structural aspects of the University and to monitor changes (even changes over time of an entire
process) arising from these and future recommendations. The committee must have authority, and reports must be made public.

Strike a joint AASUA/Administration task force to address equity issues that have already been identified by previous working groups/committees, and provide policy that commits academic staff to equity and diversity in all respects.
Section 1—Current Realities, Goals, and Importance of the University of Alberta

Creation of the University of Alberta

The University of Alberta is a publicly funded non-denominational institution, which was founded in 1906 and opened in 1908 by Alexander Rutherford, Alberta’s first premier, shortly after the creation of the province. As Alberta’s first university, it was given an ambitious mandate by President Henry Marshall Tory to provide a broad education for the entire province. From the outset, the core activity of the University was teaching and granting degrees, unlike that of some other provincial universities, which only examined students taught by local colleges, often with religious affiliations. Tory considered this a flawed model of education, and to alter it, he hired the highest quality professors from across North America and the United Kingdom, all of whom were to have a PhD or equivalent qualification. The University expected these professors not only to teach but also to pursue research and publish within their chosen fields. From the outset, Tory aimed at the University’s achievement of stature as a principal North American institution of post-secondary education. Indeed, the curricular structure, timetabling, and faculty organization were all based upon the USA model, not that found in the United Kingdom. This started with the establishment of the Faculty of Arts and Science, which included Engineering (then called Applied Science). The Faculty of Agriculture followed to meet the economic needs of the province, and after it came the Department of Extension, an outreach initiative that provided education to communities across the province. In time, two of its stellar achievements were CKUA radio station (which preceded the establishment of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation by nearly a decade) and the Banff Centre. Thus did a vision round into form, one that committed the University to take its place in the world and to educate its students to do likewise. This would come at a cost, to be sure, but the province, both government and citizenry understood that the benefits were priceless and certainly could not be costed. It is in that vein and for that reason that continual improvement has been and must remain the University of Alberta’s aspiration and plan.

In 1910, legislation established the Board of Governors (to which the president was appointed a member – an arrangement that continues to this day), and it was charged with the financial oversight of the University. The Board approved all faculty appointments and promotions upon the recommendation of the president. This structure was designed to provide an arm’s-length relationship with government and assign significant authority to the president. One key component insisted upon by President Tory was that women have equal access to all programs offered by the University.

Since its inception, the University of Alberta has provided a remarkable return on investment, whether that can be measured in terms of finances, personal growth, contribution to the development of society, or something else. This province would be a very different, inferior place were it not for the vision of Rutherford and Tory, and Alberta’s contribution to the world’s knowledge base would be meager. It is incumbent upon us to ensure that this legacy be continued and enhanced. A mission to educate and advance Alberta’s society has induced the University to seek more than Alberta’s share of the province’s, Canada’s, and, in some cases, the world’s best teachers, scholars, and researchers. The academic staff of this University excels at an immensely invigorating rate.

But the University of Alberta was all on its own in the province when Rutherford and Tory established it. Since then, as the province has grown, numerous other provincial post-secondary institutions have been created to deliver a wide range of courses and programs extending from highly technical training to liberal arts and professional qualifications. Currently, the University of Alberta alone has 18 faculties, 65 departments, and offers a rich diversity of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees. Current
enrolment comprises approximately 32,000 undergraduate students and 7,500 graduate students, and the Faculty of Extension teaches another 14,000 individuals through its outreach programs.

Funding the Academy

The funding model for the University has changed little since the foundation of the University. Primarily, revenues comprise a grant from the Government of Alberta and student tuition fees. This model has inevitably led to numerous funding crises for the University over its history, partly as a result of local or national economic events, partly as a reflection of the Government of Alberta’s budgets and other legislation. Operating what now is a polyuniversity\(^\text{11}\) in a jurisdiction that knows more than its share of boom-bust cycles presents formidable challenges. Some busts were weathered as a consequence of astute planning by the Board of Governors and Administration, with the cooperation of AASUA and NASA, while others caused significant setbacks in spite of astute planning and resourcefulness. The 1970s proved particularly challenging, and in that decade President Tory’s vision of the role of the University appears to have grown dormant, with the University receding from aspiring continuously to become an institution of international standing to being a good provincial university with pockets of excellence. By contrast, some booms enabled the University to expand in quality or quantity, diversifying on some occasions, breaking entirely new ground on others. Not being generators of profit, universities require stability in order to thrive, and stability is difficult to fashion in boom-bust cycles. In a few respects, it is remarkable that the University of Alberta enjoys the regard and stature it has earned over the course of more than a century of support from an economy that harvests resources.

Despite the clear cyclical demeanor of its evolution, the University has persisted with a vision that yokes progress to excellence. Yet, some aspects of its practices have witnessed very little progress. The University has, for example, a very traditional model of salary structure for its academic faculty and its uniquely University of Alberta-defined collective agreements, which but dimly reflect practices at other top Canadian and foreign public universities.

During the economic boom of the millennium’s first decade in Alberta, approximately between the years 2008 and 2011, the Campus Alberta grant, allocated by the Government of Alberta, was increasing at the remarkable rate of 6% per annum. In addition, the government introduced a $30M Enrolment Planning Envelope, a funding envelope for specific new programs. This investment encouraged the University to continue to pursue a deliberate path that it had adopted beginning in about 2004, a path leading from being a satisfactory provincial university to being more what President Tory's initial vision foresaw, a university of international standing, one that recruited excellent scholars and outstanding students from around the world. The Government of Alberta approved the creation of several new degree programs and encouraged significant expansion of professional programs such as Nursing and Medicine while converting some Health Sciences undergraduate degrees to post-graduate degrees.

At the same time, a number of post-secondary colleges throughout the province applied for university status, and in 2009 two became universities, increasing the provincial total from four to six. At present, Alberta has 26 post-secondary educational institutions. Yet this growth occurred while the Government of Alberta constrained the increase in tuition fees beyond the rate of inflation. Consequently and somewhat paradoxically, the University of Alberta had to rely increasingly on its Campus Alberta grant in order to embrace its vision of growth and attain its ambitious goal of international stature. In recent years, this

---

\(^{11}\) Initially a British term, polyuniversity enlarges on the idea of a traditional university, based in a faculty of arts and science, to include professional colleges (law, engineering, medicine, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, business, and so forth) and what were once entire schools of their own, for example, agriculture, forestry, theology, and teacher training.
grant covered between 60% and 72% of the University’s total operating expenditures. Tuition fees contributed another 21%–29%, and various forms of indirect costs of research paid by funding agencies, income from investments, and investments by industry represented a final portion.

In 1991, an Agreement Review Committee of AASUA and the Administration had reviewed the structure and results of the University’s unique system of annual evaluation and compensation, and made a series of detailed recommendations. The recommendations aimed to offer better means by which to recognize a professor’s truly meritorious performance. In addition, they suggested a less onerous administrative workload for departmental chairs and faculty members charged with reporting on and evaluating annual performance. However, this report’s model was not implemented. When the next boom occurred, therefore, the infusion of funding was dedicated to an unchanged system of compensation with a view to adjust the University’s academic compensation to place them in the upper cohort of Canadian university salaries. And change to the structure of compensation could hardly have been contemplated, let alone negotiated, when the priority for academic staff was understandably recovery from the Government of Alberta’s decision beginning in 1994 to eliminate its deficit and debt by requiring a portion of all public employees’ income.

By almost any measurement, that recovery has occurred, but now new challenges face all public universities in the first world to one degree or another. Governments and those who elect them are questioning the role of universities and their funding models. Some jurisdictions question whether the relationship between the post-secondary educational sector and the rest of society needs to undergo extensive revision. The United Kingdom witnessed the removal of tenure from its federal post-secondary system in 1988, and significant numbers of faculty were laid off as a consequence. In addition, students’ fees have risen substantially, even alarmingly – almost fivefold in some cases. In the United States, where funding for state universities represents a much lower proportion of total revenues than is the case at the University of Alberta, substantial decreases have occurred, and the pressure on endowment income and students’ fees has grown critical. In many cases, these institutions have had to control their expenditures (over the short-term) by freezing salaries, requiring faculty to take substantial furlough-day, instituting hiring freezes, and/or relying even more heavily on research overhead to cover salaries.

In addition, alternative methods of course delivery have been proposed, including on-line courses. However, to date, this type of pedagogy has yet to been shown to be either more effective in aiding learning or equally effective, but less expensive. The technology and development costs are very substantial, and reliance on this method as the sole source of content delivery will likely be effective for only a small proportion of learners. In contrast, it is quite possible that on-line material will become an increasingly large component of the majority of courses.

In the face of rising costs for the delivery of instruction, universities, including the University of Alberta, have turned to contract instructors (or “sessionals”) – known on this campus as CAS:T – to provide highly qualified but less expensive and more flexible teaching. Often, Contract Academic Staff: Teaching do not qualify for benefits, do not automatically receive increments based on merit, and are hired and rehired for the sole purpose of meeting the demand for particular courses. In North America, up to 70% of some institutions’ undergraduate course delivery is provided by sessionals; at the University of Alberta in the past several years, CAS:T have been teaching slightly more or less than 40% of undergraduate classes, and some graduate programs utilize CAS:T.

Another pressure on the system has arisen with the abolition of mandatory retirement, introduced by the Administration in its negotiations with AASUA in 2007–2008, in the face of likely Supreme Court challenges, which would have ruled the continuation of such policies in violation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This made succession planning and faculty renewal less predictable. A joint AASUA/Administration task force considered the potential impact of abolishing mandatory retirement.
Data available at the time suggested only a small increase in the retirement age, and that has been the case to date. Additional pressures may have arisen as a result of the financial crisis of 2008, which doubtless cost some colleagues retirement investments and prompted revision of their individual retirement plans. The effect of this development has been and is being felt differentially by departments and faculties, and it could be the case that it will continue to be felt, although the Renaissance Committee will not speculate on that possibility. The use by Administration of retirement incentives twice in the past six years will have mitigated the effect of the abolition of mandatory retirement, but data would be needed to determine the extent.

Another factor that has affected the demographics of the professoriate and increased costs has been an increase in starting salaries for professors hired at all ranks. Competition with offers from other universities is a principal reason for this development; as well, however, in the past six years, the University has been hiring more professors relative to most periods of time in the past quarter-century. Some of these recruitments come with external research awards, which, while prestigious, often include additional carrying costs for the institution, such as renovation of lab space and supplementation of the funding provided as inflationary costs build.

One irony of the current situation is that while some governments continue to question the cost of post-secondary education, they have imposed on the sector numerous additional policies, regulations, and protocols, all of which carry significant cost implications. Certainly, some of these, initiated in reaction to suspect or unchecked practices, are intended to minimize risk and liability. Most universities are being required to implement and oversee an increasing array of regulatory codes and laws, which take precious resources away from the core mission of teaching and research and are often seen as an expansion of central Administration’s bureaucracy.

The University has moved in areas where better efficiency could be attained. Where possible, centralization of some core support systems, such as Information Technology, could result in large savings. However, such shifts run the risk of appearing to contribute to central administrative growth as opposed to the local and proximate duplication of services within distributed units. A common perception is that when a service is provided locally, it is considered relevant and responsive with little consideration of the “cost.” However, if the same service is consolidated centrally, often with the intent of saving administrative costs, this is viewed as being a reduction of value and support, often without an objective assessment. Universities are seen by many as being very rigid in their structure and quite inflexible when it comes to innovation within their own activities. It is clear that in order for the University to become more financially sustainable over the long term, it does need to plan its services far more strategically and provide them more efficiently than it has done in the past, and it must learn from what has been achieved in other organizations.

The consequences of either lack of change or lack of leadership, or of poorly considered and managed implemented changes are that the University is incurring significant budget short falls and cuts to support services, which have significantly affected the morale of both the support staff and academics alike. The Workload/Work Life Task Force report of March 2009 clearly indicated that academic faculty felt increasing pressure to perform under less than ideal conditions, and that the expectations to perform in all areas of teaching, research and service were becoming unmanageable. The stress among faculty has risen even more precipitously over recent years. Ways need to be found to promote excellence while avoiding burnout and workplace friction.

The creation of the joint Renaissance Committee by AASUA and Administration recognized that conventional adversarial bargaining methods under the constraints of both finances and time were unlikely to provide long-lasting and sustainable solutions to a number of the significant challenges. This report does not contain solutions to immediate short-term budgetary challenges. Instead, it contains a
careful review of some of the University’s numerous problems of academic structures and practices. Its recommendations are designed to allow the two principals (AASUA and Administration) to deal jointly with multiple needs: to protect and manage academic staff; to increase revenue; to diminish expenditures; to pay for in a sustainable way, while attempting to improve the recognition of excellence in all aspects of it. In addition, the report not only examines the different collective agreements and the ways in which they are being interpreted to hire academic staff, but also recommends how they might more appropriately serve the various AASUA constituencies and the University. If the University of Alberta is to be able to advance in a sustainable way while achieving its goal of providing excellent teaching, research, and administration for the Province of Alberta and beyond, it is essential that Administration and AASUA together find a series of solutions for its sustainability in the short and long terms. If the academic community neglects to undertake this effort, the impact on Albertans will be profound; if it addresses it successfully, the University of Alberta will outpace universities in other jurisdictions.
Section 2 — What is, and Who Performs, Scholarship and Administration?

The University of Alberta faces new realities as a result of changes to the post-secondary landscape in Canada and around the world, as well as in Alberta. Generally, the effect of these changes has been to neglect or accord lower priority to aspects of workplace and work life in academic positions at the University. As the 2009 Workload/Work Life Task Force reported, morale is lower than is good for the health of the community.

This section focuses on issues of determining what the objectives of the University of Alberta are and should be, and what each staff member – academic, administrative, or support – does to meet them.

Guiding Principles:

- Scholarly activities form the heart of a university, and they are conducted by the academic staff.
- Leadership, administration, scholars, and support staff must be highly valued and recognized for their roles in and contributions to the mission of the University of Alberta.
- The evaluation and reward of excellence in Scholarship is the core act of accountability for academic staff.
- A definition of Scholarship and its various elements must be inclusive and broadly interpreted. The evaluation of achievements of Scholarship must include broad but clear, peer-reviewed, and rank-specific performance measures.
- Academic staff require well-defined, constituency-tailored, and risk-based protections in order to undertake fully and disseminate their Scholarship. Such protections must form part of collective agreements and have equitable performance measures.
- The University of Alberta recognizes itself as an institution excelling in all aspects of Scholarship. Teaching and research are equally important to the mission of the University.
- Academic Staff hired to fill a continuing need are provided with a continuing appointment. (This is not current practice for teaching-focused staff.)
- All continuing academic appointments require consistent and rigorous practices for hiring and evaluation.
- The teaching needs for departments and faculties differ and require flexibility in hiring practices, including fixed-term, part-time, and continuing appointments.
- Policies governing a teaching stream should focus on the quality of teaching, not on its expense.
- The existence of a probationary/promotion structure provides teaching-focused staff time both to develop pedagogical expertise and to demonstrate skills in Scholarship in order to meet criteria deployed to reach decisions on their promotion and continuation of appointment.
- The content of courses at a research-intensive university will be supported by a scholarly environment that is informed, stimulated, and enriched by research. This support requires tenure-track faculty and teaching-focused staff to maintain currency in and examine the effectiveness of their teaching (pedagogy), which requires time for and commitment to Scholarship. A Scholarship component should be included in teaching-focused positions.
- Only academic staff can evaluate, represent, and defend the interests of their peers.

Key Problems:
The University of Alberta sees itself as the flagship research institution in Alberta, but it lags behind its sister institutions in support for teaching. The current mission of the University is not sufficiently inclusive of vital aspects of Scholarship to make it competitive on every front at provincial, national, and international levels.

The University does not have definitions of Scholarship or measures of the performance of Scholarship. The University therefore has no accurate and repeatable means of evaluating scholars.

Together, the definitions of the scholar’s protection (tenure, continuing appointment, academic freedom) do not appear to meet the objectives of the University in protecting those who perform Scholarship to meet its mission.

Tenure is solely related to permanence (job security) and is not a protection of scholars using their academic freedom to challenge doctrine or dogma.

There is inequity in the performance measures required for the awarding of tenure.

There is a general misunderstanding or ignorance of the meaning of tenure, continuing appointment and elements of collective agreements.

The role and importance of governance, administration, services and support is not recognized.

There is overlap between the duties of the various constituencies and disparity in protections. This is inefficient, it creates a sense of second-tier groups, it has inequitable performance measures, and it allows for too many “creative” hiring practices, known as “work-arounds.”

The seven-constituencies composition of AASUA poses logistical challenges, which are disadvantageous to both the University and its academic staff.

Larger constituencies have stronger negotiation positions; smaller constituencies are under-represented.

Changes in demographics of AASUA’s constituencies render the current structure inappropriate/inadequate.

The non-scholar, administrative-based staff are poorly represented.

Academic administrators (chairs and above) should not be members of the same association as those over whom they have financial and/or evaluative influence, or disciplinary authority.

Those in authority cannot accurately represent the rights and protections of the members of AASUA’s constituencies.

Recommendations:

2-1 Revise the current mission statement and vision of the University of Alberta to reflect its determination to be the best teaching- and research-intensive institution in the Province of Alberta. Achievement of this determination will also make the University a major national and international institution.

2-2 In order to meet the University’s mission statement, adopt the Renaissance Committee’s definition of Scholarship as well as the various recommendations of the elements and performance measures of Scholarship, all of which have been developed from current literature and through extensive consultation, evaluation, analysis of data, and deliberations. The recommended definitions reflect principles of equity, recognize the value in the variability and intended purpose of Scholarship, and aim to make the University a leading international institution of Scholarship.

2-3 Regularly revise these definitions, and adapt them to the times, but retain and maintain the principles by which they were developed.

2-4 Adopt the following elements of Scholarship for the determination and recognition of Scholarship excellence: research, teaching, mentorship, internal service, service to the community and
profession, and contributions that go on to have an impact in a variety of ways (for example, a patent, a frequently republished article or book; also known as a translational contribution).

2-5 Define Tenure and Continuing Appointment differently in the collective agreements.

2-6 Add the Renaissance Committee’s recommended Definition of Tenure and Statement of the Responsibilities of Tenure to the applicable collective agreements.

2-7 Organize through a joint exercise (Administration and AASUA) workshops for all new faculty and librarians to provide information on the key elements of their collective agreements, on the concepts and definitions of Academic Freedom and Tenure, and on the meaning and expectations of Ranks within their appointments.

2-8 Provide similar, regular workshops for other AASUA constituencies with continuing appointments in order to ensure that key elements of the collective agreements are universally understood.

2-9 Commit through AASUA and the Board of Governors to acknowledging the key roles played by AASUA, Administration, and NASA. Identify the University’s resources and infrastructural characteristics and explain how they are intended to perform and/or support Scholarship to fulfill the University’s mission statement, specifically with respect to creating and sustaining “a vibrant and supportive learning environment that discovers, disseminates, and applies new knowledge through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, community involvement, and partnerships.”

2-10 Commit, through AASUA/Board of Governors negotiations, to invest funds and efforts in the creation of a University community truly conducive to Scholarship and supportive of staff and students, to strengthen the feeling of belonging imperative to building a strong and long-lasting Alumni base, and to aid in the aim of greater work-life balance, the achievement of all of which will lead to improvements in morale and to better workload-work life balance.

2-11 Within the tenure track constituencies, create a career progression structure for teaching-focused staff that accommodates variances within the Faculty Agreement to allow for emphasis on teaching, and that encourages and allows for promotion by means analogous to the current structure for tenure-track faculty.

2-12 Within the continuing appointment (non-tenure-track) constituencies, create permanency with ranks and benefits (including sabbatical leaves), ensuring that the evaluation of Scholarship determines eligibility for consideration for such permanency.

2-13 Provide faculties the necessary flexibility by permitting both tenure-track and continuing appointments.

2-14 Create two Scholarship-focused AASUA constituencies for six of the current seven.

2-15 Discuss, to a greater extent than the Renaissance Committee had time for, the advisability of the Board of Governors’ creation of a distinct association for APOs, with adequate protections and means of representation.

2-16 Exclude academic staff with administrative appointments (from the level of departmental chair up) from AASUA for the duration of their administrative appointment, and provide them with adequate protections and means of representation for all of their administrative activities (their scholarly activities remaining within the ægis of the AASUA).

2-17 Agree that future negotiations between each of the two associations and the Administration (on behalf of the Board of Governors) involve both wording of agreements and compensation.

2-18 Arrange for negotiations between the Administration and each of four constituencies – a reconstituted AASUA, APOs, Specialized Scholars, and Academic Administrators – to be held separately. (There is no assumption that negotiators for the four constituencies would begin with identical proposals regarding compensation.)
Relationship to the Terms of Reference

The terms of reference of the Renaissance Committee that are relevant to this section are as follows: The Renaissance Committee shall respond to the current underlying academic compensation pressures faced by the University of Alberta. Consistent with this charge and extending from it, The Renaissance Committee shall negotiate terms that include, but are not limited to:

- the introduction of a permanent teaching-intensive category of academic staff,
- the enhancement and revision of processes deployed by faculty evaluation committees,
- the redesign and simplification of salary schedules for professors, FSOs, and librarians,
- the strengthening of the role of the President’s Review Committee with a view to addressing variation across the FECs with respect to the appointment of academic staff, their evaluation, and the granting to them of tenure and promotion.

To undertake these, the Renaissance Committee first needed to know, and then assess:

- the objectives and roles of the University of Alberta
- the basis on which the work of the AASUA’s constituents should be evaluated
- the efficacy of tenure and other protections for academic staff at the University
- the clarity with which the professorial ranks are identified
- the activities carried out by scholars, such as professors, FSOs, and librarians, as well as by other academic staff at the University, and the ways in which their work is evaluated and compensated
- the distinction or lack thereof that the foregoing give the University in comparison to other universities

Scholarship in the University of Alberta Context

The University’s Mission

The University of Alberta is a Scholarship-intensive institution. It is the flagship educational and research institution of the Province of Alberta. It is vital to the economy of Edmonton and of Alberta. At present, the University of Alberta defines its mission as follows:

Our *mission* is to create and sustain a vibrant and supportive learning environment that discovers, disseminates, and applies new knowledge through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, community involvement, and partnerships. The University of Alberta gives a national and international voice to innovation in our province, taking a lead role in placing Canada at the global forefront.  

Thus, the University must aim for its environment to be conducive to and supportive of the performance of Scholarship in all its manifold forms. The University must therefore administer its resources. It must also provide support to scholars. The University also emphasizes its leadership in this regard.

---

The Renaissance Committee committed itself to undertake an in-depth analysis of the elements that the University’s mission statement comprises and to understand what AASUA constituencies did, individually or collectively, to meet the mission in a direct or supporting role. In a greater context, sister universities such as the University of Calgary, have emphasized research and teaching. Funds were allocated there in August 2012 to establish an Office of the Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning), and that university intends to stimulate and be recognized for teaching and learning.\textsuperscript{13}

Summary of Concerns:

The University of Alberta regards itself as the flagship research institution in Alberta, but compared to its sister universities is lagging on the teaching aspects. The current mission of the University is not sufficiently inclusive of vital aspects of Scholarship to make it competitive on every front on a provincial, national, or international level.

Recommendation:

2-1 Revise the current mission statement and vision of the University of Alberta to reflect its determination to be the best teaching- and research-intensive institution in the Province of Alberta. Achievement of this determination will also make the University a major national and international institution.

The Renaissance Committee recommends the following example for the principals’ consideration:

Our vision is to inspire the human spirit through outstanding achievements in teaching, learning, discovery, and citizenship in a creative community, building one of the world’s great universities for the public good.

Our mission is two-fold: To create and sustain a vibrant and supportive learning environment that discovers, disseminates, and applies new knowledge through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, community involvement, and partnerships. Our teaching will raise up the whole people of Alberta to be knowledgeable citizens of their province, country, and planet. The University of Alberta gives a national and international voice to innovation in our province, taking a lead role in placing Canada at the global forefront.\textsuperscript{14}

What is Scholarship?

To meet its mission, the University of Alberta must create an environment conducive to Scholarship; however, Scholarship is ill defined. As such, meeting the University’s missions is problematic, as is the rewarding of those that perform or support Scholarship. For the purpose of its work as defined in the terms of references, the Renaissance Committee proposes terminology in order to advance other proposals. It also grew evident that such information would be of value to all members of the University community.

\textsuperscript{13} http://www.ucalgary.ca/provost/vp/vpteaching.

\textsuperscript{14} http://www.toolkit.ualberta.ca/WhatIsOurPromise/OurVisionMissionMotto.aspx
This need was identified in the report of a 1991 AASUA/Administration joint committee on FEC reform.\textsuperscript{15}

Literature\textsuperscript{16,17,18,19,20,21} indicates that a definition of the performance of Scholarship would have to be inclusive of the key aspects of Scholarship, namely, research, teaching, service, and mentorship. A single definition had to be articulated and be applicable to all academic pursuits. Key points of performance for each should include quantity, quality, impact, and audience. Quantity must be acknowledged as a performance indicator. However, it must be considered, among many other factors, within Scholarship, the time Scholarship can take, available resources, the level of experience at which it is conducted, and the scholar’s objectives. Literature made it apparent that a few themes recur in discussions of the quality of Scholarship. Interpretation of quality should not be confused with the notions of novelty versus application of state of the art to other areas of research; both are valid and critical to advancing Scholarship. Not all impact (effect, value, influence) can be measured within a short time frame or in a scholar’s career. Only the scholars themselves can define/describe the impact of their Scholarship, and have, in time, their peers or audience assess it.

A majority of stakeholder meetings indicated to the Renaissance Committee the importance of mentorship to the University, how it is imperative to fostering growth and collegiality but also deplored its lack of recognition at evaluation time.

Summary of Concerns:

- The University does not have definitions of Scholarship or of Scholarship performance measures.
- The University therefore has no accurate and repeatable means of evaluating scholars.

Recommendations:


\textsuperscript{16} Renaissance Committee Feedback forms: http://www.renaissance.ualberta.ca/InformationSharingandFeedback/DefinitionofScholarship.aspx

\textsuperscript{17} AASUA's Research & Scholarly Activity (RSA) Committee, email communication 4 Feb. 2013.


In order to meet the University’s mission statement, adopt the Renaissance Committee’s definition of Scholarship as well as the various recommendations of the elements and performance measures of Scholarship, all of which have been developed from current literature and through extensive consultation, evaluation, analysis of data, and deliberations. The recommended definitions reflect principles of equity, recognize the value in the variability and intended purpose of Scholarship, and aim to make the University a leading international institution of Scholarship.

Regularly revise these definitions and adapt them to the times, but retain and maintain the principles by which they were developed.

Adopt the following elements of Scholarship for the determination and recognition of Scholarship excellence: research, teaching, mentorship, internal service, service to the community and profession, and contributions that go on to have an impact in a variety of ways (for example, a patent, a frequently republished article or book; also known as a translational contribution).

In one form or another, the above entails most, if not all, of the elements of Scholarship performance measures.

- Research-related activities and successes (papers to paintings to public engagement to obtaining of grants, awards);
- Teaching-related activities and successes (classes, research students/grads, awards etc.);
- Service subcategories:
  - Mentorship and citizenry-related activities and successes (one on one, initiatives, awards, etc.);
  - Internal service – related activities and successes (committees, events, presentations, etc.)
  - External and professional-related activities and successes (awards, review committees, editorships, etc.)
- Longer-term impact:
  - Translational contributions – related activities and successes (new clinical practice; translation of IP to spin off, republication of book or article, etc.)

Recommended Definitions:

The definitions below serve as principles for assessing Scholarship Performance during both performance evaluations and deliberations over tenure and promotion and in meeting the mission of the University.

Scholarship pertains to all aspects of knowledge:
- the ongoing exploration, discovery, and considered judgment of it,
- its interpretation, evaluation, contemplation, preservation, communication/dissemination, integration, application, and
- its administration.

Scholarship is applied and imparted ethically through
- research,
- teaching,
- mentorship,
- public engagement, and
- other work.
**Teaching** is the instruction of undergraduates and graduate students in classrooms and through other individual- or group-based means, as part of, or as a complement to, a degree. It excludes internal training.

**Research** is any query-based gathering of data, information, and facts for the advancement of knowledge, but excludes the development of new internal administrative systems.\(^{22}\) In those disciplines that have a humanities or fine arts complexion, in which the quality of research cannot necessarily be quantified, assessment of it involves more judgement than measurement.\(^ {23}\)

**Mentorship**, formal or informal, is a very valuable form of Scholarship; it has well recognized impact on its target: peers. Recognition of mentorship quality and quantity is imperative. Mentorship is an activity that fosters and aids the development of skills and knowledge vital for increasing Scholarship quantity, quality and impact; this is in direct support of the goals and aims of the University. Mentorship must be recognized as Scholarship, and considered as such, at faculty evaluation committees.

It is understood that Scholarship should have field-tailored ways (i.e. metrics, indicators, critical evaluations, etc.) of assessing performance, which include quantity, quality, and impact, aimed at specific and general audiences inside and outside academia.

In such contexts

Scholarship **Quantity** refers to the number of activities, actions, measurable outputs, audience members, initiatives, achievements, and/or engagements attained within the intended scholarly objectives, scope, and area, with due consideration for the expected capacity and capabilities of scholars within the field of study.

**Quality** in Scholarship must be broadly interpreted. It must consider its impact and audience(s). Scholarship of esteemed quality requires

- the effective understanding and rigorous application of preceding and current states of the art of the field(s), skillful and attentive preparation of resources; and
- the use, or improvement, or development, or convincing rejection of contemporary or state-of-the-art methodologies or techniques;
- the results of which can be effectively disseminated, replicated, employed, or enhanced, or would have the reasonable potential to have significance and add quantitative or qualitative, heuristic or holistic value to the target audience(s);
- all of which can be assessed and critiqued by the scholar, and by his or her peers and audience(s).

Scholars must be able to convey the quality and rigor of their work, and by which methods (metrics, indicators) it should be assessed by peers and audience(s). These assessments must allow for the possibility that Scholarship deviates/diverges from initially stated goals; consequently, aspects of assessment may also need to undergo change.

**Impact** or its potential (or its implied potential) can be qualitative and/or quantitative. It can be real or perceived, immediate or time-dependent. It must have an intended audience(s), which can be broad, peer-specific, regulatory-driven, or publically funded, or even introspective. The goals and anticipated results of Scholarship must be definable, as must both its intended impact in the short, medium, and long terms and the methods by which peers and intended audiences can most appropriately assess that impact. As with the assessment of quality, the assessment of impact must remain open to the possibility


that deviations/divergences from initially stated aims and anticipated results warrant reconsideration of any or all of them.

To have impact, Scholarship must have a **target or audience**. The audience can be broad, peer-specific, individual, or even introspective. Discovery (Curiosity)-, clinically-, and industry-driven Scholarship, as well as teaching, service, mentorship, and public engagement that are translated or communicated to its intended audience(s), has greater impact. Scholars must be able to define their intended audience and identify by which methods they would assess successful interactions with or impacts on them. The definition must be clearly articulated to allow for assessment and critique by peers and audiences. As with the assessment of quality and impact, the assessment of audience must remain open to the possibility that deviations/divergences from initially identified audiences warrant revision.

**Protections of Scholars:**

To perform Scholarship at its highest level, to challenge convention and dogma, scholars require protections. Protections should be equal to the level of risk associated with the breadth and reach of the Scholarship and rewarded through rank progressions (RPs; discussed in section 3). Currently, ambiguity attends many academics’ understanding of academic freedom, tenure, and continuing appointment. This ambiguity is only compounded by the definitions in the current collective agreements.

The first level of protection is academic freedom. Except for APOs, it is accorded to all academic staff from the date of hire and for as long as they are employed by the University. Academic freedom is described in the applicable collective agreements as follows:

2.02.1 The University of Alberta is committed to the pursuit of truth, the advancement of learning, and the dissemination of knowledge.

2.02.2 The University expects each staff member to engage in these endeavours.

2.02.3 The parties to this agreement subscribe to the principles of academic freedom, that is, the right to examine, to question, to teach, to learn, to investigate, to speculate, to comment, to criticize without deference to prescribed doctrine. Academic freedom does not confer legal immunity; nor does it diminish the obligation of members to meet their responsibilities to the University as set out in Article 7 (University responsibilities).

2.02.4 Members have the right to publish the results of their research without interference or censorship by the institution or its agents.

The Faculty and Librarian collective agreements have the following provisions for tenure, which touch on two elements of it:

**Appointment:** “Tenure” means 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. (§1.15)

**Qualification:** For the award of tenure, the staff 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. (§13.05 c)

However, this definition of tenure is used as well to define a type of appointment that does not involve tenure, that is a continuing appointment. In the collective agreements for FSOs (Faculty Service Officers) and for APOs (Administrative and Professional Officers) (§1.04 and §1.05, respectively), continuing appointment is defined in the same words as those in the Faculty Agreement’s description of tenure. The probationary period and performance indicators for the awarding of tenure to faculty and librarians differ

---

24 FSO, SOTS, CAS:T, Librarian, TRAS, and Academic Faculty collective agreements.
substantively from those for FSOs and APOs. As such, there is no discernible difference between the appointment protections afforded to any AASUA constituency. Yet, tenure-track academic faculty and librarians must meet stricter, if very different, performance indicators to pass probation and receive tenure, and the APO constituency does not have academic freedom.

Summary of Concerns:

- Together, the definitions of the scholar’s protection (tenure, continuing appointment, academic freedom) do not appear to meet the objectives of the University in protecting those who perform Scholarship to meet its mission.
- Tenure is solely related to permanence, or job security, and not a protection of scholars when using their academic freedom to challenge doctrine or current systems.
- There is inequity in the performance measures required for the awarding of tenure.
- There is a general misunderstanding or ignorance of the meaning of tenure, continuing appointment and elements of collective agreements.

Recommendations:

2-5 Define Tenure and Continuing Appointment differently in the collective agreements.
2-6 Add the Renaissance Committee’s recommended Definition of Tenure and Statement of the Responsibilities of Tenure to the applicable collective agreements.
2-7 Organize through a joint exercise (Administration and AASUA) workshops for all new faculty and librarians to provide information on the key elements of their collective agreements, on the concepts and definitions of Academic Freedom and Tenure, and on the meaning and expectations of Ranks within their appointments.
2-8 Provide similar, regular workshops for other AASUA constituencies of continuing appointments in order to ensure that key elements of the collective agreements are universally understood.

Proposed Definitions:

Following consultations, the Renaissance Committee agreed on the following definition of tenure and on statements important to the applicable collective agreement(s):

Tenure is a further protection of academic freedom, afforded by the University to all eligible academic staff, after a probationary period demonstrating qualification. Tenure accords academic staff the intellectual liberty to voice concerns and opinions on local, provincial, national, and international matters with due protection from outside pressures and without risk of loss of employment or of rank, salary, or legal-reprisals or sanctions.

Tenure accompanies an appointment to the specified academic staff (Faculty, Librarian) without term, which may be terminated only by resignation, retirement, death, or in accordance with the terms of the appropriate collective agreement.

With tenure come considerable responsibilities:

With the protection afforded under tenure comes the responsibility of the Academic to voice, by whichever appropriate means, his/her concerns to target audiences. This is in accordance with the
academic freedom accorded through employment and can be done within the scope of either their research or professional expertise, or based on one’s social or political beliefs, individually or as part of a collective. This must be based on sound knowledge and Scholarship.

Recognition of the Importance of Professorial Ranks:
Professorial ranks are important indicators of career progression within an institution. They provide a basis for assessing the qualifications of a tenure-track colleague. They imply greater levels of qualification and therefore a greater responsibility to use academic freedom to serve the broader community. However, the basis for the protections provided to the ranks, and the performance measures that lead to rank progression and promotion is unclear to most. A recommended basis is provided here as an example to be applied similarly to all tenure track constituencies.

**Assistant Professor** is a probationary appointment during which the colleague must demonstrate performance measures in order to meet the standards both for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and for tenure. Assistant Professor is a rank accorded academic freedom but not a continuing appointment.

**Associate Professor** is a rank earned by academic faculty through promotion or at the time of appointment to the University. An Associate Professor has demonstrated a performance measure “of meeting the goals of the institution, often (though not always including) demonstrating a strong record of published research, grant funding, academic visibility, teaching and administrative service moving from probationary to permanent status.”

**Professor** is a rank earned by academic faculty through promotion or hiring. It indicates that performance measures of the University have been met, often (though not always including) the demonstration of an exceptional record of published research, grant funding, academic visibility, teaching and administrative service, with emphasis different across national and international institutions (though often focused on research in universities).

The importance of the professional ranks, and their definition should be seen as models for both rank progression and performance expectations of scholars at the University of Alberta.

What is Administration at the University of Alberta?
The primary mission of the University is Scholarship. It is performed by specific AASUA constituencies and supported by others, including, for example, Faculty Service officers (FSOs), one of the seven constituencies that the AASUA comprises, and some NASA (Non-Academic Staff Association) staff. University Governance, the head of which at the University of Alberta is the Board of Governors, which

---

25 The Faculty Agreement (§12.03 b) notes that colleagues hired at the rank of Associate Professor does typically qualify for and are awarded tenure, but, in some cases, a probationary period may be required prior to the granting of tenure in order to permit the colleague to demonstrate competency in research and/or teaching and/or other areas of Scholarship.


27 Faculty Agreement, §12.03 a.

customarily delegates much of this work to central Administration, sets the missions of and identifies priority areas for Scholarship. Central Administration should provide the strategic analysis and support to accomplish these missions and actively undertake initiatives to expand opportunities to meet them. It is well understood that academic faculty require resources to perform Scholarship and that the resources include but are not limited to human resources (e.g. graduate students, research assistants/associates, teaching assistants), facilities (e.g. offices, labs, libraries, classrooms), supplies, funds, teaching programs, etc. In a modern university environment, Scholarship is accomplished through these vital and necessarily intertwined activities. Resources to accomplish Scholarship must be administered and tracked. Current practices in these regards need improvement.

Resources are often subject to external and internal regulation and reporting requirements. For example, Tri-Council funding and ethics requirements, and program accreditations are checks and balances that, although obligatory, consume a significant amount of time. Each of the three federal councils are, like those performing Scholarship in public or publically funded institutions, directly or indirectly accountable to the public. Agencies must report on their investments and otherwise show how their rules, standards, and procedures protect or benefit the public.

Those performing Scholarship are accountable for their activities in terms of, among others, teaching, expressions of academic freedom, knowledge translation, benefits to their audiences including professional societies and/or industry, funding agencies, and other external or internal agencies with regulations and reporting requirements. There is a need for support and administrative structures to aid scholars in reporting and disseminating their research. The Research Service Office (RSO), Human Resource Services (HRS), the Research Ethics Office (REO), Financial Services (FS), and the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) are examples of centralized administrative structures that carry out some of the work of supporting academic faculty but which still require working relationships with APOs and NASA staff at departmental and faculty levels. The coordination required is necessarily cumbersome.

However, there has been a gradual delegation of administrative responsibilities to individual academic faculty from what were traditionally duties carried out by NASA staff; consequently, academic faculty have repeatedly reported their concerns over shouldering an increased load of activities in support of their own Scholarship. This delegation certainly ensures that responsibility and accountability for Scholarship lie in the hands of those performing it; however, for some colleagues it has and for others could have undesirable consequences. Since the delegation has been incremental, the administrative duties come without any diminishment in performance expectations lowered. Feeling continuously encouraged – even obliged – to maintain or increase the quality and quantity of their Scholarship, too many academic faculty find themselves with less time than they need to perform their work. Exacerbating this circumstance is the necessity of multiple levels of internal regulations and the requirement of one-over-one-over-one-over-one approval (for example, the need to obtain four signatures for the submission of a Tri-Council grant application requires hours of an applicant’s time). The unfortunate repercussion of this burden is the heightened stress involved in applying for research funds and even an increase in the disinclination to make the effort of filing an application either for a research grant or for support for the research grant.

Elements of administration also focus their attention on expanding potential sources of funding and resources to fulfill the University’s mission. The Office of Advancement and officers in the faculties and departments whose job it is to raise funds for the University or units of it comprise a large workforce. Their goal is to attract ten times the cost of their employment. It remains unclear if the centralization of fundraising is superior to the efforts that departments and faculties can make, aware as they intimately are

---

29 Governance is defined by The Institute on Governance as the structure or mechanism that “determines who has power, who makes decisions, how other players make their voice heard and how account is rendered” (http://iog.ca/defining-governance/; accessed 10 Aug. 2013). Administration is often mistaken as Governance.
of potential sources and donors. Others suggest that alumni support, because it issues from a sense of the University’s community, begins with the success of students’ first-year university experience, ought to be the priority.

Administration in support of Scholarship:
Administration is synonymous with the processes or activities needed for the University to function and fulfill not only its mission but also various regulatory and legal obligations and other duties. It is an essential part of any institution.

Two definitions of administration are used for budgetary and reporting purposes. One is the Canadian Association of University Business Officers’ (CAUBO) and the other the Government of Alberta’s (Appendix 3). These clearly focus almost exclusively on centralized administration. Whenever an operation in support of Scholarship is centralized, the size of Administration grows in these definitions’ terms. However, from the perspective of the Renaissance Committee, administration, at least administration in support of Scholarship, has multiple levels; consequently, neither of these definitions accurately portrays the extent and location of administration at the University. The University is recognized as very decentralized by comparison with its peers. The Renaissance Committee sees central Administration’s responsibilities as supported through administrative delegation at the levels of faculties, departments, and scholars. Extensive decentralization could suggest that central Administration is lean. The Government of Alberta, in requiring the University to provide a budget, lists the following as administrative costs: VP (Advancement); VP (External); Governance (including the Office of the President); some units under the VP (Finance) (Strategic Analysis, Financial Services, SMS, Human Resource Services, Risk Management, and Resource Planning); the Information Technology office with the Office of the Vice-Provost; VP (Research); UA International; the office of VP (Facilities and Operations) (but no other units within that vice-presidency). At the faculty and departmental levels, administration is performed by deans, vice-deans, and associate deans, chairs, associate chairs, and program directors (the last are somewhat difficult to identify and their work to track).

Finally, APOs support many of the administrative aspects of the University. Table 2.1 provides a breakdown in 2012 of faculty (no APOs), total academic faculty, undergraduate student enrolment, and research funding.

---

30 Renaissance Committee/Deans stakeholder meetings.

31 Of particular note in this regard is the extensive authority that Alberta’s Post-Secondary Learning Act assigns deans and the consequent scope, importance, and responsibilities that faculties at the University of Alberta have, particularly with respect to decisions about hiring, tenure, and promotion. See Government of Alberta, Post-Secondary Learning Act, Statutes of Alberta, 2002, chpt. P-19.5 (current as of 1 Feb. 2011), §21. (At most peer institutions, the provost allocates positions and approves short-lists for hiring and starting compensation packages, while the president plays a role in decisions about tenure and promotion (this role usually extends to approval or, not a veto, but a referral back to the faculty). It is not clear why, in practice, deans at the University of Alberta do not also have the authority to determine their individual budgets and account fully for them, rather than have them determined by the vice-presidents Academic and Finance, or why no deans are involved in compensation negotiations. Finally, the decentralization appears to stop at the level of deans; that is, departmental chairs in many faculties do not discharge their responsibilities with anything like the level of autonomy that most deans enjoy in most respects, although not all (control over space marking a notable exception).

32 In January 2013, 561 APOs comprised approximately 13% of the membership of the AASUA. Between Oct. 2008 (when it represented 10.8% of the AASUA’s total membership) and 2013, the APO constituency itself grew by 23%.
Table 2.1: Faculty (Full-time equivalent) with administrative and non-administrative duties, Undergraduate (UG) student enrolment, and research funding by faculty (in millions, rounded to nearest $0.1M)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total Deans and Chairs</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Non-Admin Faculty</th>
<th>Admin: faculty Ratio</th>
<th>UG Students (2012)</th>
<th>Research Funding ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Native Studies</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>5768</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus St-Jean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3239</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3971</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine and Dentistry</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>135.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education and Recreation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Medicine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>6463</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 10% of academics (247) perform administrative duties at the faculty and department levels. These duties account for 50% or more of the time of deans, vice-deans, associate deans, chairs, and associate chairs. Each of these administration positions comes with teaching relief, from one course (1 HCE) to a full course load. (Across campus, full course loads vary from two to four courses.) A further

---

33 We acknowledge variances in datasets as a function of sources or years covered.
34 This does not include program directors, positions that require appreciable amounts of time administering programs.
35 If one assumes an average course-load relief of three courses for each of the 247 academic faculty administrators and also assumes that all such relief is provided by CAS:T at an average cost of $8,500 per course, then the University must spend approximately $6.3M annually on these levels of administration. Additional costs include administrative stipends (invaluable to ensure that such administrative duties are performed well and that there be minimal impact on a colleague’s salary progression because administration substantially limits her/him from performing other forms of Scholarship) and administrative leaves for chairs (1/5 salary annually). These costs amount to approximately $2.47M and $8.65M, respectively, if the average stipend and salary are $10,000 and $175,000. The grand total is about $17.42M per year. Furthermore, such appointments often come with other supports not factored in here, supports such as postdoctoral fellows and research grants, the costs of which cannot be accurately approximated.
consideration is that such administrative appointments often detract from a faculty member’s performance and achievement of Scholarship.

Without accounting for the academic faculty in central administrative roles, at least 808 academic and APO staff had administration as a principal duty in 2012. This is over 28% of the 2859 APO, Faculty, Librarian and FSO constituencies (full-time non contract/trust staff).

The number of academic faculty in administrative roles varies considerably from one faculty to another. The tally of undergraduate students and the ratio of undergraduate students to academic faculty administrators (UG:Administration) are provided below (Figure 2.1). Faculties with similar size undergraduate programs have a large variance in the ratio of UG:Administration. Arts and Native Studies (together) and Science, for example, the two largest undergraduate teaching faculties, have vastly different UG:Administration ratios: 107 vs. 190. In addition, the Faculty of Science has fewer faculty members (291 vs. 363) and a lower Faculty:Administration ratio (10% vs. 13%) than Arts and Native Studies (together). The figures show other faculties with low ratios. Medicine and Dentistry, which has the greatest number of academic faculty and the smallest Faculty:Administration ratio (6%), has the lowest UG:Administration ratio. The Alberta School of Business, a relatively small undergraduate teaching faculty, has the greatest UG:Administration ratio, while Education and Engineering, two medium-sized undergraduate teaching faculties, have the second and third highest UG:Administration ratios. These numbers could suggest a potential administrative imbalance or duplication and inefficiencies in some faculties versus others, indicative of an over-investment in administration. Less debatable is the whopping total of academic faculty whose roles involve a considerable amount of administration. Moreover, it should be noted that the total administration performed across campus issues from decisions about administrative needs and appointments that are reached as much at the decanal and departmental levels as at the level of central administration.

36 The organization charts of central Administration indicate 14 people who were once or are currently members of the Academic Faculty constituency of AASUA, the remaining being counted already in the APO group.
At the individual level in recent years, a transfer of administrative duties has gradually occurred. Tasks once performed by NASA members have been transferred to academic staff (e.g. travel expense claims, purchasing, research assistant hiring). The number of such tasks transferred is very difficult to identify; however, the examples demonstrate that administrative decentralization and delegation can be associated
to a degree with issues of work-life balance\textsuperscript{37} and should be seen as impacting the quantity if not the quality of Scholarship performance.

Summary of Concerns:

- The Renaissance Committee acknowledges the roles and importance of Governance structure, administration (at all levels), services, and support.

Recommendations:

2-9 Commit, through AASUA and the Board of Governors, to acknowledging the key roles played by AASUA, Administration, and NASA. Identify the University’s resources and infrastructural characteristics and explain how they are intended to perform and/or support Scholarship to fulfill the University’s mission statement, specifically with respect to creating and sustaining “a vibrant and supportive learning environment that discovers, disseminates, and applies new knowledge through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, community involvement, and partnerships.”

2-10 Commit, through AASUA/Board of Governors negotiations, to invest funds and efforts in the creation of a University community truly conducive to Scholarship and supportive of staff and students, to strengthen the feeling of belonging imperative to building a strong and long-lasting Alumni base, and to aid in the aim of greater work-life balance, the achievement of all of which will lead to improvements in morale and to better workload-work life balance.

Focus on Teaching and the feasibility/advisability of a “teaching-intensive stream.” Who delivers the Curriculum, and who should?

Teaching at the University of Alberta

As Table 2.2 shows, more than 90% of the undergraduate courses at the University of Alberta are taught by Faculty and Contract Academic Staff: Teaching (CAS:T).

<p>| Table 2.2: Approximate Sizes of AASUA’s Seven Constituencies (*January 2013)\textsuperscript{38}; ** CAS:T and SOTS numbers are of individuals; FTE numbers represent positions (FTE) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>2013*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Professional Officers (APO)</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Academic Staff: Teaching (CAS:T)**</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS:T (FTE)</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>2,147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{38} A regular experience of the Renaissance Committee has been that numbers in constituencies at any one time are surprisingly difficult to determine; these numbers are one account.
Faculty Service Officers (FSO) 61 68 66 79 87
Librarians 61 64 62 64 64 (Non-Teaching) Sessionals and Other Temporary Staff (SOTS)* 260 221 223 184 176 Trust/Research Academic Staff (TRAS) 479 443 457 410 404 Total 4,509 4,548 4,447 4,429 4,408

These two constituencies contribute almost equally to teaching at the undergraduate level with Faculty contributing only from 2% to 12% more than CAS:T over the five-year period from 2007 to 2011. Taken together, data provided to the Renaissance Committee by individual faculties show extensive variability in the percentage of undergraduate courses taught by CAS:T, ranging from minimal use to over 60%. Faculties offering professional programs typically make a higher use of CAS:T, with some notable exceptions (Faculty of Engineering).

Faculty-specific practices and policies have developed in the hiring, evaluation, benefits, duties, and career progression of CAS:T across the campus. These include Clinical Track appointments in some Health Science faculties, Faculty Lecturer appointments, and the Faculty Service Officer designation used for some teaching staff; consequently considerable variability in employment conditions of those with a teaching focus results across campus. Clinical Track CAS:T members typically have multi-year contracts and a career progression structure that parallels that of traditional academic faculty. Assistant Professor (Clinical Track) and Associate Professor (Clinical Track) titles are provided. These staff members may have access to benefits not included in the CAS:T Agreement through “Special Conditions” associated with the contracts that are approved by the Office of the Provost and AASUA. Some CAS:T staff in multi-year contracts fill key leadership roles in their departments and faculties. Faculty Lecturer staff also may have extended contracts, with five-year rolling contracts used in several faculties and development funds provided in others. Some teaching-focused staff are hired under the Faculty Service Officer agreement, by which they gain continuing appointments and other benefits not available through the CAS:T agreement. Table 2.3 summarizes the various types of contracts for CAS:T at the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolling</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed &gt;= 1 year</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed 8 - 11 mths</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed &lt; 8 mths</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the CAS:T designation is intended for short-term or fixed-term appointments, as Table 2.4 shows, approximately 25% of CAS:T are employed in contracts longer than one year, and 38% have length of service exceeding five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 yrs</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As highlighted earlier, evaluation of CAS:T and FSO teaching staff also varies substantially, with some being evaluated through FEC (Clinical Track and FSO), some through Faculty Lecturer Evaluation committees and others through review by their departmental chair.

Teaching-Intensive Stream

Stakeholders’ Perspectives

The mandate of the Renaissance Committee required consideration of a teaching-intensive category of staff. Perspectives were gathered through meetings with stakeholders from around the University. They provided comments that fell into two broad categories: benefits or rationale for a teaching-intensive category, and recommendations for implementation. Representative comments are included below.

Benefits/Rationale

- It is good to have staff stability and long-term commitment to do a thorough job.
- Such a stream would allow our department to pursue new initiatives.
- Sometimes, individuals with applied skills are in a better position to teach.
- A formal teaching stream would decrease turnover of our contingent teaching staff.
- A teaching-intensive stream would represent an investment in the teaching quality of the academy.
- A teaching-intensive stream represents the only way to get the right person for the job.
- Our department needs more flexibility in hiring for teaching needs (types of contracts we can offer)
- It’s about fairness. At the current time, our department is treating continuing staff as contingent.

These generally favourable comments, provided by deans and other stakeholders at the University, contrasted sharply with the comments provided in April 2013 by Peter Simpson, then Assistant Executive Director, Canadian Association of University Teachers, who addressed questions relevant to the Renaissance Committee during a public presentation at the University. Concern was the chief theme of his remarks:

- CAUT is generally opposed to teaching-intensive streams.
- Teaching intensive streams have turned out badly at most universities.
- Interests of the tenure-track and teaching-intensive streams are at odds.
- The profession has not figured out how to evaluate teaching.
- If we could find a better way to evaluate teaching, it might be a “different story.”
- Clinical academics are a separate situation from other types of teaching stream faculty.
- A recommendation would be to look to an approach that benefits existing staff (permanence rather than tenure).

More Perspectives on the Prospect of a Teaching-Intensive Stream (a Canadian Context)

The past decade has witnessed an increase in teaching stream faculty in Canadian colleges, universities, and research-intensive universities. Teaching streams are of course not limited to Canada; universities in the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States, and Europe utilize them and not without debate and concern.39 Teaching-Stream Faculty (TSF), as they are often termed, are “those individuals holding a full-

---

39 Ian D. Clark, “Rethinking the traditional university model: Stay the course or radical change.” Slides for panel discussion, Annual CAUBO Conference, McMaster University, 18 June 2013; http://www.academictransformation.ca/; accessed 9 Aug. 2013;
time faculty appointment as designated in collective agreements, agreement memoranda and/or policy manuals as teaching only, teaching-stream, teaching-track, etc. and for whom responsibilities are limited to teaching, teaching-related activities, teaching-related research and service. The positions that these colleagues hold may include requirements for research related to teaching or pedagogy and have tracks that permit some form of permanency and job security (tenured, continuing or permanent).

In 2008, Pamela Gravestock and Emily Gregor Greenleaf reported teaching-intensive streams at 12 Canadian institutions. Since this time, many other universities have moved to include teaching streams. In Ontario alone, eight universities had teaching streams by 2011.

Canadian U15 Universities
A review of the fifteen English-speaking research-intensive universities (U15) showed that 8 /13 have an established teaching stream; exceptions are Western University, University of Alberta, McGill University, University of Ottawa and Queen’s University. The following have added the teaching stream since the 2008 report by Gravestock and Gregor Greenleaf: University of Manitoba, University of Calgary, University of Waterloo, and University of Saskatchewan. These four joined those with longer histories of teaching-stream faculty: University of Toronto, University of British Columbia, Dalhousie University, and McMaster University. The Université Laval, and Université de Montréal do not have teaching intensive streams.

Where they exist, TSF are typically included in the Faculty agreement for the institution. As such, TSF often follow a probationary, promotion, and “tenure” structure modelled on traditional academic progression. However, descriptions of teaching-stream roles in the collective agreements are often vague or absent. Continuing positions are a component of these positions. Sometimes, they occur in a traditional tenure structure, but some are contingent and can be terminated when curricular change removes a program or field of teaching. There is also variability in the job descriptions of TSF, but they typically include teaching and service. Scholarship related to expertise in teaching or a particular discipline may also be included in job postings. Universities with programs in health science occasionally include a version of TSF with a clinical designation attached to the title. There is variability in the titles of TSF, with Instructor or Lecturer designations being most common; however, some programs, including McMaster’s, have the same titles as used in the traditional professorial ranks.


41 Vajoczki et al., “Teaching-Stream Faculty in Ontario Universities,” 18.

42 The other 14 universities comprising the U15 are UBC, Calgary, Dalhousie, Laval, Manitoba, McGill, McMaster, Montréal, Ottawa, Queen’s, Saskatchewan, Waterloo, Toronto, and Western.

43 Pamela Gravestock and Emily Gregor Greenleaf, Overview of tenure and promotion policies across Canada (University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 2008); http://ocufa.on.ca/members-area/resources/prepare-for-tenure/; accessed 4 June 2013.
Examination of Teaching Streams in Ontario

With the increase in TSF in programs throughout Ontario’s universities, educational agencies and faculty associations/unions have generated a host of research, reviews, and opinions. In 2008, the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) surveyed Ontario’s universities to examine various aspects of teaching-stream appointments. Its summary expressed concerns about the increase of TSF, with particular emphasis on workload, promotion and evaluation procedures, movement between teaching and traditional academic streams, and equity.44 The 2008 document recommended faculty agreements put limits and conditions on TSF, ensure equitable terms of employment including permanence and career progression, include provision for Scholarship, and develop policies to determine how the link between teaching and research would be supported in the work of TSF. More recent statements from OCUFA highlight similar themes, with Lawson advising that it would be valuable to examine TSF in the current fiscal and changing university environment, but that implementation should be done in a principled manner that includes consideration of job security, advancement and salaries commensurate with other FT faculty members, ability for faculty members to choose their stream of employment, and inclusion of a requirement for Scholarship in those positions.45

The University of Toronto Faculty Association’s complete response to the OCUFA survey provides perspective from a university with an established teaching stream. UTFA expressed concern about the idea of a “cap” on TSF, noting that it assumes a lower status in work type and staffing than in the tenure-track stream. A survey of University of Toronto academic staff indicated similar levels of job satisfaction among faculty types, including TSF, but several concerns specific to that stream were identified:
- security of initial appointment and continuing appointment,
- workload which may not provide time for ongoing Scholarship to maintain currency and develop expertise in pedagogy,
- the grievance and appeals process should parallel that of traditional tenure track faculty,
- the high number of part-time appointments in the teaching stream, which have no possibility of continuing appointment, and
- issues of equity and respect perpetuated partly by titles used in the teaching stream, which are the same as those of sessional lecturers.

The University of Toronto Faculty Association recommended workload that is a 60% teaching, 20% Scholarship (apart from teaching), and 20% service.46

The theme of the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario’s research document about the use of TSF in Ontario universities is the pressure exerted by increased enrolment and decreased funding, and changes in job emphasis and differentiation of faculty arising from that increase and decrease. Another theme is the challenge of implementing a teaching stream within an institutional culture focused on the “rank and status” that research productivity confers. TSF identified four benefits to their institution: departmental

---


45 Kate Lawson, Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations, Newsletter, vo. 5, no. 43 (14 Dec. 2011); http://us1.campaign-archive1.com/?u=ca9b5c14da55e36f1328eb0f1&id=9a3015d968#story1; accessed 27 July 2013.

flexibility, the fact that the ability for some faculty to dedicate time to teaching allowed others greater emphasis on research, benefits for students, and employment security for those in a primarily teaching role. Problems included the potential for TSF to be viewed as “second-tier” academics because of their lack of participation in research at research-intensive institutions, the challenge of getting teaching to be viewed and evaluated as a scholarly endeavour, and the fact that the presence of TSF implicitly compelled units/departments to reconsider the appropriate balance of teaching, research, and service. The authors also emphasized the complexity of integrating TSF into the collective agreements, insufficiently flexible administrative structures, and the cultural and political environments of research-intensive universities.

The document makes eight recommendations for establishing teaching streams:

- tailor the teaching stream to the context of the institution,
- implement a teaching stream in a gradual fashion, allowing for “paradigm” shift,
- reconsider education and teaching within the University, including the evaluation and recognition of teaching, the Scholarship missions of the University, and the links between teaching and research,
- create a career path for TSF that includes security, workload, promotion process and titles,
- involve department chairs in education about purposes and roles of TSF because of chairs’ unique connection to the assignment of teaching load and evaluation of teaching in their departments,
- increase support and encouragement for pedagogical research by all faculty,
- establish a multi-dimensional evaluation of teaching with a focus on faculty development in teaching (an iterative process is emphasized), and
- determine and clearly communicate expectations for research and other forms of Scholarship for TSF.

Ian D. Clark and two colleagues from Queen’s University see the establishment of teaching as a component of the “transformation” and “reform” of higher education in Ontario universities. They highlight the changing landscape of post-secondary education, with increasing student numbers and issues of student access colliding with budgetary limitations. They note an increase of part-time and contingent teaching staff and identify difficulties with the implications of these staff filling institutions’ teaching needs. Prime among the difficulties is the inability for such staff to facilitate student mentoring and to participate in committee and administrative work; consequently, “the burden and the privilege of self-government fall[s] almost entirely on full-time permanent faculty.” These authors see value in establishing and expanding faculty positions focused on teaching. The resulting teaching stream faculty would have secure positions that allow them to focus their efforts on teaching and other forms of Scholarship related to their teaching and field of instruction. The traditional view of researcher-as-scholar is seen as presenting a barrier to implementation, but studies exist that indicate no correlation between strong teaching and strong research. Of these, the meta-analysis of John Hattie and Herbert Marsh is the most often cited. Bringing under discussion 58 studies that examined teaching and research, their study posits models of factors influencing the relationship between teaching and research effectiveness; it then looks for data to support the models. Hattie and Marsh found no correlations between teaching and

---


research effectiveness. They reach the conclusion that “the common belief that research and teaching are inextricably entwined is an enduring myth.”  

Clark and his colleagues’ recommendations have met with a variety of responses. Some university leaders see teaching-stream faculty as a threat to the connections between teaching and research. In his review of their book, Chapnick acknowledges that the view of a “symbiotic” relationship between teaching and research persists despite the complete lack of evidence to support it, but then notes trenchantly that “a community that typically rejects unsubstantiated assertions has, in this case, seemingly grown comfortable making two of its own: first, that teaching and research cannot be disengaged without compromising the integrity of the university system; and second, by implication, that students will learn more from faculty who are active researchers.”

Chapnick also suggests that further research is needed to examine this complex relationship.

Hattie and Marsh did respond to the criticisms resulting from their initial study and devised a study to look at potential variables affecting the relationship between teaching and research. They concluded that research and teaching are “independent constructs.” They acknowledged that their research and others’ have done little to affect academics’ beliefs, and they reflected on a repercussion of their research that they neither anticipated nor approved: the tendency for universities to cite their research to justify the separation of teaching and research. They suggest that institutions decide what they would like the relationship between teaching and research to be in their academy and then develop policy to support a choice to create a “teaching-research nexus.” Support for the enhancement of the nexus could be supported by institutional policies that include the following:

- evidence in the policy documents that the link between teaching and research is primary, identified, and esteemed
- policies for appointment, continuation, and promotion that espouse and require the link
- evidence that the institution selects, retains, promotes, and supports academics who are good teacher and researchers
- a reward or recognition system that requires a minimum quality threshold of activity in research and teaching, and a prohibition on rewarding one or the other
- institutional systems that reward creativity, commitment, investigativeness, and critical analysis in both teaching and research by academics and students, and particularly reward these attributes when they occur in both teaching/learning and research
- a workable mechanism whereby the job conditions can change to meet the needs of the institution and the academic staff member in the proportion of time allocated to the various ways of performing Scholarship (teaching, research, other commitments)
- a mix of academics, some specializing in teaching, some in research, but the majority in both
- a goal that the best researchers teach across all levels of their programs
- evidence that the academics themselves model the role of the research orientation (in the processes of how research needs to be conducted, and in productivity and quality)
- availability of professional development training to encourage an excellent teacher/researcher, and learning how to improve based on feedback evidence.

---


Summary of Concerns:

- For the past several years, about 40% of undergraduate classes at the University are taught by Contract Academic Staff: Teaching (CAS:T), a group without continuing appointments and with extremely variable conditions of employment across the campus.
- The high percentage of classes taught by CAS:T, and an extended length of employment for many CAS:T employees (38% with contracts over 5 years), indicates that the University of Alberta has a teaching category in existence, but one without potential for continuing employment or career progression for teaching-focused staff that exemplifies teaching-stream faculty in other universities.
- CAS:T are not typically involved in administration or student mentoring (although, of those that are, many feel precariously circumstance, fearing as they do that declining such work when they are asked to do it might jeopardize their chances of being rehired). The more courses taught by CAS:T, the more tenure-track faculty must absorb the substantial workload associated with these tasks. This pattern also serves to decrease the familiarity that CAS:T can have with the culture, curriculum and broader priorities of their department/faculty.
- Without standard and rigorous hiring practices and multiple-form evaluation for CAS:T, the quality of teaching by this constituency is difficult to support, monitor, and reward.

N.B. Problems below relate to teaching in general, not just teaching done by CAS:T:

- The University of Alberta, along with other research-intensive universities, asserts that, because “research informs teaching,” the University distinguishes itself from other post-secondary institutions. The Renaissance Committee found no evidence that the University of Alberta has policies that support, measure, or reward the link. The published research on the research-informs-teaching claim clearly discusses it in terms of teaching done in the classroom. It does not extend its findings to claim that the effectiveness of teaching that occurs in a lab or in a discussion during office hours is uninformed by a scholar's research, and it seems preposterous to assert that such a link does not exist in such settings.
- Existing policies at the University of Alberta as found in the GFC Policy Manual and Faculty Agreement contain statements highlighting the importance of teaching, the need for both formative and summative evaluation of teaching, and a requirement that the evaluation of teaching be multifaceted. GFC policies in particular give context and structure to the concept of teacher-scholar and embrace a broad view of Scholarship, including teaching (§111.2, §111.3). However, there is little evidence that these policies are consistently applied by faculty evaluation committees in decision to award merit or grant tenure or promotion.
- The University’s current evaluation of teaching routinely and often exclusively focuses on USRI or other forms of course-based evaluation. The instruction of courses is only a portion of the teaching responsibilities of many academic staff. Graduate student supervision, mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, supporting graduate students as they acquire teaching experience, course design, and curriculum development, along with other activities, represent vital components of teaching and thus of Scholarship, but are currently only dimly represented and seldom rewarded.

Recommendations:

2-11 Within the tenure track constituencies, create a career progression structure for teaching-focused staff that accommodates variances within the Faculty Agreement to allow for emphasis on teaching, and that encourages and allows for promotion by means analogous to the current structure for tenure-track faculty.

2-12 Within the continuing appointment (non-tenure-track) constituencies, create permanency with ranks and benefits (including sabbatical leaves), ensuring that the evaluation of Scholarship determines eligibility for consideration for such permanency.

2-13 Provide faculties the necessary flexibility by permitting both tenure-track and continuing appointments.

Roles of the AASUA Constituencies:

Each constituency has a role in meeting the Scholarship mission of the University. Recent changes in their demographics may indicate a realignment of the University’s goals or a need to meet regulatory requirements.

- Faculty members are expected, during the course of their careers, to perform all types of Scholarship. Faculty members fulfill the primary mission of the University and should be supported in these activities by other AASUA and NASA constituencies, as well as the Administration. Faculty members undergo a tenure-track process and have three ranks to recognize stages of career progression. Faculty numbers have grown by 3%, or 62 members, in the last five years.

- Librarians support Scholarship, and the work of some of them includes the performance of research, teaching, and/or service; they “may participate in professional and scholarly research and may request that individual research projects be included in the specific responsibilities assigned.” Because of this potential desire for an aspect of independent research in their duties, they are the only constituency, other than Faculty, that uses a tenure-track model (although it is used quite differently in so far as librarians ranks are distinct job classifications; a very successful librarian might well spend a career in a Librarian I position). In performing such scholarly activities, they would also be augmenting the primary mission of the University. Support generally for university librarians having a tenure-track model is of long standing. The size of the constituency of the Association of Professional Librarians University of Alberta (APLUA) has increased by about 5% in the last 5 years.

- APOs’ duties are principally administrative. The APO Agreement does not make provision for academic freedom. This constituency’s size is the most variable of AASUA’s constituencies and has been experiencing growth (>23%) in the past five years, the second-greatest in a period when the membership of AASUA has decreased slightly.

- FSOs’ duties focus principally on service in support of research and teaching, and other duties required by their departments/faculties/units. FSOs are the fastest growing constituency in the past 5 years but their total remains relatively small.

---

52 Tenure process and ranks are detailed in section 3 of this report.


• CAS:T perform duties in support of teaching. Although the number of members has been decreasing in the past 5 years, the overall FTE has increased. It is expected that this constituency will be highly affected by the 2013 provincial budget, but numbers are not yet available.

• SOTS perform duties as needed by the unit in research, teaching, and service. The number of members at any one time is all but indeterminable. It is expected that this constituency will be highly affected by the 2013 provincial budget, but numbers are not yet available.

• TRAS perform duties as needed by their supervisor in Administration, Research, Teaching, and Library/Information depending upon the job family to which they belong. Their numbers have decreased in the past five years. TRAS are typically employed through grants obtained by academic faculty.

Together, TRAS, SOTS, CAS:T, and FSO are constituencies that, although differentiated by funding source and contract model, support one or another facet of the University’s mission. Each requires advanced levels of formal training and education, and expertise. There appears to be little consistency in the duties of members of these groups across campus. For example, the Faculty of Science employs FSOs to lead labs, while the Faculty of Engineering employs them as instructors and research support staff, and the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry as teachers. As such, misunderstandings abound about what the duties members of any of these constituencies might entail.

Figure 2.2 details the protections and duties of AASUA constituencies according to the collective agreements. Figure 2.3 details the protections and duties of AASUA constituencies as the Renaissance Committee could determine them from stakeholder meetings. From a consideration of both figures, it is apparent that substantial overlap exists between and among the constituencies’ performance of Scholarship. Is there a need, one is justified in asking, for so many constituencies?

In Figure 2.3, which derives from information and understandings gathered by the Renaissance Committee at stakeholder meetings, the duties of an APO expand. The expansion includes elements of research (although clearly most, although not all, APOs research the development of new internal administrative systems). Teaching performed by APOs is a question, but during the course of discussions, it grew apparent that teaching invariably took the form of training rather than the teaching of students enrolled in courses forming part of degree programs. Incidents in which scholarly activities formed part of some APOs’ duties were identifiable. The fact that they exist raises a clear problem with respect to the University’s need to protect all employees performing Scholarship, on the one hand, and the lack of academic freedom for all APOs, on the other. However, by the definition of Scholarship advanced in this report, there appears to be no reason for assigning those who perform Scholarship and those who invariably support it to the same association, and the Renaissance Committee was unable to locate any evidence to justify such yoking. It would thus appear that all APOs performing duties as per their agreement should constitute their own association. Were the Renaissance Committee constituting AASUA de novo, it would not recommend such bundling to the Board of Governors. Distinct associations for those performing and those supporting the performance of Scholarship is the norm at other U15 universities.

---


56 “University of Alberta, Administrative and Professional Officer Agreement, July 2010 (incorporating August 8, 2011 amendments)”: An Administrative and Professional Officer (APO) is “a manager or other professional who provides leadership, strategic advice and direction in the organization; and is accountable for planning, negotiating, problem solving, risk assessment and prevention, and/or operational oversight of resources” (§1.16, p. 2).
Figure 2.2: Protections and Duties of AASUA Constituencies according to the collective agreements.

Figure 2.3: Protections and Duties of AASUA Constituencies as understood from Renaissance Committee meetings with stakeholder constituencies. Note the lines from APO.
Summary of Concerns:

- An overlap in duties and a disparity in protections among the constituencies result in inefficiencies, create inequitable performance measures and a sense of second-tier groups, and encourage unorthodox or otherwise special appointments at the time of hire.
- The constituency composition of the AASUA creates logistical challenges, which are disadvantageous to both the University and academic staff.
- Larger constituencies have stronger negotiating positions; smaller constituencies are underrepresented and benefit at negotiations only from interests that they share with larger constituencies.
- The changes in AASUA demographics indicate that the current structure is no longer appropriate.
- Those who support Scholarship, that is, administration-based constituencies, are poorly represented.
- Those in authority, academic administrators (chairs and above), should not be members of the same association as those over whom they have financial and/or evaluative influence, or disciplinary authority.
- Those in authority often do not understand rights and protections of AASUA constituency members.

Recommendations:

2-14 Create two Scholarship-focused AASUA constituencies for six of the current seven.
2-15 Discuss, to a greater extent than the Renaissance Committee had time for, the advisability of the Board of Governors’ creation of a distinct association for APOs, with adequate protections and means of representation.
2-16 Exclude academic staff with administrative appointments (from the level of departmental chair up) from AASUA for the duration of their administrative appointment, and provide them with adequate protections and means of representation for all of their administrative activities (their scholarly activities remaining within the ægis of the AASUA).
2-17 Agree that future negotiations between each of the two associations and the Administration (on behalf of the Board of Governors) involve both wording of agreements and compensation.
2-18 Arrange for negotiations between the Administration and each of four constituencies – a reconstituted AASUA, APOs, Specialized Scholars, and Academic Administrators – to be held separately. (There is no assumption that negotiators for the four constituencies would begin with identical proposals regarding compensation.)

Recommended AASUA Constituency and Administrative Constituencies Structure

Such changes in the demographics of duties as well as their inconsistency within constituencies prompt a recommendation for restructuring AASUA. The recommended structure (Figure 2.4) provides the current level of flexibility to meet the needs of the University but provides more standardization in duties, greater recognition of the protections and performance requirements, and a better arrangement for fair and equitable evaluation that meets the requirements of the University and the members. As well, the Renaissance Committee has encountered trouble understanding why AASUA should include any
employees except those with academic freedom performing Scholarship-based duties. For that reason, it offers the following possible structure to the principals for further investigation and deliberation.

---

**Figure 2.4: New AASUA Constituencies and other Associations.**

**A Tenure-Track Faculty and Librarians Agreement (TTFLA)**

a. **Members**

- Formed from the current members of the academic faculty and librarians who have Scholarship duties as part of their current appointment or were hired with Scholarship duties in their contract. Members of this constituency are evaluated by one set of measures of Scholarship.
- This constituency’s duties focus on Scholarship as defined in this report.
  - Professorial ranks will consist of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor
  - Librarian ranks will consist of Assistant Librarian (tenure-track) and Librarian (tenure-track or tenured).
- The TTFLA continues to provide for flexibility in Scholarship (e.g. Research, Teaching, Service); that is, as is the case at present, a 40%–40%–20% normal appointment will not be mentioned. What would be mentioned is that faculty members may undertake short (three-year) terms, renewable once, of variation in their appointment. The agreement should stipulate that Scholarship requires that no one of the three elements should form less than 15% of a member’s work. The only exceptions are as follows:
  - Assistant professors or assistant librarians, whose service required for tenure would amount to less than 15% of their time over the course of the probationary period;
  - Clinical Faculty with high clinical duties (e.g. 85% clinical and teaching, 10% research, 5% service or some similar combination)
b. Evaluation
- All members of this agreement would participate in the same evaluation process to ensure that the same rigor is applied to assess Scholarship.
- All members of this agreement would participate in the same process to ensure that the same rigor is applied to assess the performance of Scholarship in the awarding of tenure.
- For promotion to Professor, faculty would participate in a process based on performance.
- All assessments would be made based on clearly written levels of expectation for the different aspects of Scholarship.
- Progression through the faculty ranks should be indicative of the definitions provided in section 3 of this report for the professoriate or on the requirements of employment for librarians.
- Expectations of performance for yearly rank progression would have to be clarified in writing by chairs/direct supervisors in advance of the beginning of the period under review.
- Standards of expectation for tenure and promotion would be based on the recognition of the scholar within her/his field of research, teaching, or other aspects of Scholarship and service to the community; meeting rank progression expectations should not be understood to indicate that standards for tenure and promotion have also been met.

c. Rights
- Members of TTFLA would have academic freedom.
- Members of TTFLA would have a performance-based path to tenure with rigorous standards.
- Members of TTFLA would be eligible for a twelve-month sabbatical leave after every six years of full-time service or a six-month leave after every three years.

d. Employment
- Members of either constituency would not normally be eligible for transfer from one constituency to the other (TTFLA to Specialized Scholar Agreement).
- A contingency clause would form part of both agreements, applicable to all members without a tenure-track or tenured position, or with a tenurable or tenured position funded from the University’s operating budget.

A Specialized Scholars Agreement (SSA)

a. Members
- The current members of the constituencies FSO, SOTS, CAS:T, and TRAS, and librarians that have no scholarly duties in their contract should not be eligible for tenure or placed in the tenure-track process. This agreement would also cover APOs even if, presumably because of expertise/accreditation, individual APOs have Scholarship responsibilities added occasionally or permanently to their duties.
- All academic staff on continuing, short-term, and long-term contracts would be represented by this agreement.
- Duties would be focused on Scholarship or in support of Scholarship, with the current flexibility found in FSO agreement.
- Ranks would consist of SS I, SS II, and SS III, based on levels of responsibilities and expected performance.
- Constituents defined as SS would have as a condition of their appointment one category of Scholarship above 65% and one less than 15% (for example, teaching >65%, research <10%, service < 25%); if not, the position must form part of the TTFLA.

b. Evaluation
• This constituency would participate in an evaluation process similar to the one recommended in section 3 for faculty to ensure that assessments of the performance of Scholarship are routinely rigorous and thorough.
• Assessments would have to be based on expected levels of duties.
• Performance expectations would have to be clearly laid out; Recognition of Scholarship Excellence (RoSE) awards will be made to those applicants who have, during the reporting period, been judged to exceed expectations.

c. Rights
• All staff covered by the SSA would have academic freedom but not a path to tenure.
• In order to enhance their Scholarship, all SSs would be eligible to apply for a six-month sabbatical leave after every six consecutive years of full-time service.

d. Employment
• Members of either constituency would not normally be eligible for transfer from one constituency to the other (Tenure-Track Faculty – Librarians Agreement to SSA).
• A contingency clause would form part of both agreements, applicable to all members without a tenure-track or tenured position, or with a tenurable or tenured position funded from the University’s operating budget.
• If the need for a position is ongoing or multi-year in nature a colleague performing at or above expected levels of performance in the same position for three consecutive years would have to be offered a continuing appointment.

It is apparent to the Renaissance Committee that the principals need to deliberate further about
I  the advisability of according APOs their own association, and
II  the advisability of and strong need for accommodation outside AASUA to be made for faculty serving as administrators (from the level of departmental chair up); they should not form part of AASUA during their term as an administrator.

I  The APO Agreement would need to be altered as follows to accommodate a new association:
   a. Members
• The duties of members of the APO Association are largely administrative57:
   An APO is a manager or other professional who provides leadership, strategic advice and direction in the organization; and is accountable for planning, negotiating, problem solving, risk assessment and prevention, and/or operational oversight of resources.
• The membership would consist of members currently represented by the APO Agreement and TRAS APOs.

   b. Evaluations
• Evaluations would occur based on yearly goals and job description.
• Expectations of performance would have to be clarified in writing by chairs/direct supervisors in advance of the beginning of the period under review.

57 The required job duties of some individuals, including both significant amounts of scholarly and administrative duties, may warrant jointly appointing them in SSA and APO groups to ensure protection of academic freedom for those elements of their duties.
c. Rights
   • Members hired under a revised APO agreement would not have academic freedom.
   • Members would be able to transfer into the SSA if
     • they have shown the experience, expertise, and growth to undertake Scholarship
       independently or as part of their duties;
     • they have made clear contributions to Scholarship as part of their ongoing duties; and
     • they have clear intentions, in the best interest of the institution, of pursuing Scholarship
       and being evaluated in large part on their performance of it.

d. Employment
   • A contingency clause would form part of the agreement.

The APO constituency must have representation, an association to speak on behalf of its members at
compensation negotiations and to ensure their protection. These three constituencies, covered by TTFLA,
SSA, and APO Agreement, inside and outside AASUA, would have the same benefits and pension plan
provisions as currently exist differentially for each of the seven constituencies of AASUA.

II Academic Administrators
The Renaissance Committee further advises that
Academic administrators (chairs and above) have their membership in the Faculty Association
suspended during the tenure of their administrative posting. It is critical that these individuals be
given legal protection related to their administrative work. It is also critical that these individuals
retain the types of protection given all academic faculty related to academic freedom and the
performance of scholarly activities. This protection ensures that those in authority should not be
members of the same association as those over whom they have financial and/or evaluative
influence, or disciplinary authority.

III Separate Negotiations
Compensation negotiations between the Administration and each of four constituencies – a
reconstituted AASUA, APOs, SSs, and Academic Administrators – should be held separately.
(There is no assumption that negotiators for the four constituencies would begin with identical
proposals regarding compensation.)

Changes in the structure by which academic staff have representation would address a number of matters:
• APOs being part of an association distinct from academic faculty would align with structures at
  most other U15 universities and would allow APOs to negotiate in their best interests;
• This alternative structure would permit AASUA to focus on the two constituencies of academic
  staff for whom Scholarship is paramount. An arrangement of two constituencies, having similar
duties, terms of reference, evaluation processes, and benefits, would enable excellent
representation and bring the University into line with most comparator universities.
• Conducting scholarly activities, on the one hand, and facilitating/expediting/supporting those
  activities, on the other, are fundamentally different categories of employment, the one requiring
  academic freedom, the other not, each requiring distinct mechanisms of evaluation.
• The status quo of AASUA’s organization and negotiations on behalf of the membership has
  resulted typically in positional bargaining focusing on a very few least-objectionable, common
  items, especially percentage increases to salary scales. Consequently, finely detailed, common-
  interest bargaining has not been possible. Moreover, it has been impossible to use negotiations in
  any regular fashion to fine-tune agreements to meet the specific needs and issues facing each
constituency, and to do so in a manner that also best represents the interests of the University. This barrier has been exacerbated by the separation of discussions of agreement wording and compensation, as well as by the infamously slow rate at which change comes about through the current alternative mechanism: agreement review committees.

- Those in authority should not be members of the same association as those over whom they have financial and/or evaluative influence, or disciplinary authority.
Section 3—Evaluation, Recognition, and Reward for Performance of Scholarly Activities

The previous section focused on the scholarly and non-scholarly activities conducted by academic staff at the University of Alberta. It is apparent from previous task forces’ reports that the panoply of activities undertaken by AASUA staff members leads too often to stress and poor work life balance. Some of this is an inevitable consequence of being scholars, but not all. The University’s culture and tradition exert stress that may not be necessary. In this section, the report focuses on the linkages among required scholarly duties, the breadth of scholarly activities, and the importance of nurturing scholarly development of junior members, of evaluating evaluation processes, and of studying the associated reward system.

Guiding Principles

- Scholarly activities, broadly defined, form the heart of the University of Alberta, and they are conducted by the academic staff.
- The support of Scholarship\(^ {58} \), including administrative activities performed by different constituency groups, is critical to the effective functioning of the University. However, there is a critical distinction between supporting and conducting Scholarship.
- The evaluation and reward of excellence in Scholarship is the core act of accountability for academic staff.
- All who perform Scholarship must be rewarded equitably, recognizing both the developmental progression within their rank, and for the excellence of their specific scholarly activities.
- All facets of Scholarship should be recognized, evaluated, and rewarded in proportion to the contribution to an individual’s required job duties.
- Scholarly activities, regardless of who performs them, should be evaluated and rewarded using a single system.
- Rigorous and multi-faceted evaluation of teaching is important for all academic staff.
- Evaluation of teaching should include all aspects of teaching in a staff member’s assignment, including a variety of instructional contexts (courses/seminars/labs/studio work); graduate student supervision and supervision of fieldwork; mentoring in research labs; course development, teaching innovations; curriculum design, and other teaching responsibilities.
- Best practice in teaching evaluation advises that evaluation have multiple sources of information, collected through a variety of methods and assessed at multiple points in time.\(^ {59} \)
- Evaluation of teaching will consider the effectiveness of teaching, but also the Scholarship of teaching (rigorous examination and generation of knowledge about how specific content is best taught and how learning occurs within specific disciplines).
- Evaluation of teaching will examine the connections between teaching and research and how it is realized in course design, teaching approaches, and student learning.
- The evaluation of an individual’s scholarly activities should be compared to broad international and national standards; it should not be influenced by the performance or rank of other individuals within an administrative unit.

\(^ {58} \) Defined in section 2.

• Required non-scholarly job duties, such as administrative work, should be recognized and rewarded, but through a separate evaluation system.
• Individuals in the same constituency should have consistent job expectations, evaluative systems, and opportunity for rank and salary advancement. Although individual units should have input on the academic directions of the unit, issues related to evaluation and promotion should be not be left to the discretion of unit heads.
• A system of evaluation and reward must avoid structural and procedural biases associated with cultural and demographic differences among faculties, departments, and individuals; it must account for differential expectations and opportunities among ranks; it must be consistent and fair in the handling of leaves.
• A deferred salary structure has the potential to inflict disproportionate hardship on junior faculty.
• An effective system of evaluation and reward will require, to the extent possible, limited expenditures of time, money, and emotions of the employer and employee.

Key Problems:

• There is confusion among employers and employees regarding job expectations, and how (or if) they map onto evaluation and reward. Additional confusion exists regarding the definition of meritorious work, and how that relates to incrementation outcomes.
• The existing faculty evaluation committees demonstrate substantial variability in cultural practices (e.g. quotas by department, block voting, etc.), not all of which may accord with existing collective agreements. This variation results in different increment distributions, as a function of home faculty, which influences salary trajectories and perceptions of fairness. Although these practices may 'streamline' the process, it is not clear they enhance the ability to identify and reward scholarly excellence.
• A perception that teaching is undervalued by FECs is widespread at the University.
• Similarly widespread is a perception that promotion and tenure processes place a disproportionate weight on research outcomes.
• The inappropriate use of, and reliance on, the Universal Student Rating of Instruction (USRI) as a measure of teaching effectiveness has rendered it suspect in the view of many.
• Current evaluation of teaching focuses on course-based evaluation without sufficient recognition of the broad base of teaching duties. The instruction of courses is only a portion of the teaching responsibilities of many academic staff. Graduate student supervision, mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in laboratories, supporting graduate students as they acquire teaching experience, course design, and curriculum development, along with other activities, are important components of teaching and are currently underrepresented in evaluation and recognition.
• Existing policies at the University of Alberta, as found in the GFC Policy Manual and Faculty Agreement, contain statements highlighting the importance of teaching, the need for formative and summative evaluation of teaching, and the requirement that evaluation of teaching be multifaceted. GFC policies in particular give context and structure to the concept of teacher-scholar and embrace a broad view of Scholarship, including the Scholarship of teaching (§111.2, §111.3). However, there is little evidence that these policies are consistently applied in most FEC committees’ decisions in the awarding of merit or for tenure/promotion decisions.
• The University of Alberta, along with other research-intensive universities, asserts that, because “research informs teaching,” the University distinguishes itself from other post-secondary institutions. The Renaissance Committee found no evidence that the University of Alberta has policies that support, measure, or reward the link. The published research on the research-informs-teaching claim clearly

60 As defined in section 2 and Appendix 3.
discusses it in terms of teaching done in the classroom. It does not extend its findings to claim that the effectiveness of teaching that occurs in a lab or in a discussion during office hours is uninformed by a scholar's research, and it seems preposterous to assert that such a link does not exist in such settings.

- Faculty-level allocations of merit incrementation create several problems. First, when incrementation is included for individuals at salary ceiling, then inequities emerge because faculties vary in their numbers of individuals at salary ceiling. This variation in turn affects the standard from one faculty to the next with respect to what a colleague needs to achieve in order to garner one or another level of incrementation. Second, faculty-level allocations assume that all faculties contain, on average, equally meritorious academic staff. This assumption is unlikely to be valid, given the large number of faculties, including many that are smaller than some departments. Third, by comparing the scholarly performance of individuals in a faculty, rather than evaluating them against an external standard, the FEC process uses a relativistic approach to evaluation, which limits any ability to link FEC outcome to Scholarship excellence.

- Different standards and timing of eligibility for tenure exist between academic faculty and librarians. As tenure is intended to be a University-wide award, it is unclear why standards differ.

- Data are woefully insufficient regarding tenure and promotion for all constituencies. As scholars are the heart of the institution, and their career progression is of fundamental importance to the institution, this is of major concern. That the committee could not gain an answer to the question, “what percentage of individuals is denied tenure?” indicates a problem related to decentralization and the consequent lack of central oversight.

- Having a salary trigger for promotion to Full Professor appears out of date and indefensible on academic grounds. It likely was a reasonable option when salary grids were respected, rather than worked around.

- In all evaluation systems currently used, it is unclear how activity vs. excellence is being rewarded, and to what extent. The Librarian Evaluation Committee and APO evaluation systems are of particular concern regarding the pattern of incrementation outcomes. Within FECs, there appears to be unjustifiable biases against FSOs and junior faculty – to the benefit of senior faculty. It is unclear why specific FECs are given authority to determine the degree by which individuals are assessed, given that the result is substantial variation for individuals performing the same work at the same level of quality in different faculties.

- The ability of existing evaluation groups to evaluate critically the quality of administrative work performed by academic staff appears limited. It is unclear why such non-scholarly work is bundled into the evaluation, recognition, and reward of scholarly activities.

Recommendations:

3-1 Disband the current FEC system, but retain salary reward for scholarly activities (currently called merit). The new system must use external standards for evaluation rather than the current practice of relativistic measures of performance.

3-2 Arrange for all scholars to be evaluated using the same evaluation structure, with constituency-specific evaluation committees. Non-scholarly activities should be evaluated separately.

3-3 Substantially reduce the number of committees evaluating the excellence of scholarly activities to anywhere from 3 to 6. Such committees will be formed around scholarly discipline, not faculty boundaries. Cultural practices within a unit should not be allowed to influence the salary trajectories nor the process by which scholars are evaluated.

3-4 Enhance consistency in the size of comparator groups used for evaluation, at both the small-unit and large-unit levels.
3-5 Assign all scholars an explicit ratio of expected duties, to be included in all annual reporting forms, either as a codification of a 40%-40%-20% Research-Teaching-Service ratio, or, in more individualized fashion, a negotiated outcome allowing for concentration or specialization in different aspects of Scholarship. The average of these amongst all scholars within a faculty would give an indication of differential scholarly emphasis in that unit.

3-6 Through negotiated agreement between the scholar and appropriate administrators (e.g. chair, dean), allow for variance over time of an individual’s ratio of expected job duties in order to accommodate evolving interests and abilities. Such changes must be in the best interests of both the employee and the employer and cannot be imposed by either.

3-7 Evaluate all scholars, including tenure-track faculty, librarians, and specialized scholars, in accordance with the broad definition of Scholarship provided in section 2 of this report. These constituencies should be evaluated equitably based on the Scholarship performance measures and the extent to which Scholarship comprises a part of their duties.

3-8 Evaluate all scholarly activities using more than simple metrics (e.g. Impact Factors, USRI); apply multifaceted evaluations to all scholarly activities to allow for identification of scholarly excellence.

3-9 Require all academic faculty seeking a Recognition of Scholarship Excellence (RoSE) award to detail quantitative and qualitative attributes of their individual Scholarship in their report. The committee recommends minimizing redundancy in the reporting of scholarly activities, and therefore recommends that the form required by all three of the Tri-Councils – CCV – be adopted for the quantitative aspects of reporting. Qualitative aspects could include the following:

- one-page summary of the Scholarship objectives, efforts, and obstacles
- further details (250 words) for each of the critical aspects (e.g. research, teaching, mentorship) of that reporting period’s Scholarship, focusing on impact and audience as defined in section 2.

3-10 Establish a Teaching Strategy for the University of Alberta that reviews and updates the teaching and learning policies currently in place in the GFC Policy Manual, and determines implementation of those policies.

3-11 Create specific, transparent policies for teaching evaluation to guide annual reviews, contract renewal decisions, and decisions on tenure and promotion. (As, for example, delineated in the CAUT model policy on the evaluation of teaching performance, create policies and procedures that allow recognition of all aspects of teaching duties performed by academic staff.)

3-12 Establish a committee to redesign the USRI questions, ensuring a reliable and valid tool that meets international standards for summative evaluation, provides a degree of formative feedback, minimizes the potential for derogatory feedback, ensures value to the students who participate in the process, and aligns with the University’s Teaching Strategy. To ensure movement on this recommendation, establish a two-year limit on implementation.

3-13 If changes to the USRI are not accomplished within two years (end of Fall term, 2015), declare in a joint AASUA/Admin announcement a moratorium on their use.

---

61 Section 2, above.

62 Section 2, above.

63 In which case, if excellence is more difficult to determine because of job descriptions and limitations, the level of reward should be provided mostly through rank progression, not through RoSE.

64 Appendix 4 comprises information gathered for reporting purposes.
3-14 Provide leadership, support, and resources further to encourage teaching development and teaching Scholarship at the University of Alberta.

3-15 Standardize reporting periods for all evaluation committees.

3-16 Through the evaluation of scholarly activities, adjust salary for both recognition of rank progression (RP award) and recognition of Scholarship excellence (RoSE award).

3-17 At the departmental or other small-unit level, by means of a committee that includes the chair, perform annual RP evaluations and nominate colleagues to compete for RoSE awards. Eligibility for the RoSE award would be no more frequent than every other year, and adjudication would be by committees comprising several faculties.

3-18 Scrutinize the process of recognition and reward for the performance of non-scholarly activities (e.g. administration), and, separate from the negotiated pool available to recognize scholarly activities, negotiate a pool of money to reward and recognize such activities.

3-19 Evaluate members of separate constituencies by separate committees; following the recommendation for two Scholarship constituencies for a reconstituted AASUA, create structures for tenure-track scholars, and for specialized scholars.

3-20 Award salary increases related to scholarly activities by deploying a binned system (by rank) to ensure equity in the awarding of RoSEs.

3-21 Require all scholarly evaluation committees to use external standards for the assessment of Scholarship, reaching decisions by reference to agreed-upon external standards rather than to colleagues’ performance.

3-22 If the recommendation to disband the President's Review Committee is adopted, provide the provost, and exhort him/her to use, more authority in oversight in the evaluation processes related to Tenure, Promotion, and the awarding of RP and Recognition of Scholarly Excellence (RoSE) awards (the committee believes strongly that variance in the expectations for salary increases, tenure, and promotion should be minimized).

3-23 For the awarding of RoSEs, use a binned system to ensure that all aspects of Scholarship be rewarded in proportion to the expected achievement/attainment/performance of them.

3-24 Treat leaves centrally, with an aim of equivalence across all committees evaluating scholarly performance.

3-25 Standardize the timing and process for tenure for all eligible constituencies. Require external letters to allowing external standards to be considered during evaluation. (If the required job duties do not allow for external assessment, the committee questions why protection of academic freedom is needed.)

3-26 Establish a mandatory and centralized approach to the collection of data related to tenure and promotion for all scholarly constituencies. As this is a core aspect of the academic functioning of the University, the Renaissance Committee suggests that this not be left to Human Resource Services for management.

3-27 Evaluate rank progression (RP) and scholarship excellence (RoSE) separately.

3-28 Replace the current salary trigger for promotion to Full Professor with a time-based trigger; the committee suggests six years, with consideration for early promotion with approval by the provost.

3-30 Ensure regular communication from the Office of the Provost, with specific feedback to individual evaluation committees and general feedback to academic staff regarding best practices and areas of emerging concern.
Relationship to the Terms of Reference

The Renaissance Committee shall respond to the current underlying academic compensation pressures faced by the University of Alberta. Consistent with this charge and extending from it, The Renaissance Committee shall negotiate terms that include, but are not limited to: ...the enhancement and revision of processes deployed by faculty evaluation committees, the redesign and simplification of salary schedules for professors, FSOs, and librarians, the negotiation, as discrete items, of merit pay and of adjustments to salary scales, the strengthening of the role of the President's Review Committee with a view to addressing variation across the FECs with respect to the appointment of academic staff, their evaluation, and the granting to them of tenure and promotion.

To respond to these terms, the Renaissance Committee first needed to know, and then assess,
- the current evaluation processes for each constituency, and how these relate to required scholarly and non-scholarly activities;
- the progression through constituency ranks, including probationary periods and conditions for promotion, and the awarding of tenure or continuing appointments where applicable;
- the state of existing evaluation bodies, particularly whether or not they are consistent across campus, equitable in the treatment of individuals, and capable of serving the interests of the employees and the employer.

Current conditions related to recognition, evaluation, and reward of scholarly activities
Who evaluates members of the seven AASUA constituencies, and what is the general process?

In the system of a faculty evaluation committee (FEC), the department chair, or dean (in non-departmentalized faculties), provides the initial evaluation of performance. The evaluator makes a single recommendation to FEC, which is to be based upon all of the scholarly and non-scholarly activities performed during the reporting period. It is expected that chairs (or deans) know the broad field of study such that they have a general understanding of the report’s contents and the chair’s or dean’s assessment. However, the Renaissance Committee notes that, with the existing variation in sizes of departments, it is likely that some chairs have consistently more nuanced understandings of the research activities conducted within their unit than others. For example, several departments have fewer than ten professors (FTE), while others have 60 or more. The largest department on campus has more faculty members than 11 existing faculties. Such high variation in the size of departments may introduce a bias among units during the evaluation of research.

Figure 3.1 illustrates the current means by which the different AASUA constituencies are evaluated, while Table 3.1 provides an overview of the evaluation mechanisms, processes, and outcomes. In general, there are three different ways by which those that perform Scholarship are evaluated: by a committee, by a supervisor and one-up, and/or solely by a supervisor. Of those evaluated by a committee, FSOs, academic faculty, and some CAS:T are reviewed at the faculty level by FECs, librarians have a single Librarian Evaluation Committee (LEC), and other CAS:T are evaluated by faculty-lecturer specific committees formed within a small number of faculties. In all cases identified, supervisors performing evaluation of academic staff are themselves academic staff members, in the same or different constituency groups.

In the current evaluation structure, a single body (group or individual) assesses both the scholarly and non-scholarly job activities an individual performs over a given period of time (typically 12 months). By having these job duties bundled during evaluation, it is unclear to what extent monetary rewards following evaluation are due to which aspects of the required job duties. This presents a challenge if there is an ongoing desire to reward excellence in scholarly activities through the evaluation process.
Some deans have imposed “informal” quota systems on the departmental chairs, giving each an incrementation target to meet for their department. Typically, such quotas are equal for all departments and are set below the per capita allocation (e.g. less than 1.2 or 1.175). This is done as a mechanism to both speed up the process of evaluation and to allow FECs to spend more time assigning than withdrawing increments. At least one faculty assigns differential quotas to departmental chairs. Surprisingly, the major determinant of a department’s quota in a given year is the overall performance at FEC in prior years. This administrative decision is illogical, and the result of the policy is tautological and apparently unnecessarily resistant to change. Further, the algorithms used for developing the specific quota are not made available to faculty members; consequently, individuals are unable to know the standards against which their activities are being evaluated. In some faculty, less than 10% of recommendations from the chairs are overturned by FEC. Hence, restricting – even “voluntarily” – the recommendations a chair is able to make to FEC has the potential to disadvantage (or unfairly advantage) departments and their members.

Following the compilation of the chairs’ recommendations, FEC committees discuss (or not) an individual file, consisting of the initial evaluator’s recommendation (and possibly comments). Typically, members of FEC are not experts in their colleagues’ fields of research (and teaching); evaluation is therefore a challenge. There is reason to believe that there may be as much variation in the types of scholarly activities performed within some faculties as might be found across faculties. For example, in the Faculty of Arts, creative artists and scientists will be evaluated by the same group of individuals. Meanwhile, campus-wide, FECs may or may not be chaired by the dean of the faculty.

A vote is held to determine the increment to be awarded to the individual. FEC composition varies among faculties, with some including all three faculty ranks, and others excluding membership to some ranks. Chairs, in addition to making the original recommendation to FEC, are permitted to vote on the file at FEC. In many faculties, the voting is not anonymous, but instead performed through a show of hands. It was estimated by deans that relatively few recommendations made by chairs are overturned – typically 5%–10%. This result raises concerns over the value-added aspect of FEC in determining incrementation.

At the conclusion of the meetings of a faculty’s evaluation committee, what is reported to the individual colleague is highly variable among faculties, and even departments within faculties. In many cases, the individual receives just a signed letter indicating the increment value awarded by FEC. In other cases, the dean or chair will identify specific and noteworthy items in the file. There is not a consistent practice of use of the FEC process as a mechanism of formative evaluation.
Figure 3.1: Protections and evaluation structure of AASUA constituencies as per stakeholder meetings and collective agreements.
Table 3-1: Evaluation Process of AASUA Constituencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Evaluated by</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty Evaluation Committees</td>
<td>Annual report; chair makes recommendation to FEC; FEC makes final increment decision</td>
<td>Merit increments (0a,b,c,d – 3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Single LEC</td>
<td>Annual report; supervisor makes recommendation to LEC; LEC makes final increment decision</td>
<td>Merit increments (0a,b,c,d – 6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSO</td>
<td>Included in the FEC of faculties that have FSOs</td>
<td>Annual report; chair makes recommendation to FEC; FEC makes final increment decision</td>
<td>Merit increments (0a,b,c,d – 3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS:T</td>
<td>1) FEC – full-time multi-year staff or clinical track (Pharmacy, Physical Education/Recreation, Business, Rehab Medicine) 2) Faculty Lecturer Review Committee (FLEC), or an FEC for Faculty Lecturers (Nursing, Arts) 3) Department chair or dean in non-departmentalized faculties</td>
<td>1) Annual report as determined by Faculty Council – same as for typical academic staff 2) Annual report in format determined by chair or faculty. 3) Annual report in format determined by Faculty Council or department chair or IDQ reviewed by chair</td>
<td>1) Merit – promotion decisions also for some full-time CAS:T; also, performance determination used in reappointment or extension of rolling term 2) increments (merit?), performance review for reappointment 3) increments at end of each year, required up to a certain number, thereafter discretionary; reappointment decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTS</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td>Annual report in format determined by Faculty Council or chair</td>
<td>Increments at end of each year, required up to a certain number, thereafter discretionary; reappointment decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAS</td>
<td>Trust holder</td>
<td>Annual report submitted to trust holder; trust holder submits decision to dean/VP, approved at dean/VP level?</td>
<td>Increments, reappointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>PREP-D supervisor recommendation to dean or vice-president who recommends to provost for approval.</td>
<td>Capped positions are not eligible for increments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Concerns:

The current approach to evaluation introduces several structural sources of concern, potentially serving neither the employer nor the employee. These include the following:

- Having multiple constituencies in the same evaluation committee may create a source of inequity if constituency-specific expectations are not recognized during evaluation.
The evaluation of scholarly activities performed by some CAS:T members varies as a function of their home faculty, rather than from differences in required job duties; for example, a supervisor, FEC, or faculty-lecturer evaluation committee may evaluate a faculty lecturer (CAS:T).

In many cases, individuals with direct authority over others in terms of duties and evaluation, or those who are bargaining with the association on behalf of the institution, are members of (AASAU). This awkwardness introduces concerns regarding potential conflicts of interest.

It is unclear whether evaluation committees, consisting principally of active scholars, are best suited for recognizing and evaluating excellence in non-scholarly activities.

Variation in departmental size is a challenge when it comes to maintaining that all FECs reach decisions more or less fairly.

A number of process issues may introduce bias into the evaluation of individuals across the faculty evaluation committees. These include variable memberships on FEC (including exclusion of ranks), having open rather than secret balloting, allowing chairs to vote “twice” (initial recommendation and then vote at FEC), and the inclusion of departments of highly variable sizes.

The committee recognizes that over time departments increase and decrease in the quality of scholarly activities performed, both because of career changes in individual colleagues and because of changes in a department’s composition. The University’s current allocation of increments to faculties does not offer an easy mechanism by which to reward the true merit of individual files; instead, it forces a zero-sum scenario on faculties. However, instilling differential quota (or targets), in the absence of a transparent and external set of criteria for departmental assessment, raises great potential for inequitable treatment of individuals of equal merit.

The fact that less than 10% of all chairs’ recommendations are adjusted by FEC raises substantial questions about the need for the current FEC system.

Recommendations:

3-1 Disband the current FEC system, but retain salary reward for scholarly activities (currently called merit). The new system must use external standards for evaluation rather than the current practice of relativistic measures of performance.

3-2 Arrange for all scholars to be evaluated using the same evaluation structure, with constituency-specific evaluation committees. Non-scholarly activities should be evaluated separately.

3-3 Substantially reduce the number of committees evaluating the excellence of scholarly activities to anywhere from 3 to 6. Such committees will be formed around scholarly discipline, not faculty boundaries. Cultural practices within a unit should not be allowed to influence the salary trajectories nor the process by which scholars are evaluated.

3-4 Enhance consistency in the size of comparator groups used for evaluation, at both the small-unit and large-unit levels.

What are the expected job duties of Academic Staff, in relation to Evaluation and Reward?

A critical principle of an effective evaluation system is that expected job duties are clear to the employee and employer, and that rewards follow in proportion to performance of the required duties. The committee cannot find evidence showing that this principle is generally met in the evaluation of academic staff at the University of Alberta, particularly of the professoriate.

The specific job duties expected of academic staff are outlined in differing degrees of detail depending upon constituency group, and they vary by administrative units. The committee is unaware of any constituency group whose members are consistently told how their actual job duties align with expected job duties and the resulting monetary reward. The abyss between performance and the outcome of
evaluation is particularly sharp for academic faculty and is a long-standing source of job stress and frustration.\textsuperscript{65}

Among academic faculty, there is a mythical narrative that the job consists of a percentage split of approximately 40\%-40\%-20\% among teaching, research, and service duties. However, this arrangement is not codified in the appropriate academic agreement, and it does not appear to be ‘standard’ amongst the over 2000 members of the professoriate. Moreover, individuals typically do not believe that it represents the informal weightings used by the faculty evaluation committees to reach decisions on incrementation.\textsuperscript{66} To the committee’s knowledge, only one faculty explicitly indicates the expected job duty ratios and uses that information in its faculty evaluation committee.

Further to this, the President’s Review Committee has stated the following:

The general understanding is that faculty must be evaluated on the basis of research, teaching, and service; usually expressed in the 40\%-40\%-20\% formulation although that standard is not expressed in the University/Faculty Agreement, and is in practice, disappearing as the most common workload formula in the Academy. In many faculties, research receives the greatest weight in assessing merit; teaching evaluation methods need to be improved and diversified service contributions better understood and evaluated.\textsuperscript{67}

Despite there being no standard practice to formally indicate to the employee the expected job duty percentages, the various constituencies’ collective agreements have language that allows for short- and long-term flexibility in duties. Although some accommodations are (typically) informally made for individuals in relation to reduced teaching in order to expedite short-term research or administrative opportunities, there is value in extending this practice to the entire professoriate. Furthermore, without explicit job duties listed for each employee, it is unclear how any evaluation group can ensure proper assessment of performance relative to expectation.

Summary of Concerns:

The current approach to an informal linkage between expected job duties, evaluation, and reward introduces several structural sources of concern, potentially serving neither the employer nor employee. These include:

- Ambiguity in the linkage between expected job duties and activities rewarded through evaluation could create detrimental shifts in the activities performed by employees. For example, failure explicitly to reward excellence in all forms of teaching poses a risk to the quality of undergraduate and graduate programs. Similarly, lack of importance placed upon service to the institution during evaluation is unlikely to enhance mentorship opportunities and the degree of engagement on campus, or for academic faculty to regard administration as an important and valued use of their time.

- By not explicitly discussing mutually-agreeable changes to expected job duties over short and long time-scales, the University may be missing out on opportunities to benefit from shifting skills and interests in its employees. Employees who feel able to contribute in varied scholarly ways over their career are likely to be more engaged and/or have reduced work-life stress if variation in duties for portions of a career were more readily negotiable.


\textsuperscript{67} President’s Review Committee, Report to the Renaissance Committee, 25 July 2013.
• Uncertainty in job clarity introduces unnecessary stress and frustration for an employee. For the employer, such unstated expectations make it difficult to understand the totality of human resource expenditures dedicated to different scholarly and non-scholarly activities.

Recommendations:

3-5 Assign all scholars an explicit ratio of expected duties, to be included in all annual reporting forms, either as a codification of a 40%–40%–20% Research-Teaching-Service ratio, or, in more individualized fashion, a negotiated outcome allowing for concentration or specialization in different aspects of Scholarship. The average of these amongst all scholars within a faculty would give an indication of differential scholarly emphasis in that unit.

3-6 Through negotiated agreement between the scholar and appropriate administrators (e.g. chair, dean), allow for variance over time of an individual’s ratio of expected job duties in order to accommodate evolving interests and abilities. Such changes must be in the best interests of both the employee and the employer and cannot be imposed by either.

3-7 Evaluate all scholars, including tenure-track faculty, librarians, and specialized scholars, in accordance with the broad definition of Scholarship provided in section 2 of this report. These constituencies should be evaluated equitably based on the Scholarship performance measures and the extent to which Scholarship comprises a part of their duties.

How are scholarly and non-scholarly activities evaluated (academic faculty)?
The Scholarship section of this report (section 2) emphasized the critical nature of evaluation of Scholarship in allowing the University to meet its mission and to reward individuals for achievement. Currently, the University has a salary structure that is based in and rewards short-term performance, often focusing on incremental progress without being able to discriminate sufficiently to award longer-term research programs and impact. It is essential that the University’s system of evaluation be fair and equitable. It must also be efficient and allow for the useful gathering of data by the institution through the reporting process.

Evaluation Forms
The current reporting mechanism does not generally allow for substantive comments regarding the impact and context of one’s work. The lack of uniformity that pervades the University’s dozen and a half faculty evaluation committees arises from as many unique reporting forms. This lack of uniformity reduces the ability to collect data or to provide effective understanding and comparison of Scholarship data and performance. The current state of the forms has encouraged superficial, single-measure evaluation of vital aspects of Scholarship. It is also unclear that all aspects of Scholarship are included, recognized, or evaluated. This fragmentary aspect hinders the evaluation and formation process, and it does not support the interests of the University. Furthermore, the current forms exacerbate workload for faculty, as many must create period-specific curriculum vitae for granting and other agencies.

---

68 Section 2, above.

69 Section 2, above.

70 In which case, if excellence is more difficult to determine because of job descriptions and limitations, the level of reward should be provided mostly through rank progression, not through RoSE.
Evaluation of Research

An interesting aspect of the annual merit evaluation process is that there is no requirement by any academic administrator to offer an absolute assessment of the merits of an individual’s research activities. Instead, because increments are allocated and awarded at the faculty level, assessments are made in relation to others within the faculty, not to an external standard. This habit introduces a number of inequities, and is unlikely to serve the long-term interests of the employee or employer. For example, there is a fine line between a chair’s explaining to FEC how the department conducts research and thus should be evaluated, and setting a context that is intended to favour those from the chair’s home department at the expense of individuals in other departments. The potential for gamesmanship is likely enhanced in faculties in which differential quotas have been assigned to the chairs and their departments. These concerns are largely less severe in the evaluation for tenure and promotion, as these require external letters of evaluation, and thus should be less prone to influence by internal politics.

In most of the FECs, particularly in the larger faculties, the evaluation and assessment are made by individuals well outside the scholar’s own broad field of study (e.g. choir conducting vs. economics; particle physics vs. field ecology). When this factor is combined with the ‘statistical’ nature of most FEC forms, FEC members are typically required to rely on bibliometrics (for example, impact factors, citations, etc.) as indicators of the quality of individually published works. Unfortunately, there is now substantial evidence to indicate that such metrics yield a flawed means by which to assess the work of the individual.\textsuperscript{71} Thus, although there appears to be a widespread perception that the faculty evaluation committees are better able to assess research performance than teaching, the Renaissance Committee was unable to find anecdotal or other published information to corroborate this perception. Further, those FECs that most heavily rely on bibliometrics (for example, by requiring them to be included on FEC reporting forms) may be placing unfounded confidence in their ability to measure the quality of colleagues’ research activities. Although, in aggregate, bibliometrics may be useful to deans/chairs for assessing overall output of a larger unit, this is not the primary purpose of evaluation of research through the FEC process.

There appears to be substantial variation among chairs and the faculty evaluation committees in how the ‘merit’ of research activities is evaluated. Some of this variation is necessary to account for different approaches to Scholarship among academic units. However, some of this appears to be due to cultural differences among the faculty evaluation committees, and that has the potential to create unintended inequities across the University. For example, the securing of external research funding is viewed as meritorious in some faculties, while others do not recognize grants but instead focus on the products of those grants (for example, publications).\textsuperscript{72} It would appear troubling that any FEC would choose to limit which types of information can be used to assess research activities – particularly in the context of the early stages of a research career.

Throughout the evaluation process, it appears uncommon for an individual scholar to receive in-depth feedback from any colleague in an academic administrative position regarding the quality of their research activities. This aspect of academic culture at the University of Alberta is likely due to the necessary specialization of research, limiting deep understanding by those outside one’s specific discipline. However, it appears that the FEC review process is also geared towards summative rather than formative evaluation. This inclination logically limits mentorship opportunities and disinclines senior faculty from playing a mentorship role. Some units have formed committees specifically focused on mentoring junior faculty as they progress in their scholarly development; others have not.


\textsuperscript{72} Stakeholder meetings held with the Renaissance Committee, Feb.–Nov., 2013.
Concerns have been expressed to the Renaissance Committee by many stakeholders that the current requirement for a University of Alberta review of research activities may have unintended effects on the types of research activities performed. For example, the annual process (combined with a statistical approach to reported data on the FEC form) is seen to preferentially reward incremental performance of ‘safe’ projects, as opposed to long-term research that may involve risk. Further, the annual reporting format is not effective at measuring the impact of research, as that is not typically known for years. Of additional concern are situations in which an individual conducts a form of research atypical for the culture of an FEC. For example, a long-term scholarly book project appears to be considered differently in Arts than in Science, although it is unclear that either the time invested or potential impact on the respective disciplines differ. The committee notes with concern that individuals may alter scholarly decisions in order to be most rewarded by any of the faculty evaluation committees, rather than making these decisions on purely academic grounds. One benefit of the short-term statistical nature of research reporting and evaluation is that it permits deans/chairs to learn in a timely way what research outcomes colleagues in their units have produced in the previous 12 months. Such as quick ‘snapshot’ does appear effective at an initial assessment in identifying upper and lower performers.

Evaluation of Teaching
The current evaluation of teaching focuses on course-based evaluation, without sufficient consideration or recognition of the broad base of most people’s teaching duties. The instruction of courses is only a portion of the teaching responsibilities that most academic faculty have. Graduate student supervision, mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in laboratories, supporting graduate students as they acquire teaching experience, course design, and curriculum development, along with other activities, are important components of teaching, but they are currently underrepresented in evaluation and recognition processes.

The University of Alberta emphasizes its dual role as an institution focused on the creation of knowledge (research) and the dissemination of that knowledge (teaching and learning). Its policy documents support this role in strong terms, emphasizing the links between teaching and research as central to the purpose of a university, especially a research-intensive university. In keeping with this recognition, the role of faculty as teachers is of “major importance” in annual reviews, and in decision regarding promotion and tenure.

Policies about the evaluation of teaching affirm the importance of teaching, with both GFC and the Faculty Agreement stating the need for “broad-based” or multifaceted evaluation of teaching that serves both formative and summative purposes.

The Teaching and Learning section of the General Faculty Council Policy Manual is an integrated and literature-based declaration of the importance of teaching, and the methods by which quality of teaching is assessed. However, discussion with stakeholders indicated that the GFC vision is infrequently practised by FECs. Although annual reporting mechanisms for different faculties have some component of a multifaceted approach to teaching evaluation, it is clear these approaches are used inconsistently and often.

---

73 GFC Policy: Teaching and Learning, §111.1.
74 Faculty Agreement, §13.05 (a).
75 Faculty Agreement, §13.06.
76 GFC Policy: Teaching and Learning, §111.2.
ignored in annual evaluations. Long-standing emphases on University Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) and a long-standing frustration with that emphasis were apparent in stakeholder discussions. Some reported that a single item on the current USRI, “The instructor was excellent,” was often the only item to find its way to FEC in an annual assessment.

Previous examinations of USRI use at the University of Alberta were made by the Committee on the Learning Environment\textsuperscript{77} and the AASUA.\textsuperscript{78} They resulted in similar recommendations: that the University develop a reliable and valid measure that aligns with the goals of teaching at the University of Alberta, and use the tool as only one component of a broad view of teaching effectiveness.\textsuperscript{79} The USRI is an insufficient indicator of teaching effectiveness; that is the opinion even of those who regard the tool as reliable and valid.

A particularly problematic aspect of student evaluations is student anonymity, which has raised issues of abuse, academic misbehaviour, and equity. The question of anonymity must be addressed; it is imperative that students take ownership of their responses. Doing so would lead to fewer – perhaps no – cases of abusive, unethical, sexist, or threatening language. The University must protect the identity of students but also the well-being of its teaching staff. It can do so by creating a set of questions that would no longer require a freeform section on the evaluation, removing the occasion for abusive statements. Stakeholder meetings strongly suggested devising a University of Alberta set of questions on the USRI that meet the needs of that dimension of the evaluation of the effectiveness of one’s teaching. This should be done with the Centre for Teaching and Learning and student representatives. If agreement cannot be reached within two years, a moratorium on USRI is warranted.

A recent report on Student Attributes and Competencies met with approval. USRI, as they stand, would not allow for teaching evaluation in comparison with these competencies and attributes; there are arguments that they should not, since students could well complete several courses in order to develop competencies.

Feedback from students is an essential component of teaching evaluation.\textsuperscript{80} Obtaining student feedback can be accomplished in a variety of ways including student interviews, student work samples or publications, results of standardized (national) exams where available, and course evaluations. Formal course evaluations are the typical format for student feedback on teaching effectiveness. Student evaluation questionnaires have received extensive examination of their value, reliability and validity. There is ample evidence that, when used appropriately and as a part of a broad evaluation of teaching,


\textsuperscript{78} \url{http://www.aasua.ca/en/AboutAASUA/AASUAConstituencyCommittees/~media/aasua/AboutAASUA/Docs/APO_Committee_Reports_2011-2012.pdf}.

\textsuperscript{79} This view was reiterated at the Renaissance Committee’s meeting with colleagues in the Faculty of Education whose expertise is the evaluation of effective teaching.

student evaluations can provide a valid measure of teaching effectiveness. However, the literature also highlights many ways that bias arises in the use of student evaluation questionnaires that have flawed design and implementation.

A rich literature base has explored the challenges and principles of teaching evaluation in higher education. A recent review of these practices in the Canadian context summarized recommendations for evaluation of teaching and for creating an environment that supports and recognizes teaching. Best practices in teaching evaluation emphasize a comprehensive, clear and transparent system and extend to teaching resources, support, and recognition. An effective evaluation system has multiple sources of information, collected through a variety of methods and assessed at multiple points in time.

The University’s stated policies mainly align with recommendations from the literature. The challenge is to bring the University’s practices into line with those policies in order to maintain the credibility of its heralded commitment to the quality of the teaching at this institution.

Stakeholders with expertise in teaching and learning at the University of Alberta acknowledged that it was falling behind other research-intensive universities in Canada in its commitment to and recognition of teaching excellence. The structure of teaching support at the University of Alberta has evolved over the last several years. Historically, the support and development of teaching and eLearning were conducted by separate groups, University Teaching Services and Academic Information and Communication Technologies. These functions were merged to link technology and pedagogy. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) was the result. The Center “provides educational leadership and supports excellence in teaching throughout the university community.” CTL is viewed as a service unit for the University’s community of instructors. This “service unit” view of teaching supports contrasts with initiatives at neighbouring institutions, which were highlighted as examples of institutions investing heavily in teaching and producing exemplary teaching initiatives and/or policies.

The University of British Columbia explicitly equates the value of teaching Scholarship and research Scholarship and includes definitions of Scholarship in teaching and criteria for the evaluation of teaching and the Scholarship of teaching in its faculty agreement. The University of Calgary recently announced the establishment of the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning, with teaching Scholarship innovation as its focus. The University of Saskatchewan Teaching and Learning structure has three components: the University Learning Centre, providing support to students; the Gwenna Moss Center for Teaching Effectiveness, supporting instructors; and the Centre for Discovery in Learning, which supports Scholarship of teaching and learning in a university context. An emphasis on the Scholarship of teaching is evident in these examples. Both the University of Saskatchewan and University of Calgary have vice-provost Teaching and Learning positions, a more focused portfolio, perhaps, than that of the University of Alberta’s vice-provost Academic (Academic Programs and Instruction), and one that signals clearly and prominently the central importance of teaching to those within and without those institutions.

81 Pamela Gravestock and Emily Gregor Greenleaf, Overview of tenure and promotion policies across Canada (University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 2008); http://ocufa.on.ca/members-area/resources/prepare-for-tenure/; accessed 13 July 2013.


Policy documents at the University of Alberta emphasize the essential contribution of research in the delivery of courses. The research/teaching link has not been firmly established despite decades of researchers’ time in search of such a link. If the community wishes to maintain that research-intensive universities are distinguished by a teaching that is informed, stimulating, and enriched by research, this aim should be evident in hiring practices, evaluation procedures, and reward systems. An intentional process to implement this aim could distinguish the University of Alberta from other institutions not just in words but also in policies, practices, and outcome measures.

Teaching in Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Processes

Recommendations on teaching are forwarded to FEC for evaluation by peers that should, with some variance, be performing similar teaching duties. Although the teaching approaches and materials may differ, preferably so in some cases, a more homogeneous peer group than the research evaluators perform the teaching evaluation.

The Renaissance Committee thinks that effective and rigorous evaluation of teaching should be essential for annual reviews and decisions about contract renewal. A full review of teaching contributions and quality is also of central importance in tenure and promotion decisions. In keeping with the definition of Scholarship and the performance measures reviewed in section 2, the committee views it as the role of the scholar to define the value of her/his Scholarship in teaching and contextualize its standards and, if it is the case, excellence. This must be done through data and supporting narrative.

Teaching evaluations for the purpose of tenure and promotion must be multifaceted. The array can include student ratings of courses, a teaching dossier, peer observations, external reviews of content, reflection of the teacher (self-assessment), administrator reviews of content and course observation, review of published work on teaching Scholarship, and evidence supporting the reputation of the teacher in the field(s) of instruction, within and without the University. Evaluation can go beyond teaching activities and include course and instructional method design, implementation, and results. These criteria can be applied to the full complement of teaching duties of the faculty member.

Measure of the impact of teaching on rank progression and excellence should be supported by peers through a yearly or multi-year process at the unit level and through other means available on campus or in units (Triads, Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), teaching dossier). Excellence should be further evaluated at a level over and above the unit level to ascertain and maintain university-wide standards of excellence. For tenure and promotion, review of full career teaching performance at the University and


supported through external letters of support is imperative. A teaching dossier, following CTL standards, should be part of all tenure and promotion packages.

Evaluation of Service
Recognition of service is important and must be highlighted. In contrast to research and teaching, the handling of service appears to be fairly equivalent among the FECs – unfortunately, it appears to be reported and evaluated with less care or rigor than teaching and research. In particular, the committee holds that performance of service should not be treated in the same way as excellence in service; one must not be rewarded simply for doing something others are loath to do. Further, two individuals performing equal service do not necessarily warrant equal evaluation; some, but hardly all, individuals have significant impacts on diverse audiences through their service activities. Paying reduced attention and reward to service activities creates great potential for the faculty evaluation committees unintentionally to negatively impact the collegiality of faculties and the integration of the work of professors into the general public.

Many stakeholders recognize that service is a catchall category combining both scholarly and non-scholarly activities, without the specificity of other areas. For example, elements of mentorship and public engagement are not clearly identified, yet these are critical to the mission of the University and the professional development of staff. There is concern that a failure to recognize and explicitly reward such critical activities reduces not only the willingness of individuals to perform them but also, consequently, the quality of the University. There is a broad perception that individuals approach the faculty evaluation committees in an understandable pragmatic way – focusing scholarly activities on areas that a given FEC has a history or even stated policy of recognizing and rewarding. Importantly, this is not necessarily the same as focusing scholarly activities on all aspects of required job duties (e.g. 20% service in the mythical 40%–40%–20% position).

In its research, the committee has identified the bundling of scholarly and administrative service as an area of particular concern, and it recognizes that administrative activities are critical to the advancement of the University. Individuals performing those services should be duly compensated, through both release from other activities and stipends. Individuals performing such activities with excellence should be compensated even more. However, the committee perceives nothing in the current evaluation system that allows a faculty evaluation committee effectively to differentiate excellence in scholarly activity from excellence in administrative duties.

Evaluation of Administration
It appears that a common practice among FECs is to award an extra 0.5 increment per year to individuals serving as an associate chair or associate dean (FECs do not evaluate chairs or deans). This default tradition appears difficult to justify on anything like rigorous academic grounds, due to the requirement and provision of limited information on the FEC form, as well as a lack of comparator groups for evaluation. Although the committee recognizes that the performance of some administrative duties by academic faculty is vital for the University, it wonders if administrative activities would be more effectively evaluated and rewarded if they were removed from adjudications of FECs and their merit pools.

How are scholarly and non-scholarly activities evaluated (non-faculty academic staff)?

This section focuses on the FSO, APO, CAS:T, Librarian, TRAS, and SOTS constituencies. The processes are briefly described in Table 3.2 and will not be fully repeated here. A significant difference
from procedures for academic faculty is that in all these constituencies, the review of performance is based on criteria of performance set out in the staff member’s job description and assignment of duties.

FSOs, who may perform all forms of Scholarship, undergo the same FEC process as academic faculty. However, FSOs submit an annual report to the chair on University responsibilities for the previous year. The requirements for the report are provided by the chair (FSO Collective Agreement §12.12). Normally, the same form is used for FSO evaluation as is used for the evaluation of faculty.

APO annual reporting is through PREP-D, a form tailored by each individual for reporting roles and responsibilities, core and specific/professional competencies, and key areas of focus and self-assessment of these, including professional development. Assessment is made based on yearly goals set in the previous year by the direct supervisor. PREP-D format does not allow for proper evaluation of Scholarship and is primarily focused on non-scholarly, administrative activities.

AASUA’s website provides for some academic staff (TRAS and SOTS) a PREP-D form for annual reports (with the same stipulated limitation as above), but collective agreements provide no fixed format for the reports. Librarian TRAS can be evaluated as recommended by library council (TRAS collective agreement §12.11). Teaching TRAS submit a report with teaching evaluations (USRI report) and other supporting material (TRAS collective agreement §12.04). Evaluation is the responsibility of the direct supervisor (chair, trust holder).

CAS:T members submit a report to the department chair, in a format determined by the department chair (unless Faculty Council has approved a template), summarizing academic activity during the year. The staff member may append additional pertinent information and may wish to provide additional evidence of scholarly proficiency (CAS:T collective agreement §12.04.2).

Librarians submit an annual report to their supervisor and to the chief librarian on University responsibilities for the previous year. The form for such a report is approved by the LEC on the recommendation of the chief librarian (Librarian collective agreement §7.04). Librarians are a tenure-track constituency, with a shorter probationary period and less extensive requirement for performance measures of Scholarship than academic faculty. LEC requires less clearly delineated expectations and measurements of their attainment than have FECs. In recent years, the performance of research has led to the award of greater incrementation, partly because most librarians who conduct research do so beyond their stipulated duties. The form is reminiscent of the PREPD, but focuses slightly more on scholarship aspects.

In the above cases, where teaching is a recognized duty, evaluation allows for multifaceted sources of data; how often they are deployed is unknown.

Summary of Concerns:

- There are currently as many different FEC reporting forms as there are FECs, despite all academic faculty having essentially the same job, working under the same agreement. Forms are typically statistical in nature, rarely allowing individuals the ability to provide meaningful context and interpretation of the scholarly activities being reported. This arrangement limits the ability of administrators to aggregate data across the University and increases the opportunity for potential inequities to appear in the evaluation process.

---

87 Librarian Stakeholder meetings held with the Renaissance Committee, Oct., 2013.
• There is not a standard composition of the FEC committees; several explicitly exclude ranks of professor.
• FECs inconsistently value different aspects of Scholarship, such as securing external funding, public engagement, and mentorship. There is concern that by increasing, decreasing, or ignoring the importance to some careers of certain scholarly activities, an FEC has the potential to restrict academic freedom or to limit the recognition paid by the University to the attainment of excellence by some colleagues working outside the 40%–40%–20% mainstream.
• The use of bibliometrics as a means of evaluating the quality of individual research activities is inconsistent with current understanding of the structural weaknesses and biases inherent in these measures. Further, reliance on statistical descriptions of scholarly works may give false confidence to an FEC with respect to its capability to differentiate between activity and excellence.
• The evaluation of individual performance is done in a relativistic, rather than absolute, manner. Consequently, other than at tenure and promotion decisions, there is no requirement for grounding evaluations in the context of external standards. This relativistic approach to annual increment evaluation has the potential to reward mediocrity, if a faculty’s dominant culture is predisposed towards it.
• The current system of annual evaluation of research activities may be reducing the willingness of individuals to conduct long-term and high-risk Scholarship. Further, this frequency of evaluation is unlikely to suit formative assessment in a manner that might enhance the development of junior colleagues’ careers.
• There is a widespread perception at the University that teaching is undervalued by FECs, despite strenuous efforts by some faculties in recent years.
• Similarly widespread is a perception that promotion and tenure processes place a disproportionate weight on research outcomes.
• The inappropriate use of, and reliance on, the Universal Student Rating of Instruction (USRI) as a measure of teaching effectiveness has rendered it suspect in the view of many.
• Current evaluation of teaching focuses on course-based evaluation without sufficient recognition of the broad base of teaching duties. The instruction of courses comprises only a portion of the teaching responsibilities of many academic staff. Graduate student supervision, mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in laboratories and in office meetings, supporting graduate students as they acquire teaching experience, course design, and curriculum development, along with other activities are important components of teaching but are currently under-acknowledged in evaluation and recognition.
• Existing policies at the University of Alberta (Faculty Agreement and GFC Policy Manual) contain statements highlighting the importance of teaching and the need for formative and summative evaluation of teaching, and requiring that teaching evaluation be multifaceted. GFC policies in particular give context and structure to the concept of teacher-scholar and embrace a broad view of Scholarship, including the Scholarship of teaching (§111.2, §111.3). However, there is little evidence that these policies are consistently applied in most FECs’ decisions of awards of merit or decisions on tenure and promotion.
• The University of Alberta, along with other research-intensive universities, asserts that, because “research informs teaching,” the University distinguishes itself from other post-secondary institutions. The Renaissance Committee found no evidence that the University of Alberta has policies that support, measure, or reward the link. The published research on the research-informs-teaching claim clearly discusses it in terms of teaching done in the classroom. It does not extend its findings to claim that the effectiveness of teaching that occurs in a lab or in a discussion during office hours is uninformed by a scholar's research, and it seems preposterous to assert that such a link does not exist in such settings.
• A variable and unclear understanding of what activities are being considered hinders the evaluation of service. A lack of specific criteria further reduces the ability of the FEC system to evaluate
rigorously a colleague’s breadth and quality of service activities. Given that service is a required job
duty, service activities are critical to the mission of the University, and mentorship activities
courage the development of colleagues. The committee found surprising the unavailability of
specificity. Further, there is a general feeling that activities that the faculty evaluation committees do
not see, and do not explicitly recognize or reward, will be underperformed by individuals. In the
context of service, this may come at great cost to the University.

- FEC does not seem well suited to evaluate the quality of the performance of administrative activities,
nor does the merit pool seem a logical source of resources by which to reward excellence in
administration.

Recommendations:

3-8 Evaluate all scholarly activities using more than simple metrics (e.g. Impact Factors, USRI);
apply multifaceted evaluations to all scholarly activities to allow for identification of scholarly
excellence.

3-9 Require all academic faculty seeking a Recognition of Scholarship Excellence (RoSE) award to
detail quantitative and qualitative attributes of their individual Scholarship in their report. The
committee recommends minimizing redundancy in the reporting of scholarly activities, and
therefore recommends that the form required by all three of the Tri-Councils – CCV – be adopted
for the quantitative aspects of reporting. Qualitative aspects could include the following:
- one-page summary of the Scholarship objectives, efforts, and obstacles
- further details (250 words) for each of the critical aspects (e.g. research, teaching,
  mentorship) of that reporting period’s Scholarship, focusing on impact and audience as
defined in section 2.88

3-10 Establish a Teaching Strategy for the University of Alberta that reviews and updates the teaching
and learning policies currently in place in the GFC Policy Manual, and determines
implementation of those policies.

3-11 Create specific, transparent policies for teaching evaluation to guide annual reviews, contract
renewal decisions, and decisions on tenure and promotion. (As, for example, delineated in the
CAUT model policy on the evaluation of teaching performance, create policies and procedures
that allow recognition of all aspects of teaching duties performed by academic staff.)

3-12 Establish a committee to redesign the USRI questions, ensuring a reliable and valid tool that
meets international standards for summative evaluation, provides a degree of formative feedback,
minimizes the potential for derogatory feedback, ensures value to the students who participate in
the process, and aligns with the University’s Teaching Strategy. To ensure movement on this
recommendation, establish a two-year limit on implementation.

3-13 If changes to the USRI are not accomplished within two years (end of Fall term, 2015), declare in
a joint AASUA/Admin announcement a moratorium on their use.

3-14 Provide leadership, support, and resources further to encourage teaching development and
teaching Scholarship at the University of Alberta.

3-15 Standardize reporting periods for all evaluation committees.

3-16 Through the evaluation of scholarly activities, adjust salary for both recognition of rank
progression (RP award) and recognition of Scholarship excellence (RoSE award).

---

88 Appendix 4 comprises information gathered for reporting purposes.
At the departmental or other small-unit level, by means of a committee that includes the chair, perform annual RP evaluations and nominate colleagues to compete for RoSE awards. Eligibility for the RoSE award would be no more frequent than every other year, and adjudication would be by committees comprising several faculties.

Scrutinize the process of recognition and reward for the performance of non-scholarly activities (e.g. administration), and, separate from the negotiated pool available to recognize scholarly activities, negotiate a pool of money to reward and recognize such activities.

Is the Scholarship of Constituencies rewarded fairly?

Issues of fairness in salary remuneration can be related to both process and absolute monetary values. The Renaissance Committee took a revenue/expenditure-neutral approach to its analysis of past and current circumstances and to its view of possible future conditions. Thus, fairness here is not discussed in the context of rankings of salaries relative to competitors’; nor is the committee basing its interpretation upon the cost of living in Edmonton; rather, it suggests that the long-term strategic decisions associated with salaries and benefits for all NASA and AASUA members, including central and senior Administration, are of critical importance to the institution. However, the committee also thinks firmly that these decisions and strategies are best served through negotiated settlements between the principals, and long-term visioning by the Board of Governors. Thus, here the committee restricts itself to a discussion of ‘fairness’ of the process and the reasoning that underlie/undergird the remuneration of scholarly achievement by academic staff.

A key piece of data that the committee was able to obtain related to issues of process and fairness. It comprises incrementation outcomes for FECs, LEC, and APO evaluations for varying sets of time. The committee’s examination of these data yielded the observation that the distribution of incrementation outcomes varies widely among constituencies and, with FECs, among the faculties. Some of these differences likely reflect necessary cultural differences associated with different priorities in different disciplines and job classifications on three campuses. Other aspects of these differences are less able to be defended on academic grounds and suggest significant inequities.

Variation in Incrementation Outcomes among Constituencies

The committee posits that an indicator of the ability of an evaluation system to discriminate, in terms of quality, between the activities performed by individuals will be the frequencies with which outcomes of 0.5 and 2.0 increments are awarded. The committee chose these values because they each represent two ‘steps’ away from the negotiated per capita allotment (e.g. 1.0 and 1.5 are each one-step from allotments of 1.1, 1.175, or 1.2). They are also awarded with sufficient frequency to members of some constituencies to allow for meaningful comparisons.

Figure 3.2 indicates the percentage of individuals who were not at salary ceiling when they received a 0.5 (or 1.0 for librarians) in a given year. Because in only one of five years did even a single librarian receive such an increment outcome, concern arises about the ability of LEC to allocate a 0.5 (librarians’ 1.0) increment. Similarly, the evaluation of APOs rarely resulted in such an increment outcome – with a peak at just below 2% of APOs. In contrast, FSOs received 0.5 outcomes most frequently, while academic faculty received them in intermediate amounts; both of these groups are evaluated through FECs. The

---

89 The Renaissance Committee recognizes that the LEC model is different, with twice as many increments of half the value available on a per capita basis; thus, an FEC award of 0.5 corresponds to 1.0 from LEC; a 2.0 by FEC corresponds to 4.0 from LEC.
Renaissance Committee notes the apparent trends of increasing usage of 0.5 for faculty and decreasing usage for APOs.

The committee finds significant the apparent split between FEC and non-FEC evaluation groups in the frequency of awarding 0.5 increments (librarians’ 1.0). These data alone do not permit an identification of whether or not it is in the nature of the librarians’ and APOs’ evaluation processes that renders relatively weaker performances difficult to identify, of whether or not the cultures associated with evaluations of librarians and APOs limit the usage of these increment outcomes, or of whether or not these percentages fairly represent the actual, very low percentages of underperforming individuals in those two constituencies. (The large number of APOs, together with consistency in outcomes by both APOs and librarians, raises doubts regarding the third explanation.)

Although the FECs produce a larger proportion of individuals receiving a 0.5, it is impossible to know whether the values of, respectively, approximately 12% and 6% for FSOs and faculty in 2011-12 represent fairly the quality of scholarly activities. (Compounding the uncertainty is the factor already identified, that increments are awarded in a competitive, relative process, rather than in terms of an external standard. until – normally – all increments are awarded. At the risk of redundancy, the committee notes again that it finds this to be a significant shortcoming of the existing evaluation system, with potentially significant implications for the degree of quality assurance that can be accorded the process.)

Figure 3.2: Percentage of individuals, not at ceiling, receiving a 0.5 (1.0 for librarians) in a given year throughout the University. The committee notes that data for each constituency group represented different time spans. However, data for librarians was available in the same years as for FSOs and academic faculty; thus, the values of zero are ‘true’ rather than indicative of missing data. APO data were available only for three years.

Figure 3.3 represents the percentage of individuals receiving 2.0 increments (4.0 for librarians), by constituency. The committee observes that FSOs are rarely awarded 2.0 through the FEC process, while they are most frequently awarded 0.5 (Figure 3.2). This outcome does not appear to result from an inherent reluctance by FECs to award 2.0s, as they were awarded to over 10% of faculty in 2011-12 (versus <2% of FSOs). Combined, these data raise significant concerns regarding the equitable treatment
of FSOs within the same evaluation committees that evaluate faculty. The data also indicate that FECs regularly award both 0.5 and 2.0 increments to professors. This behaviour may reflect an ability and willingness to differentiate individuals based upon their activities listed on the annual evaluation forms.

By contrast, the LEC and the APO review processes, which both work within job classifications rather than ranks through which individuals are expected and themselves expect to rise, award 2.0 (4.0 for librarians) at nearly the same frequency as do FECs. Both rarely award 0.5 (1.0 for librarians; Figure 3.2). This incidence of higher – but not lower – incrementation should result in a more rapid rate of salary growth than found in other constituencies. It also likely contributes to the higher percentages of librarians and APOs at the ceilings of their grids than is the case for FSOs (Figure 3.4).

The committee recognizes that APOs have substantial opportunity to apply for and obtain new positions on campus, in contrast to opportunities in the other constituencies. Thus, while a salary ceiling for a librarian is essentially a career cap, it is not necessarily the case for an APO. The distinction that APOs have should be taken into account in any discussion of equity and salary scales.

![Figure 3.3: % Receiving 2.0 (of those eligible; 4.0 for librarians)](image-url)
Figure 3.4: The percentage of members of four constituencies who are at salary ceiling in a given year. These data derive from the same data sets presented in Figure 3.3. Note that, as an outcome of salary negotiations, additional steps were added to the salary scales of FSOs, librarians, and APOs starting in 2009.

Variation in Incrementation Outcomes among Academic Faculty, by Rank
A grander window of FEC outcomes for faculty (Figure 3.5) indicates relative stability over time in the pattern of incrementation. Nearly 90% of faculty evaluated at FEC receive a 1.0 increment or more and have done so for over a decade. As well, that approximately 50% of all individuals received exactly 1.0, strongly indicates that this is regarded as the ‘typical’ award by FECs.
Figure 3.5: The percentage of faculty receiving different increment outcomes by FECs over time. The committee sees that a decrease in 0.0 awards for the 2009-10 and 2010-11 years corresponds to additional steps being added to the associate professor salary grid following a negotiated settlement.

Over this period, one finds substantial variation in average incrementation outcome as a function of academic rank (Figure 3.6).

Over the entire time span evaluated, there has been a tendency for the average increment awarded to assistant professors to be less than that awarded to associate professors (not at ceiling), who themselves were awarded, on average, less than full professors. The committee sees that the disparity between full professors and the other two ranks (each averaging less than 1.2) appears to have increased over time.

This inequity among ranks is surprising on several fronts. First, the collective agreement for academic faculty explicitly states that “performance expectations shall increase as a staff member moves through the ranks.” 90 If this is practiced in FECs, one might expect equal outcomes by rank, for those individuals not at salary ceiling. Second, a narrative heard by the committee from several stakeholders is that the University has made a concerted effort to enhance the quality of newly appointed professors over the last eight years through altered recruitment strategies. As will be discussed later, this has been identified as the principal reason for the increased use of market supplements at the point of hire. Thus, if the ‘quality’ of assistant professors is increasing over time, it is thus surprising that the average incrementation awarded to assistant professors has either decreased or stayed level below that of full professors.

There are numerous potential contributors to the pattern of higher levels of incrementation for full professors, including cultural practices within each of the FECs, which could introduce a structural bias in favour of senior faculty (e.g. composition of committee, order in files are discussed and awards made, etc.). Possibly, as well, it is difficult for FECs to identify ‘excellence’ in the activities of junior faculty, relative to the metrics used to identify excellence in the work of senior faculty. For example, a significant part of a junior faculty member’s duties is the establishment of a research group and program. The focus

90 Faculty Agreement, §13.05.
by a junior professor’s FEC on ‘outcomes’ (such as publications) as a measure of performance\(^9\) could
discount the developmental stages of her career. Additional contributors include a culture in some FECs
of automatically awarding 1.0 to new hires, as well as the possibility that the process of tenure and
promotion are effective filters, such that the overall quality of full professors is indeed less variable and
stronger than that of their junior colleagues. The committee recognizes the existence of contradictory
interpretations that do not even exclude each other; however, it appears undeniable that this clear disparity
in incrementation outcome will have significant impacts on the rate of salary accumulation at the early
stage of a professor’s career. The committee suggests that such disparity, if desired, should be made
explicit in policy rather than left to occur on its own.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 3.6:** Average incrementation from FEC for Academic Faculty.

Variation in Incrementation Outcomes among Academic Faculty, by faculty
A critical aspect of the FEC system is that the merit of the individual is assessed within the home faculty,
relative to other individuals within the faculty. This structure contrasts with systems that evaluate relative
to individuals across campus, or that use some external standard. Further, each faculty is awarded a
certain number of increments (currently 1.175) based upon the FTE of its total of academic faculty.
Included in the allotment are increments for associate professors at ceiling, and thus ineligible for any
merit incrementation greater than one or another form of 0.0. Their increments are thus available for
distribution to colleagues not at ceiling. (The committee notes that for APOs and librarians, increments
for individuals at ceiling are not added to the pool for distribution.)

**Figure 3.7** demonstrates that the average incrementation awarded to an individual depends to a
considerable extent on the percentage of individuals within his/her faculty who are at ceiling (whose
remunerative advancement is capped). The 2011–2012 data show two outliers that need explanation. The

\(^9\) Faculty Agreement, §13.01.
first, on the y-axis, is a small faculty, and it appears its dean was given permission to award increments in excess of the per capita quota. The second is a larger faculty, which has a large number of ‘capped’ associate professors (>25% of all faculty in 2007, >15% in 2011). In 2007, this faculty had an average incrementation outcome greater than 1.50 for those not ‘capped.’ In 2011, when this faculty did not award all its quota of increments, the average decreased to approximately 1.2.

One’s incrementation can be influenced by the promotion-status of one’s colleagues, independent of the merits of one’s own work. This fact represents a significant shortcoming of the FEC system. A consequence of it is that individuals in a faculty with a large proportion of ‘capped’ faculty will have a substantially greater salary, over time, than individuals in a faculty with few ‘capped’ faculty – independent of the quality of the Scholarship performed. The committee finds this difficult to justify on academic grounds and does not support an equitable distribution of salary-related funds.

Figure 3.7: Average incrementation awarded to an Academic Faculty member in a faculty, as a function of the percentage of faculty members at ceiling in that faculty. Here, each data point represents the average of award within a faculty. The two outliers in 2011 are explained above.

Digging deeper into the FEC outcome data related to academic faculty, the committee detected substantial differences among faculties in the frequencies with which they award 0.5 (Figure 3.2) and 2.0 (Figure 3.3) increments. This variation can be explained by the number of associate professors at ceiling (Figure 3.4) and by cultural differences and traditions.

Figure 3.8 indicates the six largest faculties’ surprisingly variable tendencies to award 0.5. In 2011-2012, these were received by less than 4% of faculty members in ALES and Education and more than 10% of faculty members in Science. Critically, because the ‘competition’ for increments occurs solely within a faculty, the frequency at which 0.5s are awarded is not an indicator of overall quality of the scholarly activities performed within a faculty. Further, because the FEC system is a relative, zero-sum competition
in each faculty, the proportion of individuals who receive 0.5 does not indicate anything about the absolute quality of the work performed by individuals within a faculty. The current FEC system is designed to differentiate among individuals in relation to each other, not in comparison to an external standard. The frequency of awards of 0.5 thus reflects a given FEC’s willingness to ‘split,’ as opposed to ‘lump.’

Although the percentage of individuals receiving 0.5 in a faculty is useless for the assessment of the true quality of Scholarship performed in that faculty, it is likely very useful in inferring which units promote competition amongst close colleagues. For example, between 2000-2001 and 2009-2010, the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry (FoMD) typically awarded 0.5s to less than 2% of its academic faculty. Consequently, except for extreme circumstances, individuals would expect to be awarded at least a 1.0 in a given year; 0.5 did not form a typical outcome for a member of FoMD. The committee notes that FoMD has increased this percentage to slightly over 4% in recent years. Individuals in the Faculty of Science have an entirely different experience with FEC. There, 0.5 percentages have typically been near 8% and now exceed 10%. Individuals in Science recognize 0.5 as a distinct possibility, something that currently is quite unlikely in the faculties of ALES or Education.

As well, the committee detects in these data the potential for substantial cultural shifts within a faculty over time. For example, in 2000-2001, ALES was the most frequent user of 0.5, at over 13%. In 2011-12, it was the most infrequent, at just under 2%. Again, as increments are allocated at the faculty level, this change cannot reflect shifting quality of a faculty, but instead reflects a willingness of an FEC to split (or more amply distribute) instead of lump its awards of increments.
Figure 3.8: The percentage of Academic Faculty, who are not at ceiling, receiving 0.5 in a given year. To err on the side of individuals’ privacy, data for only the six largest faculties is plotted (values for the remaining faculties fell within the cloud shown above).

Figure 3.9 shows the percentage of individuals receiving 2.0 in the six largest faculties. The committee notes the appearance of less variability in the awarding of 2.0 than of 0.5, particularly in recent years, and of other cultural shifts within a faculty, such as the change in Arts from approximately 20% of individuals receiving 2.0 to now less than 10%.

It is useful again to focus on differences between the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of ALES. In 2011-2012, both faculties awarded 2.0 increments to approximately 12.5% of individuals. However, as shown in Figure 3.10, 0.5 increments were awarded to nearly 11% and <2% of individuals in Science and ALES, respectively. Combined, these indicate that Science, but not ALES, is splitting individuals on both ends of the increment distribution. Individuals in Science thus have the potential to receive most increment outcomes, while in ALES they are likely to receive only 1.0 or greater. If FEC outcomes do fairly reflect differences in quality of Scholarship, one might suggest these data indicate that Science and ALES have roughly equal proportions of outstanding scholars, while Science has a much larger concentration of individuals performing below an international standard. (It is not clear that the Dean of Science would agree with this interpretation.) An alternative explanation is that, if both faculties have equal distributions of performance in their units, they have decided to differentially reward the lower 10% of the distribution. As this is not made relative to an external standard, it is not clear how such a decision benefits the individuals or the employer. A third explanation could be related to mentoring programs within faculties. One might expect mentoring and high degrees of collegiality to ‘raise up’ those who are underperforming, with the consequence that 0.5 awards grow less frequent over time.
It is unclear how the University benefits from allowing the FEC process to vary so greatly across campus. Further, as FEC is a competitive process amongst individuals who are close colleagues, the committee doubts that the current evaluation and reward structure engenders collegiality. The lack of it will be particularly pronounced in faculties that ‘split’ increment awards without basing differences on international standards. The committee also notes that a faculty that imposes ‘targets’ or ‘informal quotas’ by department shifts the pressure on collegiality from the faculty level to the departmental. The committee cannot understand how such increased competition within a small unit either enhances the quality of the workplace or serves the broader interests of the University.

The committee wishes the principals to take note that the willingness to award 0.5s in a faculty does not appear to be constrained by the number of academic faculty within the unit (Figure 3.10). However, stakeholder meetings indicated that at least some deans of smaller faculties think that the pressure issuing from the social dynamics in smaller groups is such that it prompts FEC to reduce the incidence of lower increments. Probably it is the case that this pressure would only increase if the increments of ‘capped’ colleagues were not added to the general pool.
The Renaissance Committee was unable to compile information regarding the treatment of leaves (e.g. parental, sabbatical, etc.). However, discussions with stakeholders indicated substantial variability among faculties. For example, the committee has learned of at least one faculty that awards a 0.0 following parental leave, while most faculties follow a different practice. The salient point is the discrepancy among FECs: the committee could find no justification for inequitable treatment by FECs of colleagues on leave, and the committee observes that many deans also felt that the wording about the evaluation of leaves was too vague to delineate a useful guideline. As leaves are a core benefit available to all academic faculty, the committee suggests that, in order for standardization and equity to prevail, the rules related to the handling of leaves should be defined and applied centrally rather than left to the discretion of individual faculties.

Summary of Concerns:

The current approach to the awarding of increments by different evaluation processes appears to introduce several structural sources of concern, potentially of benefit to neither the employer nor academic employees:

- The evaluation of APOs, librarians, FSOs, and academic faculty results in highly variable incrementation below the per capita allocation. In general, APOs and librarians rarely receive low incrementation, FSOs frequently receive low incrementation, and professors do so at an intermediate level. The committee encountered no evidence that this variation among constituencies was a deliberate choice but instead likely reflects different cultures of the different evaluation systems.
- FSOs and academic faculty have very different increment outcomes at FEC. It is unclear whether the FECs are able appropriately to discriminate between the expectations for performance by these two constituencies.
- Varying numbers of individuals at ceiling, partial to ceiling, and on leave within any one constituency introduces potentially significant inequities in the standard of performance required to obtain different incrementation over time.
• With nearly 50% of faculty receiving 1.0, and more than 90% receiving 1.0 or greater, it is unclear to what extent evaluation by FEC rewards a sufficient level of scholarly activity as distinct from excellence in it. The committee recognizes that there is a growing divergence between the perception of what meritorious means among academic administrators and what the rank-and-file professoriate understand that descriptor to mean.

• Inequities in increment outcomes by rank appear to be a structural consequence of the FEC system as currently constructed. Reduced compensation for junior faculty has career-long consequences for earnings. It is unclear to what extent FECs are able appropriately to evaluate the progress an individual makes in establishing herself/himself in the profession, relative to the evaluation of specific scholarly products and activities.

• The current FEC system is built upon a zero-sum competition occurring within each of the faculties and campuses, using a relativistic rather than external standard of measurement. Consequently, interpreting FEC outcomes as indicators of the quality of scholarly activities at the individual, departmental, or faculty level is a hazardous enterprise. Further, the relativistic dimension of the FEC exercise pits closest colleagues against one another in a way that cannot enhance collegiality and foster willingness to engage in the service of others.

• The committee is unable to find any justification for inequities in how individuals are evaluated while on, or returning from, authorized leaves. It is unclear why this evaluation is left to the discretion of FECs, and not instead centrally managed in order to achieve fairness.

• There exist substantial differences in the tendency of FECs to ‘split’ or ‘lump’ the awarding of increments. It is unclear why an individual, dean (or FEC) should control the frequency distribution of increments within his/her faculty, as this potentially creates inequities related to salary progression across campus. Due to its relativistic nature, the FEC system is unlikely to be effective in setting faculty-specific standards for scholarly performance. Evidence does suggest that FECs are, however unwittingly, considerable contributors to the enhancement of negative aspects of what is already a stressful workplace.

Recommendations:

3-19 Evaluate members of separate constituencies by separate committees; following the recommendation for two Scholarship constituencies for a reconstituted AASUA, create structures for tenure-track scholars, and for specialized scholars.

3-20 Award salary increases related to scholarly activities by deploying a binned system (by rank) to ensure equity in the awarding of RoSEs.

3-21 Require all scholarly evaluation committees to use external standards for the assessment of Scholarship, reaching decisions by reference to agreed-upon external standards rather than to colleagues’ performance.

3-22 If the recommendation to disband the President's Review Committee is adopted, provide the provost, and exhort him/her to use, more authority in oversight in the evaluation processes related to Tenure, Promotion, and the awarding of RP and Recognition of Scholarly Excellence (RoSE) awards (the committee believes strongly that variance in the expectations for salary increases, tenure, and promotion should be minimized).

3-23 For the awarding of RoSEs, use a binned system to ensure that all aspects of Scholarship be rewarded in proportion to the expected achievement/attainment/performance of them.

3-24 Treat leaves centrally, with an aim of equivalence across all committees evaluating scholarly performance.
The process associated with tenure and promotion is highly variable among the constituency groups. Lack of data precluded conducting a critical analysis of the evaluation process for tenure and promotion. The committee was very surprised to learn that the University does not regularly keep centralized records of tenure and promotion outcomes made by faculties, and maintain a record of how these change over time. Human Resource Services provided the best data; they indicate changes in payroll status. It is surprising, too, that such information is not maintained by the Office of Provost. Here, probably, is another consequence of the University of Alberta’s highly decentralized nature.

Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Committees, and Oversight

For academic faculty, the faculty evaluation committees are individually responsible for assessing the scholarly merit of each application for tenure and promotion. The process of faculty progress through the ranks and evaluation is provided schematically in Figure 3.11. FECs also evaluate the promotion of FSOs. For librarians, the tenure process is run by the LEC. Neither librarians nor APOs are typically promoted within a position; instead, each appointment is potentially a career appointment. However, librarians and APOs can attain a sort of promotion by applying to new positions as they become available, or for APOs, reclassification of the current position. In neither case does the promotion process for librarians nor APOs resemble the promotion process for faculty or FSOs, but more nearly resembles the process of a hiring committee.

As is discussed elsewhere, the size of a faculty influences the social dynamics at FEC; consequently, the committee heard from stakeholders in smaller units that necessarily more frequent need to interact with colleagues rendered objective decision-making more difficult.

A critical component of the tenure and promotion process for academic faculty, although not any other constituency (including tenure for librarians), are letters solicited from scholars at other institutions. In the career of the typical academic faculty member, tenure and promotion hearings mark the sole points where the quality of one’s scholarly activities is currently gauged by international/disciplinary standards. (The committee notes that promotion and tenure for all other constituencies appear to be based upon internal, rather than external, standards of Scholarship and/or administrative effectiveness.)

In contrast to structures for evaluation and oversight at most of its peer institutions, the University’s FECs appear to hold ultimate authority on tenure and promotion cases of academic faculty. The President’s Review Committee was established with, in part, the intention to ensure that university-wide standards and expectations for both tenure and promotion be met. Although the committee recognizes the critical importance of ensuring such standards, the nearly complete lack of centralized data regarding tenure/promotion outcomes represents a substantial obstacle to the provision of oversight. Consequently, the PRC is unable to determine whether or not a problem exists that needs a solution or that could be solved through increased oversight by the provost/president.

One area of oversight that does appear quite important is the use, or lack of use, of external standards for the awarding of tenure or promotion. The letters drawn from external scholars represent a critical level of oversight, and thus of particular importance. For constituencies unable to solicit such letters, due to the nature of the required job duties of the individual, the committee suggests consideration of the underlying philosophic need for and justification of eligibility for tenure.
Figure 3.11: Flow Chart of Faculty Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion processes: Evaluation Oversight
The Awarding of Tenure
As previously discussed, two constituencies – academic faculty and librarians – are eligible for tenure. Although the concept of tenure applies to the University, rather than a single constituency, the conditions and evaluation regarding suitability for tenure differ considerably between these two constituencies.

Academic faculty become eligible in a 4+2=6 year model, in which an individual is either put forward for tenure in her/his fourth year or there is an application for a two-year extension of the initial appointment. If tenure is not awarded following the two-year extension, circumstances may allow for an additional 1-year appointment, although a negative outcome in tenure evaluation typically represents the end of that individual’s employment at the University of Alberta. Exceptions apply in cases of leaves and special circumstances that may require individual accommodations. The awarding of tenure in the fourth year is typically considered “early” tenure; however, committee members were surprised to find that data were unavailable that indicate time to tenure by faculty and across the University.

Librarians enjoy a shorter path to tenure. Applications are made in the third year. An additional 1-yr extension is possible, and, as with academic faculty, timing can be adjusted based upon leaves and individual circumstances. The committee could find no justification for the comparative brevity of the probationary period for librarians.92

Stakeholders were split in their opinions on the 4+2=6 model for academic faculty. Some felt there was increasing pressure to put individuals up for tenure early, with the culture in some faculties representing tenure in the sixth year as a negative indicator of performance. Other stakeholders greatly valued the opportunity for early tenure, as it could be used as a tool for retention of highly productive scholars. One potential model for potential discussion would be 3+3=6 years. This would still offer opportunity for early tenure, although it would most likely become less common. Unfortunately, in the absence of access to more substantive data, the committee is unwilling to make a formal recommendation regarding the timing of tenure. More analysis is both requisite and necessary.

Promotion to Full Professor
For academic faculty, the eligibility for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor occurs when the salary overlaps with the salary grid for full professors. This ‘trigger’ is completely independent of scholarly activities, time since hire, or any other intellectually based reason. Due to the increase in starting salaries associated with shifts in hiring practices, the committee heard from many stakeholders that individuals are becoming eligible for promotion to Full Professor the year after promotion to Associate Professor. Such acceleration discounts the value of the rank of Associate Professor itself – both to the individual and to the University.

The standards as they currently exist indicate that there is to be a further maturation of Scholarship during this intermediate rank. In the typical arc and in many disciplines, it is at that point an individual moves from national to international prominence. It is also, critically, during this intermediate stage when an individual is expected to begin more active service to the institution and the discipline. By both increasing starting salaries and maintaining a salary trigger for promotion, the trigger potentially stunts scholars’ growth as an associate professor. The committee notes that there was overwhelming support among stakeholders for replacing the salary trigger for promotion with a time-based trigger. It was also recognized that there needs to be some flexibility to account for truly exceptional cases.

---

92 Revision: In the original version of this report (22 November 2013), this sentence lacked the negative.
### Table 3.2: Ranks and Promotion Process for AASUA Constituencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Ranks/Tenure/Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | Assistant/Associate/Professor  
| Tenure and rank of Associate Professor: 4;2;1 years + leaves (if applicable) – based on career Scholarship performance  
| Promotion to Professor – based on career Scholarship performance, but with salary trigger |
| **Librarian**| Probation period: 36 months;1 year + leaves if applicable  
| No promotion process; rather, position re-evaluation process:  
| The chief librarian determines the classification of each position following consideration by a Position Review Committee. The Position Review Committee considers all positions  
| • that are new positions,  
| • that are an existing position refashioned by the addition of new responsibilities |
| **FSO**      | Faculty Service Officer: FSO I, II, III, IV  
| Performance shall be based on consideration of the performance of the responsibilities of the staff member.  
| The standards of performance for staff members in a faculty are determined by FEC following consultation with all staff members in the faculty. The statement of standards serves to recognize the expectations for each rank. The statement of standards is submitted to the provost for consideration.  
| If the provost approves the statement, copies are sent to each staff member in the faculty; a copy is provided to a staff member on appointment.  
| The standards of performance may vary from faculty to faculty.  
| The standards of performance are higher in the higher ranks and as progress through the ranks occurs.  
| The award of increments and promotions is based on merit and not on length of service. |
| **APO**      | An Administrative and Professional Officer is appointed to a position that determines and rewards competencies by the HAY point system, based on responsibilities assigned to a position.  
| Each position is capped.  
| Progression occurs by changing position. |
| **CAS:T**    | The appointment of a Contract Academic Staff: Teaching member is for the term stated in the letter of appointment to a position in one of the following categories:  
| • full-time instructional appointments that include full-time limited term appointments for four months or longer, and that include rolling-term appointments.  
| • part-time instructional appointments that shall include appointments to teach one or more three-credit courses or equivalent but are not full-time. |
| **TRAS**     | A Trust Research Academic Staff member will be appointed on a full-time or part-time basis on either of  
| • a fixed-term appointment (if a TRAS member is appointed on a fixed-term appointment, the Letter of Appointment will stipulate the appointment’s end date. Where circumstances permit, and following a recommendation by the trust holder, the appointing officer may provide a term for the appointment that coincides with the term of the funding source. The fixed-term appointment shall not exceed the term of the funding source unless pre-approved through Academic Staff Administration); or  
| • a renewable-term appointment (if a TRAS member is appointed on a renewable-term appointment, the Letter of Appointment will stipulate the length of the original appointment. Following an annual assessment of satisfactory performance, a TRAS member appointed on this basis will have the term of the appointment extended by one year. All renewable-term appointments are reviewed with Academic Staff Administration prior to appointment). |
| **SOTS**     | The appointment of a non-teaching Sessional or other Temporary Staff member shall be for the term stated in the letter of appointment to a position in one of the following categories:  
| • full-time instructional appointments, which includes full-time limited-term appointments for four months or longer and includes rolling-term appointments;  
| • part-time instructional appointments, including appointments to teach one or more credit courses, excluding full-time employment;  
| • full- and part-time limited-term appointments for professional and administrative duties and for librarian duties. |
Summary of Concerns:

- Different standards and timing of eligibility for tenure exist between academic faculty and librarians. As tenure is intended to be a University-wide award, it is unclear why standards differ.
- Data are woefully insufficient regarding tenure and promotion for all constituencies. As scholars are the heart of the institution, and their career progression is of fundamental importance to the institution, this is of major concern. That the committee could not gain an answer to the question, “what percentage of individuals is denied tenure?”, indicates a problem related to decentralization and the consequent lack of central oversight.
- Having a salary trigger for promotion to Full Professor appears out of date and indefensible on academic grounds. It likely was a reasonable option when salary grids were respected, rather than worked around.

Recommendations:

3-25 Standardize the timing and process for tenure for all eligible constituencies. Require external letters to allowing external standards to be considered during evaluation. (If the required job duties do not allow for external assessment, the committee questions why protection of academic freedom is needed.)

3-26 Establish a mandatory and centralized approach to the collection of data related to tenure and promotion for all scholarly constituencies. As this is a core aspect of the academic functioning of the University, the Renaissance Committee suggests that this not be left to Human Resource Services for management.

3-27 Evaluate rank progression (RP) and scholarship excellence (RoSE) separately.

3-28 Replace the current salary trigger for promotion to Full Professor with a time-based trigger; the committee suggests six years, with consideration for early promotion with approval by the provost.

Evaluation Oversight

Given the fundamental importance of the scholarly activities to the core mission of the University, a need is apparent for continual quality control of the system of evaluation itself. This task is made difficult in part because of the University’s high level of decentralization and the degree of authority over the evaluation process assigned to deans. Consequently, there exist highly variable cultural practices among the faculty evaluation committees. Given the relativistic nature of evaluation by each FEC, no standardized mechanism exists by which one can evaluate the effectiveness of the FEC structure. The Renaissance Committee found no evidence of any centralized approach to understanding the effectiveness of evaluation for APOs, CAS:T, or members of the other AASUA constituencies. Given the substantial value of the academic staff to the University, and the costs incurred in return for that value, members of the committee were surprised by the lack of coordinated oversight.

Conversations with a number of stakeholders clarified the increasing number of complaints/grievances being filed with AASUA in relation to the evaluation process and other matters. In a general overview of

---

93 The Renaissance Committee did not find any evidence that the LEC was asked to report its effectiveness in any ongoing fashion, and thus acted like another FEC.
the cases that the association’s five Member Service Officers are seeing, they identified a substantial number of situations in which the process is not being followed by individual FECs. In regard to many other cases, they expressed concern that cultural practices by individual FECs appear inconsistent with the wording of the respective collective agreements. Many stakeholders recognized there is substantial complexity in the governing documents, which when combined with the cultures of a great many FECs, likely ensures problems.

Role of President’s Review Committee
A fairly recent creation is the President’s Review Committee (PRC), established in 2008, chaired by the president, and composed of at least 12 additional appointed members. PRC can review and compare the implementation of FEC standards and review specific contentious decisions by FECs related to the award of tenure or promotion to Full Professor. One member of PRC sits on each FEC, and thus PRC has the potential to offer a degree of quality assurance and a mechanism to distribute information regarding best practices on campus. Unfortunately, the committee was unable to find any evidence, or support from stakeholders, to show that the PRC is effective.

Specifically, the role of PRC is to
review and compare the implementation of FEC standards of performance related to the award of tenure or promotion to professor. It may review the standards of performance, and the implementation of those standards, in tenure or promotion to professor decisions in any specific FEC. Such decisions may be referred to PRC at the request of any of the following people: the FEC Chair, the Dean of the faculty, or the PRC member. It may make recommendations in writing to FECs regarding their standards of performance, and implementation of those standards, in tenure or promotion to professor decisions.Individual PRC members sit on the faculty evaluation committees although not on the LEC. The activities of the individuals on external committees are highly variable among FECs – ranging from full membership and participation in the process to an external observer. When contentious issues of tenure, promotion, and termination arise, PRC reviews them. Following its review, PRC may either uphold the FEC decision or recommend reconsideration by FEC.

It was brought to the attention of the Renaissance Committee that various campus-wide issues hindered the potential effectiveness of PRC. These were the lack of standardization of requirements for tenure and for promotion, inconsistent evaluation of tenure and promotion packages, and other procedural issues.

Most importantly, in contentious tenure/promotion cases, PRC recommendations are sent back to FEC for consideration. Sending recommendations to the same body that made the initial decision is a process stacked against changing recommendations and does not afford natural justice. All contentious cases referred to PRC since 2010 were denials of tenure/promotion. No cases have been reviewed in which an award of tenure/promotion came to PRC was thought to be premature. The Renaissance Committee hesitates to draw a conclusion from this.

PRC members are privy to the cultural diversity that occurs in the different FECS, as well as potential cases when compliance with the terms of the collective agreement has not occurred. The PRC member may make recommendations but has no authority to mandate changes in FEC processes. Deans’ Council indicated it had never received a formal report from PRC, and any feedback regarding the FEC process was not provided in a coordinated manner. Many deans indicated having no contact with PRC other than

94 President’s Review Committee, Report to the Renaissance Committee, 25 July 2013.
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via the representative at their respective FEC. The committee is unaware of any general communication to
the professoriate indicating a general review of the multiple FEC processes. Although PRC has not
broadly reported any findings, internal reports have made the following recommendations for the FEC
process:96

- a standardized annual report form
- standardized FEC procedures
- a review of the need for an annual process (PRC suggests a rank-specific need for evaluation –
  yearly for assistant professors, to ensure proper mentorship and direction; every second year for
  associate professors, and every three years for full professors.
- an enhanced institutional role for PRC
- a cap on career merit increments
- a university-wide standard for the awarding of merit
- better descriptions of standards with a view to more uniform awards of merit
- training for those involved in the FEC process

Stakeholders have stated the following about PRC

- PRC is a positive addition; it adds a great deal of support and learning to the faculty.
- PRC member on an FEC is a full member of the group – very helpful.
- PRC is a good idea that hasn’t realized its potential.
- PRC needs to provide a feedback loop back to faculties.
- PRC focuses too much on process.
- The president should be involved to ensure consistency for promotions across campus.
- The PRC or provostial sign-off is important for smaller faculties because it offers checks and
  balances.
- University of Alberta is anomalous in the very limited role it assigns to the provost/president in
  tenure and promotion decisions.
- The PRC member needs more authority as the president’s representative.

Summary of Concerns:

There does not appear to be an effective system of oversight of the systems used to evaluate and
reward the performance of scholarly activities. This appears to be a problem not only of the faculty
evaluation committees, but also the LEC and other evaluative bodies. The committee emphasizes that
oversight does not necessitate centralized control or a single vision of Scholarship. However, such
differences may be best to be based upon academic, rather than procedural or cultural grounds.
The PRC does not appear to be effective in communicating their findings to potential users of this
information. This represents a potentially lost opportunity that may be in part influenced by limited
authority being given to the committee.

Recommendations:

3-29 Disband the PRC.
3-30 Ensure regular communication from the Office of the Provost, with specific feedback to
individual evaluation committees and general feedback to academic staff regarding best practices
and areas of emerging concern.
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Salary Structure for Academic Staff (Faculty)

The Deferred Salary Structure
The academic faculty at the University of Alberta, as in nearly all peer institutions, has a deferred salary structure. Loosely defined, this means that the majority of individual earnings come towards the end of a career. The shape of the salary curve is roughly geometric, with the slope dependent upon how a particular system is parameterized. A deferred salary structure is a logical choice for a system with an extended probationary period (e.g. Assistant Professor): it limits institutional salary investment during the initial stage of career. However, such a structure has the potential to put salary stress on junior members, as their career earnings are back-end loaded. This does not imply that senior members exhibit no stress over salary; rather, it implies that the allocation of greater salary later in one's career is intentional.

At the University of Alberta, the specific shape of the salary curve (which is distinct from an actual salary) will be determined predominantly by two factors: across-the-board percentage salary scale settlements (ATB) and merit increments.

ATB
ATB is typically viewed as a mechanism to protect the value of an individual’s salary in the face of inflationary pressures. However, historically at University of Alberta, it has also been used as a mechanism to rapidly increase, and decrease, salaries in response to changes in strategy (for example, to render the University more competitive nationally) and budgetary challenges (for example, the Province of Alberta’s cuts to public sector salaries in 1994). Currently, ATB is negotiated as a fixed percentage allocated to all academic staff, regardless of individual achievement, level of salary, or any other factor. In this manner, the absolute amount of salary increase associated with ATB awards increases as a salary increases.

For example, imagine two individuals, with salaries of $100,000 and $200,000, a difference of $100,000. If both are awarded 1% ATB, $3,000 of salary increases are awarded to these two individuals: $1,000 to the first, $2,000 to the second. But in subsequent years, with additional ATB settlements, the difference between the two salaries widens. If a subsequent year’s ATB increase is also 1% and both individuals receive 0.0 merit increments from their FECs, then the first individual’s salary rises to $102,010; the second’s to $204,020. Thus, a flat percentage ATB has increased the first individual’s salary by $2,010 in two years; the second individual’s by $4,020 over the same time. This tool enhances or, depending upon one’s point of view, exacerbates income disparity among academic staff, with larger effects at higher rates of ATB.

Historically at the University, and currently at other institutions, ATB can be allocated as a fixed monetary amount per individual or per rank. This approach could amount to the same cost to the employer, but it results in a higher percentage increase going to those with the lowest salaries, and a lower percentage increase for higher salaries. Returning to our example, let us imagine that the $3,000 of salary increase associated with a 1% ATB were instead equally divided between the two employees. Their salaries would thus increase to $101,500 and $201,500, still a difference of $100,000. A settlement of a fixed monetary amount rather than a percentage increase for all academic staff could reduce early-career salary stress without (depending on the modeling used) altering lifetime earnings for the University’s employees.

Merit
Merit is awarded through the FEC process and goes into base salary. The values of increments are highly variable among ranks/stages, with the lowest-valued increments being at both the earliest and latest stages of career. Through differential valuation of increments, an employer is able to enhance, or reduce, the
steepness of a salary curve. It has been the practice at this university to adjust the values of merit increments by ATB.

The committee finds it to be a defining characteristic of the system of compensation at the University of Alberta that a significant aspect of an individual annual salary increase comes from ‘work performed,’ that is, merit. Further, there is a perception that an individual’s salary increase is ‘earned’ through scholarly activities. However, underlying this broad belief are two important caveats.

The first is that associate professors at ceiling are ineligible for merit increments, regardless of the excellence of the work performed. The committee is unable to find an intellectual justification for not providing an economic reward for excellence in scholarly activities. Instead, the committee finds the issue of at-ceiling associate professors an unfortunate consequence of bundling rank progression with the performance of Scholarship.

Second, and not generally recognized, is the combination of merit allocation and ATB. It results in their differential importance for salary increase as a function of salary. Let us return to our example of two individuals earning $100,000 and $200,000. Let us also assume they are an assistant and senior full professor, respectively. Let us now assume each is awarded a 1.0 merit increment valued at $2,412, and receives 1.65% ATB. The assistant professor will receive a salary increase of $4,062 (4.06%), of which 59% comes from the merit increment awarded by FEC. Our full professor will receive a salary increase of $5,712 (2.86%), of which 42% comes from the merit increment awarded by FEC. Thus, at lower salaries, an individual’s activities are responsible for a greater proportion of the salary increase than at higher salaries. It is unclear why the University currently places greater burden on junior faculty than on senior faculty to earn raises in income through recognition of their scholarly activity. As well, the committee notes that this disparity increases with increased ATB. In our example above, now assuming a 3% ATB, the assistant professor receives 45% of his/her raise from merit, while the full professor receives only 29% from merit. The committee identifies this as a significant concern, particularly given the described inequity of some FECs’ tendencies to award on average greater merit increments to full professors than to assistant professors.

Potential Impacts of Shifts in starting Salary and Market Supplements at Hire

An individual salary at the University of Alberta will be determined by a few simple components, including starting salary, history of ATB and merit, any market/salary supplements awarded, and years of service. Conditions of employment also authorize individuals to be remunerated from other sources for the performance of supplemental professional activities; those will not be considered here.

In unadjusted dollars, there have been both increases and decreases in starting salaries over time (Figure 3.12). Starting base salaries are confined to a salary grid, which sets upper and lower limits to salaries. Stakeholders commonly told the Renaissance Committee that the salary grid is very restrictive (particularly for assistant professors), and higher salaries are needed to attract desirable candidates. Thus, the committee found, the salary grid in existence is more notional than functional in value. The committee suggests that it appears instead that deans develop individual approaches – “work-arounds” – to starting salaries, and that such practice is facilitated by the use of market supplements.

A recent occurrence is a substantial increase in the use of market supplements added to base at the time of hire (Figure 3.13). Currently, at the point of hire, approximately 50% of all assistant professors are awarded market supplements. Their average value is approximately $20,000. This represents approximately 20% of starting salary. In aggregate across campus, approximately 7.4% of the starting salary mass of assistant professors comes from market supplements – no insignificant amount.

The committee notes that the current system for awarding these supplements does not require external evidence supporting the argument that it would prove impossible to hire the desired assistant professor by
offering a salary at the floor of the rank (currently, approximately $74,000). The committee has been told that supplements may be offered to avoid departmental inequities, even if not required by a candidate – essentially a pre-emptive tool for retention. The committee found these supplements to be highly variable in terms of usage and values in different faculties. Above all else, they are highly contentious on campus.

Figure 3.12: Average starting base Salaries of new hires, in unadjusted dollars, over time.

Figure 3.13: Percentage of new hires awarded a Market Supplement at the time of hire, over time.

Increases in starting salaries above those outlined by the salary grid have several consequences. First, as described elsewhere, eligibility for promotion to Full Professor is tied to salary, not competencies. Individuals who thus enter the system at high salaries and have supplements rolled into base when
awarded tenure become eligible for promotion to Full Professor earlier than originally intended. As stated previously, the committee sees no logical justification for having salary serve as a trigger for promotion.

Second, also as previously described, the University, perhaps unintentionally, uses a geometrically increasing salary curve. Thus, the higher the initial starting salary, the substantially higher the salary at retirement. For example, in one model of the existing salary structure, and assuming modest ATB and typical performance at FEC over a 35-year career, a $10,000 increase in starting salary can correspond to an increase of nearly $500,000 in lifetime earnings.

Lack of Mandatory Retirement and consequent Constraints on Succession Planning
Any geometric salary curve creates salary mass pressures associated with the timing of retirement. Quite simply, if an individual gains salary at geometrically increasing rates up until retirement, salaries may be substantially higher than necessary to maintain international competitiveness. This may happen independent of any change in actual age of retirement, due to the compounding effect associated with increasing starting salaries. Needless to say, the issue is exacerbated if the average age of retirement increases, although the committee has seen no data to suggest that an increase presents a concern currently.

The committee does not advocate salary caps, as they may serve as a disincentive to excellence in the performance of scholarly activities. The committee recommends an alternative solution, involving the separation of rank progression and scholarship excellence, later in this section.

The committee has been told, aside from potential pressure on salary mass, that the inability to plan for retirement – either as an employee or academic administrator – introduces an ugly combination of stress and surmise. From an employee’s perspective, everyone eventually retires. Having a clear sense of what options will be available in due course, without needing to guess whether a one-off plan will be offered, seems reasonable. From an employer’s perspective, having a mechanism to incentivize retirement, while also establishing both a means to limit continued salary increases of underperforming individuals and a means of accelerating salary for those performing with excellence, would be both practical and very useful. The committee thinks that room abounds for improvement on these matters.

Summary of Concerns:

- The University of Alberta has a deferred salary structure, which places salary stress more on early than on late stages of career. (The current practice of awarding ATB as a flat percentage increases the severity of this income disparity.)
- It is unclear why an expectation exists that earners of large salaries would “earn” a lower percentage of their raise through meritorious activities than earners of lower salaries. This expectation is particularly troublesome since the deferred salary structure means that the lower-salary earners are also typically junior colleagues, much of whose scholarly activities are, as already noted, associated with developing independent research programs.
- What is the value of a salary grid if it is breached more often than observed? The committee has not heard any compelling justification for the continuation of a salary-grid approach to starting salaries, although it is widely agreed that informal ‘ranges’ are needed.
- It is unclear why deans have such autonomy in determining starting salaries. As the geometric nature of salary curves has substantial impact on the costs to the University, it is surprising that a more formalized approach to determining initial salary offers is not in place. Such a system may also help prevent any inequities towards any groups, ranks, or constituencies.
• If a salary grid is abolished, the committee can see no continued need for the use of market supplements at the time of hiring. Routine, as opposed to current common, practice would then be that a starting salary is negotiated.
• It is reasonable to offer a clear and predictable approach to retirement planning, both for the employee and for academic administrators.

Salary Structure for Academic Staff (except Faculty)
The committee, having received little information about the salary structure of other AASUA constituencies, notes that the salary structure of FSOs parallels that of faculty, with the addition of a salary ceiling. APO positions are capped, and progression occurs by application to a different position, but it can also occur through changes to job description. Table 3.3 below summarizes the different structures.
Table 3.3: Benefits, Process for hiring, Appointment, Promotion, and other Information about AASUA constituencies (Source: collective agreements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits package</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>FSO</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>APO</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>SOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As negotiated through joint Academic Benefits Management Committee</td>
<td>As negotiated through joint Academic Benefits Management Committee</td>
<td>As negotiated through joint Academic Benefits Management Committee</td>
<td>As negotiated through joint Academic Benefits Management Committee</td>
<td>As negotiated through joint Academic Benefits Management Committee</td>
<td>As negotiated through joint Academic Benefits Management Committee</td>
<td>As negotiated through joint Academic Benefits Management Committee</td>
<td>As negotiated through joint Academic Benefits Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Period</td>
<td>Tenure Period with potential for second probation of 2 years; on recommendation of the departmental chair and dean, FEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Tenure Period with potential for second probation of 2 years; on recommendation of the departmental chair and dean, FEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Tenure Period with potential for second probation of 2 years; on recommendation of the departmental chair and dean, FEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Tenure Period with potential for second probation of 2 years; on recommendation of the departmental chair and dean, FEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Tenure Period with potential for second probation of 2 years; on recommendation of the departmental chair and dean, FEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Tenure Period with potential for second probation of 2 years; on recommendation of the departmental chair and dean, FEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Tenure Period with potential for second probation of 2 years; on recommendation of the departmental chair and dean, FEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Period leading to continuing appointment</td>
<td>Probation of 3 years; on recommendation of the chief librarian, LEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Probation of 3 years; on recommendation of the chief librarian, LEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Probation of 3 years; on recommendation of the chief librarian, LEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Probation of 3 years; on recommendation of the chief librarian, LEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Probation of 3 years; on recommendation of the chief librarian, LEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Probation of 3 years; on recommendation of the chief librarian, LEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
<td>Probation of 3 years; on recommendation of the chief librarian, LEC decides if a tenure appointment is offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process for Promotion</td>
<td>Apply for promotion to next rank (Assistant to Associate, Associate to Full Professor). FEC review with external input into promotion decision. Promotion to Associate normally comes with award of tenure.</td>
<td>Eligibility when current salary is within one increment of the minimum salary of the next rank. Apply for promotion to next rank. (FSO 1 to FSO 2 to FSO 3 to FSO 4). FEC review with external input into promotion decision.</td>
<td>Eligibility when current salary is within one increment of the minimum salary of the next rank. Apply for promotion to next rank. (FSO 1 to FSO 2 to FSO 3 to FSO 4). FEC review with external input into promotion decision.</td>
<td>Eligibility when current salary is within one increment of the minimum salary of the next rank. Apply for promotion to next rank. (FSO 1 to FSO 2 to FSO 3 to FSO 4). FEC review with external input into promotion decision.</td>
<td>Eligibility when current salary is within one increment of the minimum salary of the next rank. Apply for promotion to next rank. (FSO 1 to FSO 2 to FSO 3 to FSO 4). FEC review with external input into promotion decision.</td>
<td>Eligibility when current salary is within one increment of the minimum salary of the next rank. Apply for promotion to next rank. (FSO 1 to FSO 2 to FSO 3 to FSO 4). FEC review with external input into promotion decision.</td>
<td>Eligibility when current salary is within one increment of the minimum salary of the next rank. Apply for promotion to next rank. (FSO 1 to FSO 2 to FSO 3 to FSO 4). FEC review with external input into promotion decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring and Made by the dean.</td>
<td>Made by the dean.</td>
<td>Made by the dean.</td>
<td>Made by the dean.</td>
<td>Made by the dean.</td>
<td>Made by the dean.</td>
<td>Made by the dean.</td>
<td>Made by the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointment</td>
<td>Contingent appointments are allowed where position funding is from external sources. Special conditions at variance with the collective agreement are possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSO</td>
<td>of an advisory selection committee, on advice of the dean, appointment is made by the provost. Contingent appointments are allowed where position funding is from external sources. Special conditions at variance with the collective agreement are possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>librarian, normally on advice from Advisory Selection Committee. Contingent appointments are allowed where position funding is from external sources. Special conditions at variance with the collective agreement are possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>Special conditions at variance with the collective agreement are possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAS</td>
<td>appointing officer (president, vice-president, dean or department chair) on the recommendation of the trust holder: fixed-term or renewable-term, full-time or part-time. Special conditions at variance with the collective agreement are possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>dean. Set term either full-time or part-time. Special conditions at variance with the collective agreement are possible. Renewal is based on performance evaluation and could result in a rolling-term or recurring-term appointment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTS</td>
<td>or vice-president. Full-time instructional for 4 months or longer, including rolling-term and part-time. Full- and part-time limited term (APO and Librarian duties). Special conditions at variance with the collective agreement are possible. Renewal is based on performance evaluation and could result in a rolling-term or recurring-term appointment. Rolling- or recurring-term appointments can be terminated early if funding is terminated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>As per the Faculty Agreement. Variation of duties for up to 3 years is allowed upon a written agreement between chair, dean, and staff member. Teaching assigned by department chair.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSO</td>
<td>Written job description with specific duties assigned by supervisor. Position review committee determines the classification of position into professional ranks as defined in the collective agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Written job description with specific duties assigned by supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>Written job description with specific duties assigned by supervisor. Each position is evaluated to assign salary range based on variant of Haye system by Human Resource Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAS</td>
<td>Written job description with specific duties assigned by supervisor/trust holder. Each position is evaluated to assign salary level by Human Resource Services within a job family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Duties specified in letter of appointment with specific duties assigned by supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTS</td>
<td>Duties specified in letter of appointment with specific duties assigned by supervisor. APO-type and Librarian-type positions must have a job description.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Sabbatical or Professional Leave</th>
<th>Eligible for one year sabbatical after 6 years of service (without sabbatical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSO</td>
<td>Professional Leave Salary level to be defined based on benefit to the University and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Professional Leave Salary level to be defined based on benefit to the University and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>Professional and Education Leave. Eligible for up to 6 months after serving 3 years, or after 6 years eligible for 1-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>FSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or 6 months after 3 years.</td>
<td>University and cannot be less than 50% and can be up to 100%. Duration from 1 month to 1 year and can be part time. On return, commit to equal period of service as leave period; report due within 2 months of return from leave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>FSO</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>APO</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>SOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through an FEC</td>
<td>Through an FEC</td>
<td>Through the LEC</td>
<td>PREP-D</td>
<td>Annual evaluation with trust holder.</td>
<td>Process set by Faculty Council. If Faculty Council is silent, annual evaluation with department chair</td>
<td>If duties include instruction, process follows CAS:T rules. If duties are in the library, process set by Library Council. Otherwise supervisor is responsible for evaluation procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>FSO</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>APO</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>SOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated and pooled within the FEC. Capped positions contribute to the pool. Un used faculty increments can be awarded to FSOs.</td>
<td>Negotiated and pooled within the FEC. Capped positions contribute to the pool. Un used FSO increments can be awarded to faculty.</td>
<td>Negotiated and pooled within LEC. Capped positions do not contribute to the pool.</td>
<td>Supervisor’s recommendation to dean or vice-president, who recommends to provost for approval. Capped positions are not eligible for increments. Available increments may be pooled at any size of unit, typically faculty or vice-president.</td>
<td>Trust holder’s recommendation to dean or vice-president for approval. Capped positions are not eligible for increments.</td>
<td>Based on performance evaluation; if satisfactory, to be applied to salary at re-appointment; maximum of 7 increments over 7 years</td>
<td>Based on performance evaluation; if satisfactory, to be applied to salary at re-appointment; value that of increments for Assistant Professor, Lecturer, or 3% of salary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vacation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>FSO</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>APO</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>SOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>&lt; 10 years - 22 days 10 &lt; 20 years - 25 days &gt; 20 years - 30 days</td>
<td>&lt; 10 years - 22 days 10 &lt; 20 years - 25 days &gt; 20 years - 30 days</td>
<td>&lt; 10 years - 22 days 10 &lt; 20 years - 25 days &gt; 20 years - 30 days</td>
<td>22 days (pro-rated if part time) or 4% salary for appointments less than 1 year</td>
<td>22 days (pro-rated if part time) or 4% salary for appointments less than 1 year</td>
<td>22 days (pro-rated if part time) or 4% salary for appointments less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>FSO</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>APO</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>SOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applies for potential</td>
<td>Applies for potential</td>
<td>Not in agreement</td>
<td>Applies for potential severance</td>
<td>Lay-off provisions</td>
<td>Lay-off</td>
<td>Lay-off provisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>FSO</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>APO</th>
<th>TRAS</th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>SOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization</td>
<td>severance decision</td>
<td>severance decision</td>
<td>language.</td>
<td>decision</td>
<td>apply; based on fund/work availability</td>
<td>provisions apply; based on fund/work availability</td>
<td>apply; based on fund/work availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>Right to publish research results without interference or censorship.</td>
<td>Right to publish research results without interference or censorship.</td>
<td>Right to publish research results without interference or censorship.</td>
<td>Not in agreement language.</td>
<td>With approval of trust holder, right to publish research results without interference or censorship.</td>
<td>Not in agreement language.</td>
<td>Not in agreement language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Retirement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>June 30 after attaining Age 65</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of an Alternative Evaluation System for Academic Staff

The Renaissance Committee’s discussions with stakeholders made apparent that the current evaluation process has many shortcomings, both superficial and structural. The committee finds of particular concern the lack of ability of the current evaluation systems to offer meaningful formative feedback, particularly for junior faculty. Along with a representative from CAUT, the committee finds confusing the bundling of recognition of scholarly development with reward for excellent achievements. This confusion signifies a broken system. Further, the committee thinks that there are structural biases in the FEC system as practised variably, and that these biases result in decreased incrementation outcomes for assistant and associate professors (it is notable in this respect that few recommendations by chairs/deans are overturned by faculty evaluation committees campus-wide). At its core, the FEC system is based upon a relativistic approach to evaluation, which pits close colleagues against each other in a competitive scenario. Separate faculty-based competitions (and 1 LEC), without an effective system of oversight and coordination, gives rise to numerous inequities and questionable practices. The committee does not suggest that these occur intentionally, but they are a logical consequence of such a decentralized evaluative system. The committee believes that the number and magnitude of problems are such that it is doubtful that this system can be sufficiently modified to meet the needs of the employer and employee.

With some concern, the committee notes the lack of a standard by which scholarly activities can be meritoriously assessed, other than in relation to those of other individuals in the same administrative unit. As a consequence, individuals of equal scholarly quality will receive different incrementation outcomes depending upon the mean quality of the unit. The committee cannot fathom how this might enhance the long-term trajectory across the University; indeed, it may well serve as a mechanism by which mediocrity is richly rewarded in some units and excellence under-rewarded in others. Similarly, the committee notes with concern that there does not appear to be adequate adjustment of expectations as individuals progress through the ranks, and/or through a career. In the zero-sum scenario of FEC, this lack has the potential to delay salary increase for junior colleagues, even if they are performing at a very high level relative to external standards.

To allow for greater recognition both of the progression of the colleague and of excellence in scholarly achievements, the committee presents for consideration and discussion one (of potentially many) alternative system (Figure 3.14).

The core of the system allows for explicit differentiation between, on the one hand, a colleague’s progression through a rank as s/he develops as a professor and, on the other, recognition of excellence in the performance of scholarly activities (broadly defined). The committee upholds the critical feature – that scholars must evaluate the work produced by scholars – and also suggests that administrators are best suited to evaluate administrative activities.

The system described below may cost more, less, or equal to the current system of compensations; this will depend upon the specifics of parameterization, which the committee holds should be the outcome of negotiations among the Principals.

The committee believes that the general structure of this evaluation system could be applied to all constituencies that perform Scholarship as their required job duties, although the committee also advocates constituency-specific parameterization and evaluation.

---
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Figure 3.14: Flow chart of an alternative evaluation system for academic staff.
The committee intends this recommendation to be the continuation of a dialogue initiated by the 1991 joint agreement review report on FEC reform, rather than a specific negotiated settlement intended for ratification. Such a change in the system of evaluation would represent a fundamental change in the academic dimension of the University, so it needs to be the subject of extensive discussion and deliberation. It is noteworthy that many of the issues identified here, as well as potential remedies, were independently identified and addressed 22 years ago.

Overview and Goals
A framework for replacing the current merit system of compensation with one that separates compensation associated with Rank Progression (RP) from compensation associated with Recognition of Scholarship Excellence (RoSE).

General Goals
1. Provide a fair and predictable annual salary progression when colleagues meet the standard of expectation in the performance of scholarly and other required activities, including the recognition and reward of excellence in scholarly work.
2. In the RP/RoSE system, create in the RP award system a uniform progression of salaries for all individuals associated with progression within a given academic rank. Variability in salary curve among individuals will be driven by differential success in being nominated for and awarded RoSEs in recognition of specific excellence in scholarly achievement.
3. The committee emphasizes that mediocrity is not the standard of expectation in the recommended system, and that there is a fundamental difference between recognizing scholarly development and rewarding mediocrity. Further, the committee holds that the RP/RoSE system will more effectively allocate salary increases based upon scholarly achievement, relative to external standards, than structure and cultures permit in the University’s existing FEC, LEC, and APO evaluation systems. (The APO system is included here to make provision for the same evaluation to be done of the performance by any APOs whose normal duties include some Scholarship.)
4. Recognize that academic faculty have defined ranks, and less well defined stages within ranks (e.g. early vs. late full professors):
   - colleagues at each stage have unique workplace and financial challenges;
   - one progresses in development as a scholar within and up ranks; the standards for expectation and excellence should similarly increase with scholarly and rank progression; at some point, colleagues no longer ‘progress’ within a given rank but rather are fully developed at that rank. Promotion opportunities may be provided, and specific criteria may be met, allowing individuals to transition to a new rank.
5. Provide financial incentive to achieve, and reward colleagues for having conducted, excellence in Scholarship. Such recognition and reward should be provided regardless of stage of scholarly development, academic rank or position, or past performance, and should be independent of the performance of others.
6. More effectively link financial rewards to expected job duties and individual performance, and use the evaluation process to meet both formative and summative needs.

---


99 As was seen in section 2, the Renaissance Committee uses a broad definition of Scholarship.
7. Recognize that evaluation processes can involve a significant investment of time and stress. To the extent possible, these should be reduced, while also allowing for full evaluation of an individual’s scholarly work.

8. Reduce the direct competition among close colleagues.

Goals related to Scholarship

1. Reduce the economic variability associated with different types of Scholarship that require different periods of time to achieve; long-term and short-term scholarly activities are to be (as nearly as possible) equally rewarded.

2. Reduce real or perceived emphasis on specific types of Scholarship when expected job duties require performance of a diversity of types of scholarly activities.

3. Allocate rewards within an evaluation unit in proportion to the aggregate of the expected job duties of individuals within that unit (i.e. if teaching is to comprise 40% of scholarly activities within an evaluation unit, 40% of the funds allocated to reward scholarly activities and excellence should go towards teaching-related Scholarship).

4. Ensure evaluation of scholarly activities is based upon the quality of the work itself, in relation to external criteria, and not relative to other individuals within a unit.

Goals related to Human Resource Management

1. Offer greater clarity to all professors regarding expectations, job duties, and economic outcomes.

2. Enhance the economic mechanisms available to encourage under-performing professors to increase the quality and quantity of their scholarly activities.

3. Minimize the person-hours and costs associated with FECs and the allocation of salary increases amongst academic faculty.

4. Enable units and the University to aggregate efficiently data regarding core operations (e.g. Scholarship and the allocation of human resources).

5. Continue to provide a mechanism to terminate employment of tenured faculty who are grossly negligent in the performance of duties over a sustained period of time.

6. Create a more efficient appeal process.

Parameterization

1. Parameterization of the system of compensation does not change from the current practice of a negotiated agreement between the Board of Governors and AASUA.

2. The predominant impacts of the system of compensation on individual salaries depend upon the parameterization of the system and the performance of individual colleagues; they are not determined by the structure of the system in and of itself. There are some exceptions, most notably:

   a. Recommended eligibility for RoSE awards regardless of the rank, position, or number of rank progression awards available to a colleague means that no longer will any individual of any constituency using this system of evaluation and compensation be “at ceiling.”

   b. A limited number of RP awards will mean that as an individual progresses through a rank, there is increased reliance on excellence in the performance of scholarly activities in order to attain increases in salary (irrespective of any negotiated ATB).

   c. Non-annual evaluation will alter the periodicity of raises but need not alter lifetime earnings.
3. Consequences for the total salary mass of the system of compensation depend upon the parameterization of the system and the demographics of the University; they are not determined by the structure of the system in and of itself.

4. Important parameters needing consideration and negotiation include the following:
   a. ATB, including how it is distributed among ranks/stages.
   b. A mechanism by which the salary curve that currently exists among academic faculty could be flattened without altering salary mass (this could be particularly advantageous to individuals establishing a scholarly program, and before they are able to demonstrate substantial scholarly products and creative works).
      i. ATB can be negotiated in a flat-dollar amount per individual rather than on a flat-percentage basis.
      ii. Such an arrangement would have the consequence of payment of the highest percentage ATB for the lowest salaries and of the lowest percentage ATB for the highest salaries.
      iii. In conversations with Peter Simpson (CAUT), the Renaissance Committee learned that this alternative is not an uncommon practice in Canadian university compensation settlements.
   c. One multi-step mechanism by which, this aim could be achieved is as follows:
      i. negotiate a single %ATB to the salary mass through the usual process;
      ii. determine the dollar value of ATB mass as: ATB Mass = %ATB * salary mass;
      iii. divide the ATB mass by the total number of eligible faculty FTE, resulting in per capita ATB allocations; and
      iv. add this constant amount to the base salary of all eligible faculty.
   d. NOTE that this change in ATB allocation can be enacted independent of any of the structural changes to FEC/Merit described below.
   e. Number of rank progression (RP) awards within each academic rank (or position for other constituencies): because RPs recognize the time it takes for a colleague to develop competencies at a given academic rank, the Renaissance Committee does not believe these should be unlimited, since, at some point, a colleague attains a ‘developed’ stage in that rank.
      i. The committee suggests the following for academic faculty, as an initial position for discussion:
      ii. Assistant Professor = 6 RPs
         1. Colleagues hired at assistant professor are eligible for 6 RPs regardless of starting salary.
         2. Colleagues promoted prior to receiving all 6 of their RPs may carry the remainder to the next rank. For example, if promoted after earning 4 RPs, they may earn up to two additional RPs at either the associate or full professorial ranks.
      iii. Associate Professor = 8 RPs
         1. Upon promotion to Associate Professor, colleagues are eligible for 8 RPs (Associate) regardless of salary at the time of promotion.
         2. If any RPs were carried over from Assistant Professor, they must be used before drawing from the Associate Professor RP allotment.
         3. Colleagues hired at the rank of Associate Professor are eligible for 8 RPs regardless of starting salary.
4. Colleagues promoted prior to receiving all 8 of their Associate Professor RPs may carry the remainder to the next rank.

iv. Full Professor = 11 RPs
1. Upon promotion to Full Professor, colleagues are eligible for 11 RPs regardless of salary at the time of promotion.
2. If any RP were carried over from Associate Professor, they must be used before drawing from the Full Professor RP allotment.
3. Colleagues hired at the rank of Full Professor are eligible for 11 RPs regardless of starting salary.

v. Career allotment. In this model, over the course of a career, a colleague hired at the rank of
1. Assistant Professor can earn up to 25 RPs
2. Associate Professor can earn up to 17 RPs
3. Full Professor can earn up to 11 RPs

f. Inducement for retirement
i. The committee recognizes predictable life planning and faculty renewal can benefit both the employer and employee; sporadic and crisis-induced severance packages limit long-term planning. The committee suggests that an ongoing Voluntary Severance Package could be linked to the RP system to minimize the incidence of such spasms.

ii. Eligibility could be initiated after a period of six years during which no RP has been awarded, either because of an exhaustion of the maximum available at rank or negative outcomes from review (six being a sizable number but one that accommodates colleagues involved in various types of leave), such a severance program to be available both to senior full professors and to senior associate professors who have not been promoted.

iii. Eligibility would be based upon RPs awarded rather than age or years of service; variation in the age of hiring or the number of leaves taken over the course of a career would not put the colleague at a disadvantage by this arrangement.

iv. The value of the severance package should decrease sharply as a function of number of years post eligibility.

v. This qualification would make it an inducement for retirement to encourage faculty renewal in a predictable manner, rather than a bonus system driven by individuals’ idiosyncratic choices.

g. The committee suggests that there be constituency-specific parameterization in recognition of unique expectations and conditions among employee groups.

h. The value of RP steps, including whether they are constant or variable among ranks and stages within ranks.

i. The committee suggests that there may be value in flattening the salary curve associated with a deferred system, particularly the aspects of individual salary increase associated with scholarly development.

j. This could be achieved by setting the value of RP greatest at the rank of Assistant Professor and lowest at the rank of Full Professor, potentially complementing a flat-number approach to the distribution of ATB, and variable values of RoSEs.

100 This is described in more depth in section 4.
k. Value of the RoSEs pool, including whether *per capita* allocations, are constant or variable among ranks and stages within ranks (addressed below).

l. Because, as discussed above, current FEC practice exhibits inequities in the treatment of FSOs relative to professors, and among ranks of professors, the committee suggests that constituency groups not be evaluated together, but instead have separate evaluation groups.

m. As well, the committee suggests that RoSE pools be divided on a *per capita* basis among academic ranks, and potentially two ranks for full professors (e.g. those with RP eligibility and those beyond RP eligibility). Such separations would
   i. prevent the need for individual evaluators to modify standards of excellence as a function of the career stage; and
   ii. reduce the introduction of unintentional biases by creating an evaluation committee that consists of individuals drawn equally from all academic ranks and stages.

n. The committee suggests as well that the RoSE pools be further subdivided amongst Scholarship types, as explained below.
   i. This is to ensure that all aspects of Scholarship that are required duties (as defined by individualized variation in duties and, therefore, variation in performance expectations) be eligible for RoSE awards

Structure and Process – Rank Progression (RP) Awards
Standard of Expectation and Rank Progression Awards

1. Setting Performance Standards
   a. The committee suggests that the University set explicit standards of expectation for all academic staff, highlighting the differences among constituencies and ranks. This should be a fundamental document for the University and included as conditions of employment for staff.
   b. Home departments (or faculty in non-departmentalized faculties [NDF]), in consultation with the dean, should adapt the university-wide expectations into a form that meets the specific needs of the unit. It is critical that these unit-specific standards
   c. Align with the core mission and goals of the University
   d. Be set relative to external, not internal, standards (e.g. disciplinary norms).
      i. This may be most relevant for research and creative works.
      ii. Failure to use external standards becomes the vehicle by which mediocrity can be normalized and rewarded; the relativistic approach to evaluation is a structural problem in the current FEC system, and should not be repeated in an alternative.

2. Communicating Performance Standards
   a. Standards of expectations are to be made clear to all academic staff, both in aggregate (at the Unit level) and on an individual basis.
   b. Individuals
      i. It is expected that individuals be hired to perform certain duties, or certain suites of duties (including a process for individual negotiation). For example, an
assistant professor may be hired in a 40%–40%–20% split of research, teaching, and service duties; others with a 60%–20%–20% split.\textsuperscript{101}

ii. The committee does not advocate that a specific ratio is preferable.

iii. The ratio determined at the point of hire should be made explicit, and included on the annual evaluation form.

iv. Employer and employee may be best served by variance over time in required duties by way of response to special awards, opportunities, and shifting interests and competencies.

v. The inclusion of flexibility in the setting of individual expectations allows for such changes.

1. It would not serve the interests of the unit or University to allow individuals, on their own, to determine their job duties.

2. It would not serve the interests of the individuals to allow the employee/unit to arbitrarily adjust the job duties of an existing employee.

vi. Changes to previously agreed-upon job duties must be formally negotiated with the chair and require approval by the dean and the employee.

vii. Any adjustments to the expected job duties should be determined prior to the period under review and indicated on the annual evaluation form.

c. Aggregation

i. Units must retain the flexibility to differentially allocate human resources towards different scholarly activities, in a manner that serves the interests of the University (e.g. Arts and Science run a large undergraduate program; Rehabilitation Medicine does not have an undergraduate program).

ii. This distinctiveness should be made public to the University community. This information is critical to the allocation of RoSE awards in a manner ensuring all aspects of Scholarship conducted within a unit are valued in proportion to their expected frequency of performance.

iii. The average allocation of duties to teaching, research, and service should be calculated on a FTE basis within a Faculty.\textsuperscript{102} Faculty-level allocation targets must meet University priorities and therefore would require approval by the provost or president.

iv. The pool of money associated with RoSE awards should be divided into groups based upon these aggregate ratios.

3. Assessing Performance in Terms of assigned/Negotiated Duties

a. All individuals compile a short-form annual report,\textsuperscript{103} which includes

   a. The negotiated ratio of expected job duties (see above).

---

\textsuperscript{101} As it did in the case of this report’s section 2, the Renaissance Committee encourages the principals to discuss whether or not a three-term ratio is sufficient.

\textsuperscript{102} If the evaluation of RoSEs is to occur in multi-faculty pools, the average ratio also needs to be calculated for all individuals falling under a given Evaluation of Excellence Committee.

\textsuperscript{103} This is discussed in detail in Appendix 4.
b. A complete list of all scholarly and non-scholarly activities performed as part of their appointment over the course of the reporting period.104

c. The file, along with all others in the unit, is reviewed by a Unit Evaluation Committee (UEC).

d. For adequate breadth of comparison, the committee suggests a minimum of 25 files need to be sent to a single UEC.
   i. Individual UECs will be formed within most departments or NDF.
   ii. Some departments may be split into multiple UECs, if there is sufficient heterogeneity in research activities.
   iii. Some UECs may contain members from multiple departments/faculties, to meet the 25-person minimum size. The committee suggests that individuals should be consulted in determining which UEC is best suited to assess their scholarly activities.

e. The UEC could comprise
   i. Chairs of the departments (or dean of NDF) of the individuals being evaluated by a UEC. (In a situation in which individuals from multiple departments are sent to a single UEC, there would be multiple chairs on the committee.)
   ii. One or two elected members from each department (or faculty in NDF) represented in the UEC’s files.
   iii. One elected member from an affiliated department (or faculty in NDF) not evaluated by a UEC. (Typically, affiliated departments would be within the same faculty.)
   iv. The committee suggests that all departments, where possible, have a member serving as the external evaluator on one UEC.
   v. The committee suggests that an even number of UEC members be achieved, as this will lead to full discussions of marginal cases.
   vi. Regardless of the final composition of a UEC, the committee suggests it be standardized and applied to all UECs across campus.

e. Counter to the current practice of a chair making a recommendation to FEC, chairs do NOT make a recommendation to the UEC. The intent is that the UEC reach its own conclusion about a colleague’s success or not in meeting expectations.

f. Following a negotiated process, a departmental evaluation committee (UEC) determines whether the standard of expectation has, or has not been met, and which files are sufficiently strong to be considered for a RoSE. (The committee anticipates that for most files these two decisions will be rapid.)
   i. For all files, the chair of the UEC (and home department, if different individuals) should write a letter summarizing the reasoning behind the UEC’s decision, and offering formative feedback.
   ii. For junior faculty, comments regarding progress relative to international standard/tenure/promotion should be added.
   iii. It must be emphasized to the individual that RP awards recognize an individual’s progression within an academic rank. They are not intended to imply that an individual performance was sufficient to transition into a different rank.

104 The Renaissance Committee envisions that a 1 July 1–30 June reporting period would be used in all units. Such regularization would, among other things, facilitate the collection of data across the University.
iv. If the UEC decides that the performance of the individual met or exceeded expectations, an RP is awarded (provided that all RPs available at the rank have not already been awarded)

v. **RP Award**
   1. If an individual was eligible for an RP, a single RP (no more, no less) of the appropriate value for rank/stage is awarded.
   2. If the last RP at rank/stage is being awarded, the chair includes in his/her letter confirmation that this is the last RP for which the colleague is eligible at rank/in career.
   3. If an individual was beyond RP eligibility, none is awarded (RPa). The chair confirms ineligibility for the RP in the letter.
   4. If, while still eligible for an RP at rank, an individual took an approved leave for more than 40% of the time within the reporting period, an RP of the appropriate value for the rank/stage is automatically awarded (RPc).

vi. **RoSE Award – Eligibility**
   1. If an individual received an RP (including RPa and RPc), the UEC next determines whether the performance is also sufficient for consideration for a RoSE (Recognition of Scholarship Excellence).
   2. If a RoSE was awarded the prior year, the evaluation process ends here because eligibility occurs no more than every second year.
   3. If no RoSE was awarded the prior year, the individual is eligible for consideration for nomination.
   4. If the individual has RoSE eligibility, then upon evaluation of at least the last two years of annual reports (up to four years, as described below), the UEC will decide whether aspects of her/his scholarly activities warrant nomination for consideration for a RoSE.
   5. If yes,
      a. the UEC chair adds to the letter the specific aspects of scholarly activities the UEC viewed as being notably excellent.
      b. the UEC chair’s letter advises the individual of the opportunity to submit a long-form annual report (see below) by an announced deadline.
      c. The individual has the choice to withdraw the file for consideration of a RoSE, if they so choose. To do so requires written notice by the individual indicating a wish not to be considered at that time; lack of written notice is to be viewed as wishing to be considered for a RoSE award.
      d. Unless the individual directs otherwise, the file, including the UEC chair’s letter and the long-form report (provided at the discretion of the individual), is forwarded to the appropriate Evaluation of Excellence Committee (EEC).
      e. It is emphasized to the individual that the UEC does not have the authority to distribute RoSE awards, only to nominate individuals.
   6. If it is determined by the UEC that the scholarly activities do not warrant nomination for a RoSE award, the evaluation ends.
a. The Renaissance Committee suggests that this decision not be appealable.

b. The Renaissance Committee suggests that the individual has the right to a meeting with the UEC chair (and departmental chair if different individuals) to discuss her/his file, the intent being an occasion for formative comments.

vii. If the UEC decides that the individual’s activities, as indicated on the annual report, were not achieved or did not meet expectations, then

viii. No RP is awarded. The Renaissance Committee suggests that this decision

1. not be appealable, and that it trigger a meeting between the individual and the UEC chair (and, if a different person, the individual’s departmental chair). At this meeting, the letter from the UEC is reviewed, with an emphasis on the provision of formative feedback.

ix. The UEC chair’s letter advises the individual of the opportunity to submit a long-form annual report (see below) by an announced deadline.

x. The file (including long-form report, if provided) is forwarded to the EEC (see below) for its determination whether the file should be awarded an RPb or RPd – they retain the same legal consequences as 0b and 0d have in the current FEC process.

1. The Renaissance Committee suggests that the decision from EEC be appealable, with the appeal going to a separate body, thereby affording natural justice.

2. Removing the RPd decision from the local unit and placing it in the larger EEC body, the committee thinks, can distance UEC chairs from the decision and thus enhance their opportunity to offer the colleague in question helpful formative feedback.
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g. Critical issues for discussion are the expected proportions of files to be submitted to EEC for consideration of a RoSE award, and the percentage unlikely to be awarded an RP even when eligible. The committee suggests that these should be discussed during negotiations (they are intertwined with the parameterization of the awards); ultimately, however, they should be an outcome of the evaluation process. The committee suggests a few guiding principles:

i. As discussed previously, the committee questions the robustness of evaluation in the current evaluation systems used on campus. However:

ii. Approximately 50% of files are awarded a 1.0 through the FEC process; this may be a good first approximation of the percentage of ‘typical files’ most suited for consideration for an RP, but not to be nominated for a RoSE.

iii. Approximately 10% of files are awarded < 1.0 through the FEC process; this may be an upper-limit percentage expectation of files that do not garner an RP award. The committee anticipates that, with more explicit formative evaluation and recognition of mentorship, this percentage could be greatly reduced.

iv. With RoSE eligibility being no more than every other year, one might reasonably expect a 20% success rate at EEC. The committee sees value in EECs not awarding RoSEs to all files; a reasonable expectation is that EECs would consider approximately 25% of all files in a given year.
v. The Renaissance Committee does not advocate strict quotas for UECs; however, there must be guidelines. The committee suggests

- Using the 25% rate as a target, UECs are expected to nominate no more than 30% of files in a given year to EECs.
- To exceed this value requires explicit approval from the provost, as EECs will be multi-faculty in their composition.
- Any variance authorized by the provost must be based on comparisons to external, not internal, standards. The variance should not reflect EEC outcomes in prior years.

Structure and Process – Recognition of Scholarship Excellence (RoSE) Awards

Evaluation of Excellence Committees

1. Activities
   a. The EECs are tasked with handling files forwarded from the UECs with respect to some RPs (adjudicating RPb, RPd, or overturning the UEC decision not to award a RP).
      i. The committee suggests the awarding of an RPd as the only appealable outcome; a separate body must hear the appeal, affording natural justice.
   b. to all RoSE – Deciding the type and number of awards specifically for scholarly activities.
      i. The Renaissance Committee suggests that RoSE decisions not be appealable.
      ii. The Renaissance Committee further recommends that RoSEs not be awarded for any non-scholarly work, including administrative work (e.g. administrative duties in a position of any level of chair or dean, administrative work of APOs, etc.); the committee suggests an alternative pool of money administered by a different evaluation process be negotiated.

2. Number of Committees and Oversight
   a. The Renaissance Committee suggests that there be a small number of EEC committees on campus (three or four), each of them evaluating files from more than one faculty.
   b. The intent is to ensure that
      i. the standards for excellence be drawn broadly upon the types of scholarly activities described in section 2 of this report.
      ii. local culture and expectation be defendable in a larger body – monitoring of the potential for local standards to drift too high or too low, relative to the rest of the University, is advised.
   c. As a relatively small number of files will be sent to all EECs in a given year (perhaps 800 FTE faculty), the workload should be manageable.
   d. Based upon discussions regarding the variation in files viewed by the current large FECs (e.g. Arts, Science), the committee does not see greater heterogeneity occurring in blending files from several faculties.
   e. The committee suggests that individual scholars be allowed to identify which of the EECs they would prefer to have handle their file.
i. This has the potential to reduce discipline heterogeneity within these evaluation groups.

f. Because EECs are multi-faculty bodies, the provost would provide quality assurance and oversight.

3. Suggested Composition
   a. Provost, as non-voting chair of committee
   b. Deans of all faculties represented within an EEC
   c. Three to six elected members
   d. Representation of all three ranks of professor
   e. No more than one member of any department evaluated by that EEC.
   f. At least one member per faculty having members’ files evaluated by that EEC.
   g. A total of elected members greater than the sum of the number of deans on the committee.
   h. Application to all EECs of the same composition.

4. Files for which an RP was not awarded by a UEC
   a. File presented to EEC by chair of colleague under review
   b. Discussion including department chair
   c. Any EEC member from the same department should be absent during discussion. This is added to
      i. Ensure equity among files, as not all departments will have an elected representative; the chair’s presence should be sufficient to offer departmental context.
      ii. Reduce putting closest colleagues in positions of potential conflict.
   d. Secret voting for each file
      i. No voting permitted by the presenting chair (who already voted on the file at UEC), provost (present for quality control and oversight), or any EEC member from the same department.

Outcomes: In all cases, EEC chair writes a letter explaining the decision.

   e. UEC’s decision overturned
      i. If the colleague is eligible for RP, then EEC awards an RP
      ii. If the colleague is ineligible for an RP, the decision is changed to a RPa
   f. UEC’s decision confirmed
      i. No RP awarded, regardless of eligibility
      ii. Discussion and additional vote only on whether or not the file deserves a RPb or RPd
      iii. Appeal process. If an RPd decision is reached, the colleague may appeal.

5. Files for RoSE award consideration
   a. Standards: The Renaissance Committee suggests that the University set explicit standards of excellence for all academic staff, highlighting the differences between constituencies and ranks. These should be fundamental documents for the University, and included as conditions of employment for individuals.
b. Home departments (or faculty in non-departmentalized faculties (NDF), in consultation with the dean, adapt the university-wide expectations into a form that meets the specific needs of the unit. It is critical that these unit-specific standards both
   i. align with the core mission and goals of the University, and
   ii. be set relative to external, not internal, standards (e.g. disciplinary norms)
c. It is the nominee’s duty to ensure that a committee of non-specialists be able to identify and understand excellence in the file, and to differentiate excellent from good achievement. The long-form annual report is the appropriate document for such contextualization.

Eligibility
a. Eligibility for a RoSE is independent of rank/stage, salary, and whether or not a colleague is still eligible for RPs. Members of eligible constituencies are never at-ceiling with respect to RoSE awards

b. All individuals are eligible only every other year for one or more RoSE awards.
   i. The activities in any Scholarship type to be evaluated for a RoSE must have occurred in the previous four academic years, ending 30 June of the year in which the EEC considers the file (presumably, in December of that year), and have not been part of a prior RoSE file.
      1. Activities within the last four years that were included in an unsuccessful RoSE nomination may be included in a new nomination.
      2. Activities included in a successful RoSE nomination may not be included in a subsequent nomination.
      3. The intent here is the following: if an individual is nominated every two years, s/he uses only the most recent two years’ worth of reporting; however,
      4. if work done three or four years earlier had not formed part of a previous RoSE award, it should be eligible for consideration.
      5. This should allow for more recognition of longer-term scholarly projects.

Exceptions
a. Impact: Some aspects of Scholarship may emerge as having unusually strong impacts after an extended period of time. In such cases, the colleague may make a special argument for a given piece/body of Scholarship.
b. Individuals can claim impact for an aspect of Scholarship once, regardless of how long ago such work was produced.
c. It will be incumbent upon the nominee to clarify how such impact was not previously rewarded with a RoSE through the usual process.
d. The committee notes that RoSE awards granted for publications in high-impact journals would preclude a subsequent RoSE for impact, and the use of journal ranking in recognizing implied impact.
e. Very long-term projects and activities: some forms of Scholarship may take longer than four years to complete, whether it is a cycle of teaching, a research project, or service-related activity. In such cases, the colleague may make a special argument for an extension of the time of eligibility. It would be incumbent upon the nominee to clarify how this work was not rewarded previously, either at one point or in stages, incrementally.
Process

a. File is presented to EEC by chair of the individual under review

b. Discussion ensues, which includes department chair
   i. Any EEC member from the same department should be absent during discussion.
   ii. This restriction ensures equity among files, as not all departments will have an
tenlected representative. The chair should be available to offer departmental context.
   iii. Reduces putting close colleagues in positions of potential conflict.
   iv. All files within a rank/stage are treated equally regardless of whether activities cover
a two-, three-, or four-year time frame.

c. Secret-ballot scoring for each file
   i. No scoring permitted by the presenting chair (who already voted on the file at UEC),
provost (present for quality control and oversight), or any EEC member from the
same department.

d. Outcomes: In all cases, a letter explaining the outcome is provided to the nominee.

e. To enable the evaluation of research excellence to be a series of positive assessments (e.g.
how many RoSE should I score for a file?), as opposed to a negative assessment as is
common in many of FECs (e.g. from which files should the chair’s recommendation be
lowered?), the committee is recommending a fundamentally different approach to the
distribution of funds associated with RoSEs. This involves a two-step process:
   i. Determination of the number of RoSEs awarded
   ii. Determination of the monetary value of the RoSEs awarded

f. Based on previously identified inequities associated with the current FEC systems related to
rank/stage, and perceived inequities as to which types of Scholarship are monetarily valued,
the Renaissance Committee suggests that the RoSE pool be divided into several smaller
pools:
   i. By rank.

g. The committee suggests that
   ii. The per capita RoSE allotments for all individuals potentially eligible for a RoSE
(that is, who did not receive a RoSE in the prior year) be tabulated and separated by
rank/stage, with separate tabulations required for each of the EECs.
   iii. It is expected that, except in special (that is, rare) circumstances, the entire sum
allocated to each RoSE pool will be awarded each year, by Scholarship type within
rank.
   iv. As well, because each individual potentially eligible for a RoSE has a clearly
identified ratio identifying expected distribution of time related to scholarly activities,
each EEC should calculate the average percentage for each Scholarship type for all
individuals potentially eligible for the award. This will need to be done separately for
each EEC, and likely each rank/stage within each EEC. For example,
      1. EEC1 may have an average of 40%–40%–20% RTS
      2. EEC2 may have an average of 50%–30%–20% RTS
   v. The total monetary amount available to an EEC should be subdivided into separate
pools, exactly in proportion to the average ratios described above. These will need to
be done separately for each rank/stage within each EEC. For example,
      1. If the total value of RoSEs to be awarded to full professors in EEC1 is
$300,000, then there should be three sub-pools of values $120,000, $120,000,
and $60,000
2. If the total value of RoSEs to be awarded to full professors in EEC2 is $300,000, then there should be three sub-pools of values $150,000, $90,000, and $60,000.

h. Determination of the number of RoSEs awarded
   i. Each file is scored for excellence in each of a number of Scholarship types (e.g. research, teaching, service related to scholarship (not administrative service))
   ii. For each Scholarship type, each eligible-to-vote EEC member indicates the number of RoSE units they suggest be assigned to that file. The committee suggests a range of from zero to five.
   iii. Delete the high and low votes for each of the Scholarship types; thereby, reduce the influence of outliers/politics and opportunities for “horse-trading.”
   iv. After those deletions, calculate the average RoSE for each Scholarship type.
      1. If this average is less than 1, a RoSE for that Scholarship type may not be made.
      2. If the file does not garner sufficient scoring to warrant >= 1 in any aspect of Scholarship, no RoSE is awarded.
      3. This ends the evaluation process for that file
      4. As no RoSE was awarded, the individual remains eligible the subsequent year

i. Determination of values of RoSEs awarded: RoSEs automatically become part of the colleague’s base salary regardless of rank/stage.
   i. A unit value would be determined as follows:
      1. calculate the total number of RoSE awards within a given Scholarship type by a single EEC for a given rank/stage (sum of awards by type)
      2. divide the total amount of money allocated to a given rank/stage pool for that Scholarship type (above) by the sum of awards by type for that rank/stage
   ii. For example:
      1. If $120,000 were available to reward teaching excellence by full Professors in EEC1, and after deliberations, EEC awarded 100 RoSEs for teaching excellence, each would be valued at $1,200.
      2. Because individuals could be awarded between zero and five RoSEs for a given Scholarship type, this would represent values between 0 and $6,000.
      3. If $120,000 were available to reward research excellence by full professors in EEC1, and after deliberations, EEC awarded 200 RoSEs for research excellence, each would be valued at $600
      4. Because individuals could be awarded between zero and five RoSEs for a given Scholarship type, this would represent values between 0 and $3,000.
   iii. The committee recognizes that this approach to parameterization will result in the value of RoSE awards varying among EECs, among years, and as a function of Scholarship type. In particular, the value of ‘underperformed’ Scholarship types will be high, relative to the value of ‘commonly performed’ Scholarship types.
   iv. The committee appreciates this as a strength of the system, as an adaptive response of colleagues will be future investment in the underrepresented Scholarship types, thereby helping the University meet its stated mission.
   v. If it is found that this arrangement underweights certain aspects of Scholarship (e.g. research), the solution, the committee submits, is to change the expected job duties of
the individual academic. A critical benefit of this system is its prevention of subsidization; that is, the reward of one type of Scholarship cannot draw allocated funds from another type.

vi. The committee anticipates that, through a frequency-dependent process, this system will eventually stabilize, the activities of academic staff to the mission and goals of the University.
Section 4—Expenditures and Revenue

In section 3 of the report, the committee focused on the linkage among job duties, evaluation, and reward. The committee did this in a cost-neutral manner, focusing primarily on the philosophical, academic, and equity aspects of this linkage. However, universities – particularly research-intensive universities – are not, nor should they be, inexpensive operations. Neither time nor mandate supported a detailed accounting of all aspects of revenue generation and expenditures. The committee focused on a few specific topics. They are presented here and include discussion of administrative expenses, revenue generation, and some broad consequences of the current organization of the University of Alberta and its many faculties. The committee appreciates that these topics may be highly contentious.

When the Renaissance Committee was created in the fall of 2012, the University was dealing with an anticipated shortfall in the 2013-2014 academic years due to the Government of Alberta’s three-year commitment of 2%. This was less than the University of Alberta’s consolidated institutional planning budget of 4.4%. One of the purposes of the Renaissance Committee was to examine what cost containment measures could be implemented to “avoid budget reallocations.” However, in March 2013, the Government of Alberta unexpectedly announced a 7.2% cut. The Renaissance Committee’s mandate was not short-term cost saving measures but long-term vision and initiatives. The committee, with the support of AASUA and the Board of Governors, maintained its long-term focus in spite of the changes to the budget. Thus, recommendations on expenditures and revenue are targeted for the long-term and are not intended to address immediate issues. The committee recognizes that this focus will be a disappointment to some.

Guiding Principles

- The University should be a vibrant institution contributing to the Edmonton, Albertan and Canadian culture, community, and economy, focusing on its Scholarship strengths while ensuring financial viability through innovative practices and renewal.
- The net revenues of the University must be sufficient to allow it to meet its institutional priorities.
- If net revenue is unlikely to be obtained to meet institutional priorities, and efforts to alter the bottom line fail, institutional priorities should change.
- The organization of the institution into faculties and departments imposes costs and results in benefits. Consequently, it is important that any organizational choice be consciously made, based on sound logic rather than accepted because of tradition. Costs should be clearly identified and acknowledged, as they are offset by benefits. No one aspect of the University balance sheet caused the so-called structural deficit or is “primarily responsible.” All decisions related to costs and revenue generation deserve equal attention.
- The relationship between the Government of Alberta and the University of Alberta, including the latter’s heavy reliance on provincial funding as well as non-market driven limits to tuition, restricts the ability of the Board of Governors to generate revenue. This financial reality is unlikely to change in the near to medium term.
- Terms such as “administrative bloat,” and comments regarding excessive salaries of professors or leadership have great potential to be divisive and decrease community engagement. These issues must be discussed in an open and safe environment, but such a discussion is difficult to have in the current climate on campus.
- Suggestions to rethink the organization of academic units will feel threatening to many and would be disruptive to the institution. These issues must be acknowledged but not be a reason not to ask “what if?”
Key Problems:

The demographic composition of academic staff is shifting towards increased make-up of specialized scholars and APOs, and away from traditional professoriate. These changes run counter to trends in research funding and graduate student enrollment since specialized scholars cannot hold or supervise students independently.

- Overall, the composition of academic staff at the University of Alberta is older than it was 10 years ago, particularly among the professoriate. Recently, there has been a significant drop in the relative numbers of assistant professors, with potentially negative consequences for the academy.
- Heavy reliance on provincial funding puts the University at risk of financial crisis, as per governmental, rather than academic, choices.
- A focus on the unit, rather than the University, decreases the ability to create a cohesive sense of belonging on campus. A consequence of this is increased ease in identifying problems on campus in other units, with decreased acknowledgement of challenges within one’s own. A NIMBY approach to university administration is unlikely to be in the long-term best interests of anyone.
- The University of Alberta is fully governed. It is very decentralized, but the decision-making power does not accompany the responsibility in this structure. Because governance processes can be used in a very heavy-handed way, they can stifle the attainment of academic goals.
- The splitting of the University into 18 faculties and 65 departments creates a number of structural problems related to governance, expenditures, and quality assurance. As indicated by the structure of peer institutions, the University of Alberta’s level of decentralization is unusually high.

Recommendations:

4-1    Commit the University of Alberta to an ongoing and aggressive monitoring program based on demographic trends in the academic staff. This commitment would allow for adjustment to programs, both from academic and human resources perspectives, prior to the occurrence of significant and unexpected shifts.

4-2    Open a dialogue in the University community about the relative proportions of professors and specialized scholars necessary to ensure a vibrant culture and allow the University to meet its mission. The absence of such a discussion will likely result in infighting and decreased collegiality as groups stake out turf. This outcome would be exacerbated if conditions among faculties differ substantially, such that connection to the wider institution diminishes.

4-3    Commit to ensuring that assistant professors represent a certain proportion of the professoriate through time. This balance can be achieved through retirement incentives as well as shifts in hiring strategies. For example, in periods in which the total number of hires declines, it is critical that a greater proportion of hires be made at the level of assistant professor to offset the natural decrease of assistant professors through promotion.

4-4    To simplify and clarify the hiring process, disband the hiring grid and the use of market supplements, and replace them with starting salaries negotiated with the deans within ranges approved by the provost.

4-5    Simplify the hiring process further by reducing the number of constituencies in AASUA (see section 2 of this report).

4-6    Encourage retirement through the introduction of a system of incentives, such as the one deployed at Stanford University. This type of incentive would mitigate the need for voluntary severance packages in times of unpredicted fiscal cutbacks. The incentive would allow faculty to
plan for transition into retirement. Triggered by rank progression, this incentive would treat women and men equitably.

4-7 Invest at all levels – central administration, faculties, and departments – in emeritus professors so that this talent pool can be encouraged to continue to contribute. Office space on a shared basis, small research stipends, and/or other incentives, need to be provided to them. The wealth of experience and skills could be used in the review of potential grant applications, etc. This small investment would yield enormous dividends for the University in terms of both continuing to access a significant talent pool and releasing senior salaries to enable the recruitment of junior faculty in order to expedite the renewal of the academy.

4-8 Search both in Administration and AASUA for a mechanism to engage the community in an open and safe discussion about the costs of administering the organization. The discussion must include such sacred cows as the salaries of central administrators, hiring priorities among constituencies, and the division of the University into its decentralized form. The committee suggests that trusted senior members of the institution lead such discussions, and this may be a role for some emeriti.

4-9 Commit to an ongoing process for the quantification of the costs and values allocated to the scholarly and support aspects of the University. All principals must work together to define terms and establish a robust monitoring program.

4-10 If there is a desire to reduce administrative costs, centralize as far as possible administrative services currently provided by faculties (for example, registration, research services, graduate student admissions).

4-11 Reduce the number of departments and faculties. The committee suggests a minimum department size of 40, with each faculty consisting of no fewer than 160 tenure-track or tenured individuals (and four departments). This restructuring does not imply reducing the total size of the professoriate. This would allow the University to reorganize its existing faculty complement in a more effective structure, one that enhances both Scholarship and opportunities for students.

4-12 Require that the indirect costs of research (ICR) be collected on all eligible grants. Work with funding agencies to permit ICR gradually to be introduced. In some cases, make it University policy to refuse to support grant applications to agencies that appear not to have legitimate reasons to exclude ICR.

4-13 Implement a single and transparent policy for the distribution of ICR, regardless of its source. In recognition that ICR are borne at all levels of the institution, include disbursements to central administration, faculty, department, centre/institute, if appropriate, and PI.

4-14 Do not permit industrial research to be supported with the ICR that comes to the University as a result of grants obtained from the Tri-Councils.

4-15 Shift the Research Service Office’s emphasis towards the scholar’s experience of the grant process. Anything that causes professors what they perceive to be unnecessary extra work will likely result in reduced grants being written and received and could result in increased administrative costs associated with journal vouchers having to be completed in order for the grant holder to access funds.

4-16 Work to improve the relationship between personnel in faculty development offices and those in the Office of the Vice-President (Advancement) with a view to encouraging everyone to feel part of a single institution, rather than of an individual unit.

Relationship to the Terms of Reference:

“The Renaissance Committee shall respond to the current underlying academic compensation pressures faced by the University of Alberta.”
Since academic compensation has been identified as not being the only underlying source of pressure on the financial situation of the University, the Renaissance Committee felt it appropriate to look more broadly at financial pressures. It did this at the further request by AASUA Council:

The Council of the Association of Academic Staff at the University of Alberta asks:

The Renaissance Committee to conduct analysis of the historic growth of the University’s administrative operations for the last twenty years relative to the investment in academic faculty.\textsuperscript{105}

The committee notes, in making further recommendations in section 5 of this report, that it did not have access to twenty years of data. With the available information, the Renaissance Committee provides the following in response to questions of revenue and expenditures.

Current Status/Context at the University of Alberta

Over the last decade, the University has undergone an expansion in the size of the academic staff, that is, those who perform scholarship as well those who support scholarly activities. This expansion resulted from both a shift in leadership vision for the University and a period of substantial increases in base funding from the Province of Alberta. In addition to growth in numbers of people came a growth in the number of buildings. It comes as no surprise to find that the University skyline differs substantially now from even a few years ago. Both people and buildings cost money, and as their numbers have increased, so too have the costs of the operation.

Some of these costs could be offset through revenue derived from increased enrollment (and tuition) of undergraduate and graduate students, as well as a number of related fees. Other revenue comes from the indirect costs of research (IRC), with funds able to be used to support a number of activities. Additional sources of funds come from donations and gifts.

On 7 March 2013, the University presented a narrative addressing a “structural deficit,” defined as an approximately 2% difference between salary mass increase and Government of Alberta funding.\textsuperscript{106} The emphasis placed on the “structural deficit” designation referred to the salary, benefits, and pension costs of the employees of the University, with particular focus having been placed on the scholars who perform the core activities of the University.

Here the committee suggests not singling out any particular aspect of the revenue and expenditures of the University, but instead having an open discussion of the decisions leading to the current situation, and developing a long-term plan that allow for discussions of net revenues. Achievement of this goal requires openness and trust across campus and individuals willing to put the University ahead of their unit. The committee has attempted to do so here in this report and below presents ideas for discussion that unlikely follow the traditional narratives being presented by either central administration or AASUA.

Human Resources
Current Demographics

Currently, the AASUA consists of over 4,000 members, with approximately 50% being academic faculty (see section 2 of this report). Since 1994, CAS:T\textsuperscript{107}, FSO, and APO categories have the highest rates of

\textsuperscript{105} Academic Faculty Committee motion for special Council meeting of 2 May 2013.

\textsuperscript{106} http://change.ualberta.ca/financials/structural-deficit.

\textsuperscript{107} The data for the CAS:T constituency are difficult to interpret, as the constituency did not exist in 1996, and the committee included the Sessional and Other Temporary Staff (SOTS) category until 2006; since, both groups have decreased in numbers.
growth (Figure 4.1). Figure 4.2 provides a more detailed accounting of changes in the last five years for all current AASUA constituencies.

It is clear from these data that over this period, most of the growth in the AASUA was not in academic faculty but rather in specialized scholars (e.g., CAS:T and FSO) and predominantly administrative positions (i.e., APOs). A more extensive discussion of the roles of the different constituencies is offered in section 2 of the report. Given the increased emphasis on increasing the international standing of the University of Alberta as a research-intensive university, the disproportionate increase in specialized and administrative positions, relative to that of professors, is noteworthy.

![Figure 4.1: Percentage Change in AASUA Constituency Membership, 1994 to 2012](image)
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108 2012 vs 1994; Data from AASUA Work Load/Work Life Survey, AASUA, and HRS.
Figure 4.2: Change in Population of AASUA Constituencies in the last 5 Years.

Additional data permitted a comparison of changes in some constituency sizes between 2003 and 2012, in comparison to changes in student populations, research funding, and donations (Figure 4.3). Over this time, the committee again found the group with the greatest relative increase in numbers to be the APO constituency. Its growth outpaced the increase in students, research funding, or donations. The committee notes that graduate student populations and research funding each increased by approximately 60% during this interval. The committee further notes that, during this period, the growth of the professoriate slightly outpaced the growth of the undergraduate student body. Clearly, the scholarly activities performed by professors have shifted. The shift has included a rapid increase in research-related activities.

One critical caveat here is that the committee did not have access to a comprehensive database extending for several decades, and thus was unable holistically to evaluate long-term trends. The time-windows presented are those that were available; they were not chosen. The committee was unable to identify any particular date as the “benchmark” year against which comparisons should be made.
Table 4.1 provides the gender proportions by constituency. As a recent equity report shows, women are a minority in the academic faculty, but are a majority in other constituencies with Scholarship responsibilities (teaching and research) and/or administrative responsibilities. The committee acknowledges that this is a superficial review of the issue and discusses equity at greater length in section 5 of this report.

Table 4.1: Proportion of male/female per AASUA constituency in 2013. Green indicates the majority gender (Source HR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic trust</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS:T and Sessionals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Academic/support not eligible</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSO/APO/Librarian</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the University have an aging Academic Faculty?

A recurring theme from conversations with stakeholders was concern regarding the age and rank distribution of the professoriate, with a perception that it was becoming older and more senior (by rank) relative to times past. This was expressed as concern in the context of increased costs (individuals who have worked longer will, rightly, have higher salaries than recent hires), potential impacts on social dynamics within a unit, and a perception that the quality of scholarly work performed towards the end of the career will be more variable amongst individuals compared to early in the career. As presented in

section 3 of the report, the committee believes there is an alternative system of compensation that could deal with many of these concerns, while also recognizing excellence in scholarly activities regardless of age. Here the committee focuses on more basic: is the population of academic staff aging, and, if so, does it matter?

Figure 4.4 shows the percentage of individuals over the age of 60 years in five of the AASUA constituencies at three points over the last 10 years. The committee notes several interesting trends. First, the FSO constituency has not shown measurable changes between 2002 and 2012, although it had an unexplained period of youthfulness in 2007. The data from the other four constituencies are clearer; they have all shown measurable increases in the proportion of members over age 60 over the course of the 10-year data window. The committee notes that the APO constituency has nearly doubled in this statistic over ten years; this likely has contributed to the large proportion of APOs currently at salary ceiling (section 3 of the report). The committee also notes that the constituencies whose members perform Scholarship (faculty, FSO, CAS:T, librarians) all tend to have a higher proportion of individuals over 60 than do APOs; this is likely related to differences in age of retirement and potential for renewal (discussed below). The committee is unable to say whether over 16% of the professoriate being over the age of 60 is good, or bad, relative to it being 10% 10 years prior. However, it most certainly costs the University more, as would be expected given the current salary curves (section 3 of the report). To better understand the causes of these age-class shifts, the committee turned to the ages of individuals at entry and exit from the University.

![Figure 4.4: Percentage of FTE 60 years or older (Source HRS).](image)

Age at the Time of Hire

Over 70% of the academic faculty has been hired in the last 15 years. The committee has no idea whether this is a large or small number, as long-term data are not available. The committee had no comparable data regarding age-at-hire for other constituencies. This lack is unfortunate given the common pattern of aging among all groups, which suggests that this is a structural issue within the University (and potentially a societal one, although the committee notes that Albertans have a younger average age than
Canadians in other provinces). Thus, although the committee puts focus on professors here, doing so should not be interpreted as that group having unique trends.

For professors, the age of new hires (31–35) at the rank of assistant professor has remained relatively stable over a 35-year time frame. Critically, this stability runs directly counter to a common narrative the committee heard in support of the increased use of market supplements at the time of hire: new hires are training more and thus warrant higher starting salaries. Although shifts such as forgoing a Master’s degree but an increasing number of scholars undertaking postdoctoral training cannot be accounted for, the committee strongly encourages individuals not to assume greater competencies at the time of hire without comparisons to external standards and historical data. The committee suggests that central administration should be more active in collecting and distributing such data to the appropriate administrators.

In contrast, the age at the time of hire of individuals appointed to the ranks of associate or full professor has shown steady increases since the mid/late 1980s (Figure 4.5). It is important to note that males tend to be 2–4 years younger than females when hired at the assistant or associate ranks; there is no difference in age of hire among males and females at the rank of full professors (figure not shown). Combined, these suggest that changes in age at hire could have some influence on the age distribution of the professorate, particularly if there is substantial hiring at the associate and full professor ranks.

![Figure 4.5: Average Age of Academic Faculty at Time of Hire (Source HRS)](image)

Figure 4.6 indicates that since the 1990s there has been no trend in the proportion of new professors hired at the rank of assistant professor. Thus, contrary to a narrative heard by the committee from many stakeholders, it found no evidence that the University has shifted hiring priorities to more senior ranks. However, because the age at hire for associate and full professors has increased during this time period,

110 [http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/110928/dq110928a-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/110928/dq110928a-eng.htm). “Alberta had, on July 1 (2011), the youngest population among the provinces with a median age of 36.0 years and a proportion of persons 65 years or older of 10.8%.”

111 The committee has reduced confidence in the older data.
even constant rates of hire at the three ranks will necessarily cause an aging of the professoriate. In section 3 of this report, the committee identified increased starting salaries, particularly for full professors. It is likely that these pieces of data are related such that there has been an active choice to hire more experienced and more expensive full professors, even if the proportion of new hires at the senior rank has not changed. Critically, if there are concerns regarding the salary mass of professors, this strategy of hiring more senior individuals must be taken into consideration because the practice increases costs. Alternatively, if this practice meets institutional goals, then there should be more explicit recognition that this is money well spent rather than the cause of a problem for the University.

Figure 4.6: Percentage of new hires that were appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor (Source HRS)

Retirement Patterns

Age-dependent mandatory retirement ended in 2007, and at the time it was believed that there would be little impact on the average age of retirement.\(^{112}\) Supporting this, the committee found no clear trend in the age of retirement resulting from this change (Figure 4.7). The committee focused only on faculty and APO constituencies, as they are the two largest constituencies with continuing appointments, and thus provide sufficient numbers for analysis.

APOs and academic faculty are retiring later now than in 2007, but this trend is not clear in the comparison to 2006, when mandatory retirement was still active. Further, the actual age of retirement in 2012 for both groups is less than the age of retirement in 2006. The committee suggests these data offer strong evidence to show that inducements for retirement (e.g., VRIP in 2010) can have impacts on retirement decisions, with demographic consequences. Given the recent VSP program in August/September 2013, it is likely that the average age of retirement will decline over the next year. A predictable and cost-effective inducement program may be prudent as a means to limit salary mass

\(^{112}\) Source; associate vice-president, Human Resource Services.
growth associated with an aging academic staff. This may be most prudent in constituency groups that currently have lower rates of retirement, and may not be necessary where retirement rates are high relative to other constituencies. This program should be part of a larger set of tools that support renewal to meet institutional goals to maintain excellence and provide a positive work environment.

Currently, professors tend to retire approximately two years later than do APOs (Figure 4.7). This is also seen in Figure 4.8, where 18% of APOs aged 60 or older in 2012 retired in 2013, compared to only 8% of faculty. Clearly, there are differences between these two groups in propensity to continue with employment. Thus, if the University wishes to encourage retirement, the committee suggests differential programs among constituencies are likely to have the most impact. The committee wishes to note that the end of mandatory retirement was, in part, a strategic decision for hiring and retaining practices: “The University gains by retaining excellent staff and continuing to attract top performers late in their careers.”113 Thus, although inducing retirement may save money, it may also induce the loss of scholarly excellence.

The committee noted that the end of mandatory retirement has provided a secondary source of income for those at or above age 60 through the Canadian Pension Plan.114 Further, at a certain age individuals are required to receive UAPP payments (beyond the last day of the year in which member turns 69), and critically, are prevented by federal legislation from contributing (maximum pensionable service is 35 years).115 These proscriptions are not necessarily a problem to be solved, although the committee heard from stakeholders and individuals that it presents the perception of unfairness to the system. Such perception comes at the risk of reduced morale and collegiality on campus.

![Figure 4.7: Average age of retirement for Academic Faculty and APO Constituencies (Source HRS)](image)

113 Carl Amrhein and David Johnson, *Changes to Mandatory Retirement*, Interdepartmental Correspondence, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), University of Alberta, 23 Mar. 2007.


Because of the deferred salary structure inherent in nearly all constituencies, an aging constituency will result in increased income disparity within the constituency. In Figure 4.9, the committee shows the difference between the proportions of individuals of a given constituency who are over age 60, and that of the salary mass paid to that constituency that those individuals receive. Here, positive value indicates that individuals over 60 receive more than their “share” based upon purely equitable distributions of salary (flat; non-deferred). The committee is not advocating this particular salary curve but uses it for comparison. What can be seen for all groups, other than FSOs, is an increased concentration of the salary mass being paid to individuals over age 60.
Figure 4.9: For those over 60 years old, Difference between Percentage of Salary Mass and Percentage of FTE. Positive values indicate concentration of Salary Mass, which results from a deferred compensation structure (Source HRS)

Distributions among Ranks

Among professors, the committee sees a potentially alarming trend regarding the proportions of the three ranks of professors. Throughout the period 2002–2009, the professoriate grew (Figure 4.10). Occurring at roughly equal rates in all three ranks, this growth resulted in no substantive changes in the rank-distribution of individuals (Figure 4.11). However, from 2009 to the present, a shift has occurred. In the last four years, there has been a precipitous drop in both the number of assistant professors (from 600 to 400), and their relative abundance among the professoriate (from approximately 28% to less than 20%). Like caribou in Alberta, assistant professors are becoming a rare sighting at the University of Alberta.

Over this same time period, absolute numbers of associate and full professors have steadily increased. However, professors generally remained at a constant percentage, although in 2013 they are nearing the 47% mark. Associate professors now represent a higher proportion of the professoriate than at any time in the past 11 years.

The committee finds these changes of great interest, and they most certainly influence the workplace environment and increase costs to the University. As assistant professors are typically less expensive than associate and full professors, shifting ratios will alter costs, even in the absence of changes in the total number of professors. Because there does not appear to be a change in the proportion of new hires that are appointed at assistant professor (Figure 4.6), these changes in ratios (Figure 4.11) are most likely due to an overall reduction in hiring (below), continued promotion through the ranks, and, potentially, shifts in retirement decisions (below).

The committee is unable to find any indication that a reduction in the proportion and number of professors at the assistant professor rank is healthy for the academy; nor does it portend positive outcomes in the future. Shifts in rank distributions, as they are related to salary distributions, must impact salary mass, renewal, and the costs of pension and benefits. Due to the critical importance of both Scholarship and economic sustainability, the committee suggests great care should be taken with any practices that result in demographic shifts. Such changes should be intentional rather than accidental.
Promotion and Resignations through the Assistant and Associate Professor Ranks
As a result of the above concerns, the committee explored possible reasons for the shifts in demographics. Changes in academic faculty demographics are influenced by changes in the assistant and associate professor ranks, through promotion, or departure from the University. The promotion of associate professors can be made to any of the different levels of full professor, depending on current salary.
Data about assistant (Figure 4.12) and associate professors (Figure 4.13) are presented at two time points, 2007 and 2012. For assistants, the committee sees that over 82% of operating funding in 2007 stay as assistants into 2008. In contrast, only about 72% of assistants stay as assistants in 2012–2013. Similarly, the committee sees higher promotion to associate and higher rates of departure from the University in 2012 relative to 2007. These discrepancies indicate that a drop in assistants going into 2013 is due to many being promoted and more leaving. Likely, these events are linked to the tenure process, but they could stem from low morale or other reasons.

Figure 4.12: Population Changes of Assistant Professors in 2007 and 2012. The figure shows those who stayed at assistant (blue), those who were promoted to associate professor (red), and those who left the University (green) in the following year (2008 or 2013) (Source HRS)

For associate professors, overall, the committee sees more promotion to full in 2007 than in 2012. This discrepancy is also consistent with findings (Figure 4.13) showing an increase in the number of assistants moving to associate but not yet ready for promotion to full in 2012.
Faculty can be paid from either the operating grant or trust funds. (For about every four of the former, there is one of the latter.) Thankfully, there is no evidence that promotion or leave outcomes differ as a function of funding source. There is one exception: while for operating-grant-funded associate professors, in both years of these data, less than 50% of those who became full professors were promoted to Full Professor Level 1, a majority went to Full Professor Level 2 or Level 3, conversely, over 50% of trust-funded associate professors were promoted to Full Professor Level 1. In 2012, none of the trust-funded associate professors were promoted to Full Professor Level 3.

Rate of Hiring of Academic Faculty

The University promotes its institutional goals and values by strategically allocating resources to initiatives that reflect those goals. For example, there has been increased hiring of specialized scholars (the committee’s term) and APOs relative to academic faculty. However, this discrepancy does not imply that hiring among faculty has been limited; indeed, the rate of the hiring of professors has increased for much of the last 20 years (Figure 4.14). Among the academic faculty, stakeholders indicated a shift towards recruitment of internationally competitive candidates at all ranks. These scholars were hired at higher initial salaries (section 3 of the report), which were presumably justified as both their recruitment aligned with the strategic plan of the University to be internationally recognized and the market demanded such salaries. After 2003, practice was to hire the best possible candidate in the pool\textsuperscript{116} to become a top national and international institution. This occurred at a time when government funding was increasing. In more recent years, the number of annual hires decreased. As indicated previously, the

\textsuperscript{116} Stakeholder discussions.
committee found no evidence of a shift towards hiring at more senior ranks and thus could not substantiate a narrative that prevails on campus.

It was noted that this increase in the breadth of the hiring pool for academic faculty did not extend to all constituencies, where many (e.g. APOs; CAS:T) tend to be hired from a municipal or provincial pool of candidates. The expectation is that salary scales would vary as a function of the breadth of the candidate pool, although the committee did not have data for such analysis.

![Figure 4.14: Number of new hires per 5 year by rank. (Source HRS)](image)

Valuing Experience while Encouraging Retirement

“If youth knew and age could” does not easily apply to academic faculty. Both junior and senior professors possess a significant degree of knowledge upon entering academe, having studied and achieved the qualifications in preparation for the chosen career path. Academics have a long professional life span, typically only limited by health issues. Often, they work as part of teams or centres in which contributions of both junior and senior faculty are vital. In this environment, renewal can be a contentious subject.

There is an aging academic faculty population that has made, and continues to make, enormous contributions to their respective fields and to the education of countless undergraduate and graduate students. They justly deserve recognition, praise, admiration, and a continued place at the University of Alberta. However, there are also those who were, but who are no longer, fully contributing and yet who have no real incentive to leave. There is a pool of individuals who continue to contribute but would like to retire or change careers, but they financial circumstances preclude their doing so. At the other end of the career spectrum, there is a pool of young, dynamic, and full-of-potential PhDs and postdoctoral fellows with a panoply of new skills and ideas looking for employment and opportunities to contribute. This young group often possesses the disruptive ideas that result in a highly vibrant academy. There must be room for both to exist while ensuring a steady turnover and an even distribution of junior and senior colleagues.
Lack of Mandatory Retirement, Difficulty with Succession Planning, and an ongoing Mechanism to incentivize Retirement

Any geometric salary curve creates salary mass pressures associated with the timing of retirement. Quite simply, if individuals gain salary at geometrically increasing rates up until the day they retire, salaries may be substantially higher than necessary to maintain international competitiveness. This result may occur independently of any change in actual average age of retirement because of the compounding effect associated with increasing starting salaries (section 3 of this report). Needless to say, the issue is compounded if the average age of retirement increases. Although the committee has not seen data to suggest this is of current concern for the University of Alberta, it is a pressure that could be building as the numbers approaching normal retirement age continue to climb. Further, the implementation of retirement incentive programs, such as the VRIP (2009–2010) and VSP (2013–2014), impacts retirement decisions by employees and forces a unit to be reactive rather than proactive in program planning and succession planning.

The committee heard from stakeholders that, aside from potentially exerting pressure on salary mass related to an aging professoriate, the inability to plan for retirement (as an employee or as an academic administrator) exerts substantial stress and uncertainty. From an employee’s perspective, everyone will eventually retire, but the question is when? Having a clear sense of what options will be available in due course, without needing to guess or wait to see if a one-off plan might be offered, seems a reasonable expectation. From an employer’s perspective, having a mechanism to incentivize retirement, while also providing a means to limit continued salary increases of underperforming individuals, and accelerating salary increases of those performing with excellence would be a useful management tool. From both perspectives, having a permanent mechanism to incentivize retirement would allow individuals to plan better for their future and provide the University with a more orderly and steady exit from the institution so that a far better-distributed demographic profile across the academy over time could result.

The committee believes that the University needs an ongoing system of incentives to encourage retirement, such as the Stanford University model. This was mentioned briefly in section 3 of the report, and it ties into the RP/RoSE model that the committee recommends to the principals. Key features of the model could include the following:

- Eligibility for the retirement package is initiated at some agreed upon (and negotiated) number of years after an individual has last earned an RP, either through exhaustion of available RP awards at rank or failure to perform relative to expectation. The committee suggests eight years may be a reasonable trigger, in a system in which (as sketched in section 3 of this report) individuals are able to earn up to 25 RPs over a career. This would make them eligible for the retirement package no earlier than 33 years after appointment. The applicants must be eligible for the Canadian Pension Plan benefits.
- Once the process for the package is triggered, individuals would have the option of applying for a salary severance of a certain value. A key feature is that the value of the salary severance decreases sharply in each subsequent year. For example, the committee suggests one package for consideration: include a 100% current salary severance in the first year of eligibility, 50% in the second year, and 0% in the third year. This could be higher or lower pending negotiations between the principals; however, the goals of this incentive require the sharp reduction in value once eligibility is triggered.
- In this model, individuals either would have a clearly defined target for taking retirement with an incentive or would be able to make a clear decision not to avail themselves of the package. If the

---

former were the choice, the agreement would be binding upon signing. Similarly, after the expiry of the time to trigger eligibility, individuals would not be permitted to file a retroactive application.

- Discussions with stakeholders clarified for the committee that one contributor to the reluctance of some individuals to retire is the risk that their position will be absorbed by their faculty rather than retained by their department. Thus, although individuals may recognize the benefits of facilitating renewal, they also hold allegiance to the department and close colleagues. The committee suggests that this reluctance can be addressed by assuring individuals that, under typical circumstances, any position vacated through this program would return to the department. An added benefit is that, if the individual chooses and is eligible to stay as an emeritus, there would be opportunity for mentorship of the new hire.

- There are several potential ways by which this program could be funded. First, if positions are to return to a department, then the faculty line could be left unfilled for sufficient duration to permit payment for the retirement package. Alternatively, this program can be treated similarly to other benefits and funded through negotiation among the principals.

The committee believes this type of incentive would mitigate the need for voluntary severance packages in times of unpredicted fiscal cutbacks imposed by government and allow faculty to plan for transition into retirement. Triggered by rank progression, rather than age, this incentive would treat equitably individuals who begin their academic careers at different ages.

Professor Emeritus Status
The University has long awarded the status of Emeritus Professor to individuals upon retirement who have made significant contributions to the academy over their distinguished careers and who wish to continue to perform one or more of research, teaching, service, and mentoring of junior colleagues and students. However, in recent years this award has been perceived as less prestigious than it once was, and in many circumstances it may confer little benefit to either the institution or the individual. Often, office space for emeriti is seen as too costly and is denied. This decision precludes the potential contributions for mentoring and limits the ability for emeriti to continue research. Yet, many stakeholders suggested to the committee that the University needs ways to nurture this talent pool and encourage faculty turnover without losing the considerable skill sets and knowledge base of this cohort. Further, individual scholars make life-long commitments to the institution and their discipline, which need not end simply because of a change in job status. The institution suffers when it does not properly value, and draw value from, the skills and experience of emeriti professors.

Cost and Liability of the Pension Plan
The committee recognizes that the cost of the UAPP and the structural shortcomings and current liability of the plan are of concern for the institution; moreover, they present a hardship for incoming assistant professors, due to the high contribution rates (which are not uniformly disclosed during negotiations). This fact weighs heavily on morale at that rank and in some cases may affect recruitment and retention. Recent activities by plan managers, associations, and employers to change the pension plan prevented the committee from undertaking an in-depth analysis. Needless to say, the plan remains an issue that the principals should work on within the current structure, or through a new approach. At a time when provinces are gathering to discuss changes to the Canadian Pension Plan\textsuperscript{118}, although Alberta and the federal government are reticent to the idea, it may be brave and bold of this and other Alberta institutions to be proactive in the matter.

\textsuperscript{118} 15 Nov. 2013 Canada’s premiers meeting, Toronto, ON.
If the plan itself cannot be assessed or changes to it recommended at this stage, again alternative means of enticing eligible members to retire is an important consideration. The committee notes again that the end of mandatory retirement has also provided a secondary source of income for those at or above age 60 through the Canadian Pension Plan. Further, as stated previously, at a certain age individuals are required to receive UAPP payments (beyond the last day of the year in which a member turns 69), and, critically, are prevented by federal legislation from making further contributions (maximum pensionable service is 35 years). These constraints do not necessarily pose a problem to be solved, although the committee heard from stakeholders and individuals that they present the perception of unfairness to the system. Such perceptions come at the risk of reduced morale and collegiality on campus. If, however, the recommendation listed above encouraged retirement at around the time when individuals cease to contribute to the plan and junior faculty are recruited in their place, then junior faculty would be contributing to the plan and helping with its sustainability.

Summary of Concerns:

- The demographics of academic staff are changing. Although shifting demographics will alter both scholarly and financial aspects of the University, it does not appear that these shifts are well documented, or necessarily intentional.
- In relative terms, there has been more growth in the hiring of APOs and specialized scholars (as defined in section 2 of this report) than traditional academic faculty. At the same time, there has been increased research funding and growth in the graduate student population. Available data do not permit a determination of whether the increase in growth in support and specialized scholarship facilitated the growth in research, occurred independently, or inhibited growth.
- There has been a substantial decrease in the relative and absolute abundance of assistant professors. This cohort is extremely important for the long-term intellectual sustainability of the University, and a decrease in number has quite significant implications for the reputation and vitality of the University.
- If hiring practices include assistant professors but are not balanced by a reduction in more senior ranks, costs will continue to rise. This result would compound potential impacts on UAPP.
- Different constituencies have different natural patterns of retirement. If there were a desire to encourage retirement, such a program would likely have differential effectiveness (and need) among the constituencies.
- There are many outstanding senior professors and many talented junior academic faculty. Renewal is needed, but not at the loss of those who continue to make great contributions.
- It is good Human Resource practice to offer a clear and predictable approach to retirement planning, both for the employee and for academic administrators.

Recommendations:

4-1 Commit the University of Alberta to an ongoing and aggressive monitoring program based on demographic trends in the academic staff. This commitment would allow for adjustment to programs, both from academic and human resources perspectives, prior to the occurrence of significant and unexpected shifts.

4-2 Open a dialogue in the University community about the relative proportions of professors and specialized scholars necessary to ensure a vibrant culture and allow the University to meet its
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mission. The absence of such a discussion will likely result in infighting and decreased collegiality as groups stake out turf. This outcome would be exacerbated if conditions among faculties differ substantially, such that connection to the wider institution diminishes.

4-3 Commit to ensuring that assistant professors represent a certain proportion of the professoriate through time. This balance can be achieved through retirement incentives as well as shifts in hiring strategies. For example, in periods in which the total number of hires declines, it is critical that a greater proportion of hires be made at the level of assistant professor to offset the natural decrease of assistant professors through promotion.

4-4 To simplify and clarify the hiring process, disband the hiring grid and the use of market supplements, and replace them with starting salaries negotiated with the deans within ranges approved by the provost.

4-5 Simplify the hiring process further by reducing the number of constituencies in AASUA (see section 2 of this report).

4-6 Encourage retirement through the introduction of a system of incentives, such as the one deployed at Stanford University. This type of incentive would mitigate the need for voluntary severance packages in times of unpredicted fiscal cutbacks. The incentive would allow faculty to plan for transition into retirement. Triggered by rank progression, this incentive would treat women and men equitably.

4-7 Invest at all levels – central administration, faculties, and departments – in emeritus professors so that this talent pool can be encouraged to continue to contribute. Office space on a shared basis, small research stipends, and/or other incentives, need to be provided to them. The wealth of experience and skills could be used in the review of potential grant applications, etc. This small investment would yield enormous dividends for the University in terms of both continuing to access a significant talent pool and releasing senior salaries to enable the recruitment of junior faculty in order to expedite the renewal of the academy.

Administrative Structure and Costs

Scholarship is the essence of a University, representing a diversity of activities presented in a diversity of forms (see section 2 of this report). However, many aspects of Scholarship cannot be performed without the provision of critical support by a diversity of individuals in both AASUA and NASA. For example, teaching is not effective when students are unable to register for classes; research comes to a standstill when ethics and safety requirements are not met; and staff members are rightly upset if pay cheques are not distributed. Similarly, although individuals may disagree with strategic decisions made by leadership, deans, and chairs, these positions are critical and vital to the institution. The question thus is not whether administrative services are required but whether or not the University spends too much for the services delivered. This is a contentious issue.

In section 2 of this report, the committee discussed the role of academic administrators, as they represent a typically “hidden” cost (and benefit) to the institution. The committee highlighted that different faculties have differing numbers of administrative positions. This variation may be caused both by need (e.g., research funding, student population) and by historical influences (e.g., number of departments in a faculty). Here the committee discusses administrative costs more broadly, including aspects of central administration. However, there are two important limitations: (1) no one seems to agree on what is, and is not, “administration,” and (2) the availability is limited of data needed for a thorough analysis of administrative costs.
There is no agreed-upon definition of what constitutes administrative work or administrative costs on campus. Discussions with stakeholders led the committee to believe that the dominant perspective, regardless of who is speaking, is that the work of others is more likely to be administrative than the work of oneself. In a push for more formal definitions, as would be required for any meaningful analysis of the issues, the committee asked for clarification from the broader University (through the committee’s website) and AASUA directly. Unfortunately, there was no agreement among the community; nor could AASUA itself offer an approved definition representing the voice of the association. The committee finds this particularly interesting, as AASUA is an association consisting of individuals who perform substantial amounts of Scholarship, and individuals who perform substantial amounts of administration. In many cases, individuals do both. Thus, the committee envisioned them uniquely suited to offer clarity on the issue. It is possible that the issue of administration is currently too caustic to allow for even a discussion of definitions, let alone priorities. Thus, in the absence of specific direction from our principals, but in the presence of a clear timeline, the committee chose to use definitions correlated to available data.

Administrative Costs as reported to the Government of Alberta

The University of Alberta produces annual financial statements, approved each year by the province’s auditor general. The institution is also required to project budgets. Have the intended expenditures approved yearly. And indicate to the Government of Alberta the percentage of the operating budget that it spends on administration, in a two-year cycle. Therefore, the Province of Alberta has substantial data on the administrative cost of the institution. Furthermore, it has consistently approved the related expenses.

In its reporting to government, the University represents its administrative costs as the expenses associated with most of the vice-presidential portfolios, along with the costs of university governance.121 In discussions with stakeholders, this view of administration, represented primarily by central, is consistent with the views of many.122 The province set a target for such expenditures to be less than 5% of the operating budget. As shown in Table 4.2, the University of Alberta has been below this target in the last three reporting cycles.

The committee recognizes that individuals may disagree with individual line items in these total expenditures. It also recognizes that the size of the operating budget is quite large, such that even 5% represents a large amount of money. However, these are the data reported to – and approved by – the Government of Alberta.

Table 4.2 Percentage of Operating Budget spent on Administration, as reported to Government of Alberta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>07/08 - 08/09</th>
<th>08/09 - 09/10</th>
<th>09/10 - 10/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee did not have data from comparable universities in Alberta to make comparisons. However, another source of data may allow for some insight.

Administrative Costs as reported to CAUBO

121 Human Resource Services (Jeremy Wilhelm).

122 As indicated in section 2 of this report, the committee believes focusing on central administration greatly underestimates the costs actually spent on administration in a highly decentralized university. By definition, with decentralization comes costs at the “tips” of the institution, not solely at its centre.
All Canadian universities (or at least nearly all) report data in a somewhat standardized way to the Canadian Association of University Business Officers (CAUBO). As indicated on its webpage, CAUBO is designed to facilitate the operations of universities in Canada:

The mission of the Canadian Association of University Business Officers is to promote and support the professional management and effective leadership in the administrative affairs of Canadian universities and colleges, and in doing so to help achieve the goals of the institutions we serve. As part of its operations, CAUBO publishes an annual report (and database) entitled *Financial Information of Universities and Colleges*. CAUBO indicates that:

Financial *Information of Universities and Colleges* is an annual publication prepared by Statistics Canada for the Canadian Association of University Business Officers (CAUBO). CAUBO obtains the financial data for the publication by undertaking an annual survey of its degree granting member institutions. Users have indicated that the publication is a comprehensive reference source for the financial data of universities and colleges in Canada.

The financial data in the publication is based on an annual return completed and submitted by each member institution. The hard copy of the publication reports the financial data individually, by institution, and in aggregate, by province, region and nationally.

Although the future of this database is uncertain due to changes in Statistics Canada, existing datasets cover the academic years 1999–2000 through 2011–2012. Although decisions and recommendations in the report of the committee are made in consideration of the unique circumstances at the University of Alberta, comparisons with peer institutions can add to the data set for analysis. Unfortunately, despite the structure and definitions present in the data, great variability can still exist. Limitations to the CAUBO data are both significant and well known. Nonetheless, it is the best of the bad data available, if one wishes to make financial comparisons among Canadian universities.

The large volume of data renders a comprehensive evaluation of it beyond the scope of this report; thus, the committee presents here only a few relevant aspects and directs the reader to the CAUBO website (http://www.caubo.ca/) where additional data may be found.

The most relevant category reported to CAUBO is the percentage of operating budget spent on “administration and general.” This is an extremely broad category and includes areas such as grants management, accounting, registrar’s office, governance, and so on. (CAUBO’s definition of administration may be found as Appendix 3 of this report). Thus, while the Government of Alberta reported data focused predominantly on central administration, the CAUBO data is broader in the items included.

As seen in Figure 4.15, there is a long-term trend at the University of Alberta for a decrease in the percentage of operating budget spent on administration and general, as reported to CAUBO. Through this 13-year interval, the percentage stood above the U15 average in most years, and above that reported by University of Calgary. However, the data from the University of Calgary highlights the risks and limitations associated with analyses of the CAUBO data. In 2009–2010, the University of Calgary reported spending approximately 6% of its operating budget on administration, but the percentage leapt to 18% in 2011–2012 – a trebling of relative costs. Were the University of Calgary to have truly tripled administrative expenses over a two-year period, the committee is of the belief that news of it would have been in the front page of newspapers, and have been emphasized during the recent budget cuts. Instead, the reported increase appears to be due to other causes. In discussions with stakeholders, it was identified that the University of Calgary both changed reporting practices as well as the degree of centralization of services within its structure. Critically, some of these changes resulted in absolute administrative savings.
at that university, despite the reported increase in percentage expenditures. Unfortunately, the CAUBO data also cannot account for the true costs of administration, as costs at the “tips” (e.g., departments) and in the “core” (e.g. central administration) are not equally included in the calculation.

One suggestion the committee received from stakeholders was to focus not solely on the percentage of operating budget spent on administration but also on those expenditures in relation to the percentage of the operating budget spent on academic salaries. The committee believes this approach is predicated on the idea that the percentage of operating budget spent on academic salaries is an indication of the priorities of the institution. The committee does not disagree with the concept – the direction of money can be an honest indicator of actual, rather than stated, priorities.

Figure 4.16 shows that the average percentage expenditures in the U15 on academic salaries have declined. The pattern at the University of Alberta is murkier, as there is a substantial increase in percentage expenditures between 2007 and 2010, consistent with increases to the professoriate ranks and negotiated salary settlements.

Figure 4.17 shows the ratio of administrative and academic expenses, as reported to CAUBO. The committee notices that the U15 average only slightly varies over the year (0.3–0.36). University of Alberta fluctuates between 0.36 and 0.5 since 1999, and is always higher than average. In contrast, there has been a relative increase in administrative expenses at Toronto and Calgary, as reported to CAUBO.

Regardless of the picture painted from these data, there are substantive problems that limit the value and interpretation. First is the issue of these data being focused on operating budgets. Research-intensive universities, particularly those with medical schools, have large numbers of tenure-track professors on
contingent – not operating – budgets. The University of Alberta is no exception; approximately 20% (440 of 2400 \(^{123}\)) of all tenure-track professors are NOT paid through the operating budget. Despite the different source of their remuneration, these individuals share all the same rights and responsibilities as those funded through operating funds, for as long as the contingent source of funds continues. What this means to the issue of costs, is that the data for the University of Alberta do not include a very large fraction of the actual costs paid for the professoriate. Further, the relative amount of academic costs offset at other institutions is not reported to CAUBO, and thus the true expenditures toward academic faculty are unknown and likely variable. This point raises critical questions for discussion, and the various answers are critical to interpretation. For example, is a university being financially prudent by finding alternative external revenues to cover some of the cost of its academic mission? If so, what degree of financial risk is acceptable, given that contingent funds can (and, in the case of the funding of professorial positions by the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, effectively did) come to an abrupt end?

![Figure 4.16: Percentage of Operating Budget spent on Academic Salaries, as reported to CAUBO](image)

Figure 4.16: Percentage of Operating Budget spent on Academic Salaries, as reported to CAUBO

A second concern with the CAUBO data is the question of what exactly the percentage of operating budget spent on academic salaries indicates. Is it really an accurate signal of anything? For example, the committee suggests that if one wants to know if the University of Alberta is shifting scholarly activities

\(^{123}\) AASUA.
away from the professoriate to other academic staff, it is helpful to investigate demographics (above). If one is interested in asking whether salaries are too high or too low, it is useful to consult rankings of salaries and have an understanding of the marketplace. As mentioned, the committee is, it thinks rightly, not making a judgment on salaries; rather, it leaves that topic to the principals as a focus of negotiation.

However, there is evidence that the percentage of operating budget spent on academic salaries is not a useful indicator of salaries that the University is willing to pay the professoriate. One will note in Figure 4.17, that in 2011 the percentage of expenditures on faculty salaries at the University of Toronto is a full 30% (0.33% vs. 0.45%) less than at the University of Alberta. As Toronto has, on average, quite higher faculty salaries than Alberta, this would suggest that a decrease in percentage expenditures at Alberta would result in increased faculty salaries. Alternatively, the CAUBO data may be seen as being of limited value in assessing the commitment of a university to the remuneration of its most critical resource, the professoriate.

Figure 4.17: The Ratio of the Percentage of Operating Budget spent on Administration and Academic Salaries, as reported to CAUBO. The Renaissance Committee notes that calculating this ratio based on actual expenditures, rather than ratios, results in the same pattern.
Faculties, Departments, Centres and Institutes: Opening a Discussion on the potential negative Consequences of the Renaissance Committee’s Approach to Academic Organization

As the committee has discussed above, and previously in section 2 of this report, there are limitations to understanding of the true administrative costs of the University. A major component of this difficulty is the degree of decentralization found at the University of Alberta. This factor requires a full discussion of administration, one that extends beyond “central” to include the “tips” of the University: faculties and departments. The committee is of the belief that there are a number of academic, financial, and governance difficulties caused (or at least exacerbated) by the degree of the University’s decentralization. This characteristic does not mean that there are no advantages to decentralization, but it does mean that the costs are not fully accounted for and acknowledged. The committee holds that it is in the best interests of the institution to initiate an open conversation on these topics. However, the committee found that defensiveness arises when it begins to discuss the potentially negative effects to the University of there being a large number of departments in an individual faculty, or a large number of faculties in the University. The committee found that stakeholders have normalized the existing structure of the University and not questioned the consequences of the existing structure. This attitude may not be surprising in the context of the current budget situation. Given its longer temporal perspective, this committee finds it crucial to begin a discussion on these topics, even though they are contentious and will feel threatening to many. It is the belief of the committee that the University pays a very high cost for its present structure. Perhaps that cost is defensible and valuable, but it is impossible to determine as much unless the costs and benefits are explicitly understood. For the purposes of reporting, the committee begins with a virtual-level of organization within the University: centres and institutes.

Centres and Institutes
In June 2012, the University had 132 centres and institutes (99 academic and 33 affiliated). Centres engage multiple faculty members, mainly within a single faculty. Institutes engage multiple faculties. The University controls academic centres and institutes, and affiliated centres and institutes share control with one or more partners. These can be critical to the academic mission, as they may showcase strengths in an area of expertise, attract funding, generate scholarship, engage with diverse stakeholders, and foster collaboration. However, these units are also associated with risks and costs.

On the costs side, it is common for academic staff to have part of their duties allocated to a faculty-related centre/institute. Re-allocation/secondment comes at a cost in terms of lost teaching capacity in the home unit, the frequent “absence” of a departmental member, which increases the service load of others, and often the commitment of support positions filled from AASUA and NASA employees. Not all centres/institutes are totally self-funded, and thus they represent real costs to the University in the above stated ways. These costs should be seen as an investment, or dollars well spent, when the centres and institutes align with the core mission of the University. However, alignment does not invariably occur, and thus the University is spending valuable operating dollars on activities that may only indirectly help it achieve its goals. This predicament is exacerbated when the centre/institute relies on heavy subsidies from the institution.

In recognition of the potential costs and benefits of these units, The Centres and Institutes Committee (CIC), chaired by the vice-provost (academic), recently applied a set of principles and strategies to review the reputation, resources, and reorganization of centres and institutes. Based on the committee’s measurement of them against these principles, several were terminated, or terminated and subsequently
reclassified. In August 2013, the number of centres and institutes stood at 109 (95 academic and 14 affiliated). Of the remaining 109 centres and institutes, over 70% are hosted in the faculties of Medicine (17), Arts (13), Science (12), Business (9), ALES (9), and Education (8). All 14 affiliated centres and institutes are held in senior administration portfolios.

As of this year, all academic centres and institutes will now report to a dean who reviews the units once every five years. The goal is that a portion of the centres and institutes be reviewed annually from 2012 onward. The review process examines governance, financial sustainability, reputation and risk.

The termination of some centres and institutes and the strategic plan to review existing units on a regular basis following central policies, processes, and procedures will help address costs related to this relatively hidden aspect of administrative support within the institution. The committee views these changes as a positive example of increased centralization from previously quasi-independent entities. They should help limit expenditures for university activities not aligned with its goals, provide a uniform means by which risks are monitored and mitigated, and ensure that governance structures are followed. As described next, the committee suggests an analogous approach be adopted for a critical evaluation of the university’s departmental and faculty structures.

Faculties and Departments
With 18 faculties and 65 departments, the University is highly decentralized. It appears the University of Alberta has one of the most, if not the most, faculties among major universities in Canada, and among the most in North America. Being unique is worth acknowledging, but questioning whether this is by choice or accident is important.

Many core activities required by all faculties (for example, payroll, grants administration, etc.) are performed within each faculty. Duplication of efforts can also occur among departments, although not invariably. The University spends substantial funds (in aggregate) to support the operations of the “central administration” within these units (deans of different levels; chairs of different levels; APOs and NASA administrative support for these individuals). More details on these potential costs are provided in section 2 of the report. Thus, based on first principles, two units of half the size and duplicating efforts should cost more than one unit.

Decentralization provides individual faculties with a high level of autonomy, and the committee heard from some deans who support mergers of their faculty (and several others who could see merit in such reorganization, even if it was not their preference). Faculty-level autonomy can be positive when it allows for increased quality of scholarly activities and an opportunity for students, or negative if it enhances cost without gain or introduces undesirable inequities amongst individuals in different units (section 3 of this report).

The committee heard a number of reasons supporting a reduction in the number of faculties at the University of Alberta, although it did not hear any in favour of maintaining the current number. Not surprisingly, individuals tended to highlight other units in need of close scrutiny, rarely putting their own forward, with some notable exceptions. The committee believes substantial benefits could accrue to the University through a significant reduction in the number of faculties. These include, but are not limited to:
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• Reduced costs. Savings will accrue through reduced numbers of administrative positions and processes where there is the potential to gain from an economy of scale. Additional savings will accrue from reduced numbers of academic administrators (more details in section 2 of this report).

• Academic opportunities. Conversations with stakeholders yielded a general feeling that faculty boundaries inhibit the development of potentially popular interdisciplinary programs and research collaborations. For example, several programs have been discussed over the last 15 years that would be at the interface of Science and ALES (e.g., wildlife biology; conservation biology). Despite their potential to be of a high priority to the province, popular with students, and internationally recognized, discussions of them have regularly stalled because of politics. Additional opportunities could emerge through mergers of the smaller Health Science faculties, or a combined Faculty of Arts & Science. In the absence of mergers, the current mechanisms of funding do not appear to encourage cross-faculty programs, to the detriment of the institution.

• Governance: It appears very difficult to have Deans’ Council play a meaningful role in setting and implementing the direction of the University. Deans noted that a smaller number of individuals at the table would allow for more effective debate and discussion.

• Equity and quality assurance. In the decentralized model, there is no current mechanism to assure equity among faculties, and the committee’s analyses indicate gross inequities (section 3 of this report). This state of affairs is inevitable in a system with many small units (many faculties smaller than 100 individuals), in which local politics and social dynamics can have a very strong influence on decisions.

To initiate conversation, the committee presents a few alternative outlined in Appendix 6.

The committee questions the need for 65 departments, including apparent redundancies among several disciplines. Further, much of the existing structure appears to be a legacy from previous periods of budget crisis, such as during the era of provincial cuts to the public sector, which began in January 1994. It is noteworthy that although the faculties of Arts and Sciences have similar undergraduate populations, Science has fewer faculty members despite a larger graduate population and more research funding. Particularly noteworthy is that Science is divided into seven departments, Arts 14. Prior to the era of what became known as “Klein Kuts,” what is now the Department of Biological Sciences was five separate departments. The faculties of ALES and Engineering appear to have undergone similar periods of academic reorganization.

The committee is doubtful that if created de novo, the University would have anything resembling the academic organization that currently exists and thus encourages an open conversation about the need for this degree of splitting of units. The committee suggests that, at a minimum, individuals acknowledge that these choices impose cost, even if well spent.

Key Problems:

• Administrative services are essential to the delivery of scholarly activities, but are divisive amongst the academic staff, and difficult to identify in a manner that invites consensus. The result is a very negative atmosphere for meaningful discussion of the issues.

• Due in part to disputes over terms, there is no agreed method of quantifying administrative services at the University of Alberta. The data submitted to CAUBO has serious flaws, which reduce its value in addressing these issues.

• The University of Alberta’s highly decentralized structure likely comes at considerable academic and economic cost. Previous rounds of rationalization of departmental and faculty boundaries were unevenly applied, such that surprising inequities among the major faculties now exist.
Centres and institutes represent additional administrative layers for the University, which impose both cost and risk, actual and potential.

Recommendations:

4-8 Search both in Administration and AASUA for a mechanism to engage the community in an open and safe discussion about the costs of administering the organization. The discussion must include such sacred cows as the salaries of central administrators, hiring priorities among constituencies, and the division of the University into its decentralized form. The committee suggests that trusted senior members of the institution lead such discussions, and this may be a role for some emeriti.

4-9 Commit to an ongoing process for the quantification of the costs and values allocated to the scholarly and support aspects of the University. All principals must work together to define terms and establish a robust monitoring program.

4-10 If there is a desire to reduce administrative costs, centralize as far as possible administrative services currently provided by faculties (for example, registration, research services, graduate student admissions).

4-11 Reduce the number of departments and faculties. The committee suggests a minimum department size of 40, with each faculty consisting of no fewer than 160 tenure-track or tenured individuals (and four departments). This restructuring does not imply reducing the total size of the professoriate. This would allow the University to reorganize its existing faculty complement in a more effective structure, one that enhances both Scholarship and opportunities for students.

Revenue Generation

The financial sustainability of the University is going to be a function of both expenditures and revenues. An exhaustive analysis of revenue lies well beyond the scope of this committee. However, based upon frequent stakeholder comments, the committee discusses two aspects: indirect costs of research (ICR), and advancement. The committee notes stakeholder requests for it to discuss more than financials and include comments regarding the perception of these operations at numerous levels of the University.

Indirect Costs of Research and the Research Service Office

Indirect Costs of Research (ICR) refer to expenditures incurred in the conduct of research that are not readily or effectively traceable to specific expense activities, yet are real costs that must form part of the budget for a research project.

Tri-Council funding provides indirect costs of research directly to the University as a block grant, with these funds meant to be allocated at the discretion of the institution. Currently, there is no standard formula used to disperse these funds among different units (central administration, faculties, departments, centres and institutes, and researchers). The use of these funds is not clear to the University community, although the funds are often used to pay for aspects of the core operations of RSO, including salaries. The amount received varies both according to the formula created by the federal government and the grant success of the research community at the University of Alberta. Typically, a block grant valued amounts to approximately 17% of eligible Tri-Council funding.

For non-Tri-Council funding (from industry, other levels of government, and so on), the University requires principal investigators (PIs) include a budget line for ICR of 20%. In reality, the University
collects approximately 1.5% of non-Tri-Council research as ICR – dramatically less than that received from the Tri-Councils. It was estimated that The University’s peer institutions received closer to 5%, indicating there is substantial lost revenue at the University. The reasons behind the low rates of collection are varied and often include ICR being “waived” at various stages in the grant signing process. Further, the Government of Alberta does not separate out indirect costs of research support to the University. They bundled this support into their operating grant in the early 2000s. As well, the University does not identify this funding in the budget. These practices have resulted in a misunderstanding by many members of the University community who do not believe that the University receives ICR from the Government of Alberta. A second concern is that the figure of 1.5% may be an underestimate.

A consequence of this discrepancy in ICR received from Tri-Council and non-Tri-Council funding is that core research administrative support is disproportionately paid by Tri-Council research, while other forms of research, including industry-sponsored research, pay less of the costs. The committee was unable to find any reasonable justification to allow such an administrative subsidy towards one form of research to be the University’s normal practice. This is compounded by inequities in the distribution of ICR related to non-Tri-Council funding. In contrast to the opaque nature of Tri-Council ICR distributions, the University of Alberta has formal policy related to non-Tri-Council ICR. Until recently, this included dividing it up among central administration, faculties, departments, centres and institutes (if eligible), and the individual researcher. This practice was adopted in recognition that there are actual indirect costs associated with research at all levels of the research enterprise. The committee was unable to find any justification for having a differential policy that cuts out departments and individual researchers related to Tri-Council ICR.

The recently announced revision to ICR for non-Tri-Council funding allocates 85% to faculties and 15% to central administration, whereas previously it was 48% to the former, 20% to the researcher, 23% to the department, and 9% to the faculty. However, it is not clear if this new arrangement will allow money to flow down to the department and to the researcher to defray their costs. Additionally, this revision may incentivize deans to disfavor Tri-Council funding within their faculty, as they receive no ICR from such scholarly activities. This possible shift is worrisome. Further, it remains unclear why Tri-Council and non-Tri-Council funding should be treated separately. However, efforts at the levels of chair and dean to inform faculty about the cost of doing research so that ICR is built into any non-Tri-Council grant applications would be both prudent and valuable.

Even with the collection of ICR, the committee was told, the University spends $0.58 on indirect cost of research for every dollar of non Tri-Council funding received, compared to $0.40 for every dollar of Tri-Council funding. As presented, these numbers indicate that research activities are a major commitment for the institution that spawns two logical conclusions: (1) cutting back on research activity would reduce expenditures, and (2) the University is not adequately accounting for the indirect benefits of research. For example, in a university where research informs teaching, research activities benefit students, both graduate and undergraduate, as well as postdoctoral fellows. The benefits can be indirect, such as in the introduction of leading-edge content in the classroom, or direct, such as in the provision of opportunities to join research teams. The committee believes that these benefits are under-recognized, and are critical to the identity and reputation of the institution.

Numerous stakeholders commented on concerns regarding the effectiveness of the RSO and the granting process. There are substantive concerns that practices are not designed with sufficient consideration paid to the end user, that is, the scholars. The committee heard on numerous occasions that there can be extensive delays in setting up grants, requiring extensive use of journal vouchers, which increases administrative costs. It also heard of numerous situations where inaccurate information led to the loss of funding opportunities, and other occasions where individuals chose not to pursue funding because of
annoyances and irritants. The committee suggests that a re-evaluation of the workflow within RSO be undertaken.

Advancement

Advancement oversees revenue from donations and external affairs. Some types of donations, such as land, increase assets but impose a burden on operating budgets. Some, such as cash or the endowment of existing an existing program, reduce pressures on operating budgets. Net donations/grants received have been increasing as the result of aggressive fundraising campaigns. Lacking is transparency on the efficiency of operations, including targeted and achieved returns on investment.

Advancement is seen as another administrative block to deans keen to advance their own strategic initiatives. Therefore, deans compete with one another to gain support from Advancement for their own faculty’s priorities for fundraising. Further, the committee heard from stakeholders that there is a heavy investment in the Office of Advancement centrally, but, because of inefficiencies, this arrangement has not benefited faculties. Some have commented that there is a “wedge between central and faculty initiatives.” Some faculties experience inconsistent support, in part due to high turnover rate of staff in the development office.

As it does with respect to the RSO, the committee suggests a re-evaluation of workflow be undertaken. It further suggests that a reduction in the number of faculties will improve the functioning of both RSO and Advancement.

Key Problems:

- Because recovery rates for indirect costs of research are low, substantial amounts of revenue are lost.
- Current and former distributions of ICR are inequitable as a function of funding source. A consequence is that Tri-Council-funded research is subsidizing the administration of industry-funded research.
- By having differential policies regarding the distribution of ICR as a function of its source (Tri-Council vs. non-Tri-Council), administrative policies may influence the types of research that deans promote in their faculties. In the current formulation, a faculty receives a greater percentage of funds when researchers conduct industrial research than when they conduct discovery-based research.
- The indirect value of research appears underappreciated by the University.
- There are concerns from stakeholders about the working relationships with both RSO and Advancement.

Recommendations:

4-12 Require that the indirect costs of research (ICR) be collected on all eligible grants. Work with funding agencies to permit ICR gradually to be introduced. In some cases, make it University policy to refuse to support grant applications to agencies that appear not to have legitimate reasons to exclude ICR.
4-13 Implement a single and transparent policy for the distribution of ICR, regardless of its source. In recognition that ICR are borne at all levels of the institution, include disbursements to central administration, faculty, department, centre/institute, if appropriate, and PI.

4-14 Do not permit industrial research to be supported with the ICR that comes to the University as a result of grants obtained from the Tri-Councils.

4-15 Shift the Research Service Office’s emphasis towards the scholar’s experience of the grant process. Anything that causes professors what they perceive to be unnecessary extra work will likely result in reduced grants being written and received and could result in increased administrative costs associated with journal vouchers having to be completed in order for the grant holder to access funds.

4-16 Work to improve the relationship between personnel in faculty development offices and those in the Office of the Vice-President (Advancement) with a view to encouraging everyone to feel part of a single institution, rather than of an individual unit.
Section 5 — Other or General Issues

The Renaissance Committee, through its intensive review and data gathering processes, identified other problems that did not logically fit in the previous sections but that are important to the University community. These issues fell into multiple categories previously discussed, for example, availability and accuracy of data to guide important financial and human resource decisions, staff members’ lack of awareness of the terms of their constituency’s agreement, the structure of mechanisms for discipline and for appeals, and the strengths and limitations of a highly decentralized university with a large number of faculties.

It should be noted that not all issues identified by the committee could have recommendations brought forth. Because of lack of data, potential stakeholders we did not have the opportunity to meet, time limitations, or other reasons, some issues could not be addressed. In this section, we also list some of these, which the committee thinks merit attention in the future.

Guiding Principles

- The key academic mission of the University of Alberta relies on efficient and effective management, which requires an understanding of the current status of the University and past trends.
- Consistent collection and timely reporting of, reliable data support decision-making at all levels of the University.
- Appeal mechanisms and disciplinary processes function most effectively when guided by policies and procedures that are fair, transparent, and timely and are implemented in a collaborative interaction between the Office of the Provost, Human Resource Services, and AASUA.
- The University of Alberta and its staff benefit when all members of a constituency have a full understanding of their own constituency and the terms of their agreement.
- A full understanding of the rights and responsibilities in each agreement can prevent some of the situations that result in appeals or disciplinary procedures.
- Mentorship is a key to good working conditions for students and staff.
- Investing in resources to support staff development in mentorship, leadership, administration, and Scholarship is an investment in the future of the University of Alberta.

Key Problems:

- Currently, administrative and decision-making structures of the University are limited by its ability to collect reliable data from departments and faculties and to query data that requires information from diverse data sets.
- Without a strategy to collect meaningful data and to generate systematically analyses of the data, the University cannot make confident or timely decisions about resource allocation that promotes Scholarship. At present, the University is hobbled by problems with or lack of data. The ACORN initiative now being put in place will help, certainly, but data not available electronically (pre-2000) should not be lost forever; a program that painstakingly assembles it and renders it electronically available would provide an indispensable and very valuable footing for plans, negotiations, and interpretations. (The rediscovery of the 1991 AASUA/Administration Agreement Review Committee on FEC Reform’s report testifies to the value of information dating from before the new millennium.) Institutional memory loss comes at a severe cost.
• When data are available, the office (Strategic Analysis Office) that can provide it is currently understaffed if faced with a need to resort to manual counting and review of paper files to obtain information.
• The current system (PeopleSoft) is not used to its full capacity to allow for efficient data collection and data analysis.
• Staff members equate salary with compensation. Many are not aware of their complete compensation packages.
• Academic Administrators are not fully aware of their responsibilities as determined by staff agreements or by how the University/AASUA structure works.
• Mentorship is not recognized or supported sufficiently at the unit or university levels. For example, mentoring of assistant professors is often a department-level initiative, with the result that some junior staff receive excellent mentoring and others almost none.
• The structure of appeal and disciplinary processes are expensive and lengthy, consuming an untenable amount of time and resources at all levels of the University: staff members’, departments’, faculties’, Human Resource Services’, and the AASUA’s.
• Integrated in University Governance are processes that put the same respondents in place at multiple levels, having multiple votes on the same issue (e.g. appeals). Full of repetition and redundancy, this is a process inconsistent with general Human Resource standards.
• There is no single arm’s-length group of impartial individuals on campus to review and assess the current University of Alberta status or context.

Recommendations:

5-1 Create meaningful, reliable data sets that can be collected from every department and faculty across campus and that, when analyzed, provide key information related to academic Scholarship, human resource management, and important initiatives.
5-2 Lead a push to collect and share uniform data among Alberta and Canadian institutions, within or outside CAUBO.
5-3 Develop an Annual Total Compensation Letter to each member of the academic staff, detailing her/his total compensation for the past year (salary, salary supplements [annual, not added to base], benefits, pension, vacation entitlements).
5-4 Make leadership programming seminars and orientation (e.g., Chair School and Decanal training) mandatory for all academic administrators, and have AASUA involved in the programming to ensure that human resources and other roles and responsibilities of academic administrators are well understood.
5-5 Recognize mentorship as a University priority, and ensure that assistant professors receive mentorship for all aspects of Scholarship; best practices currently underway in decentralized departments should be applied campus-wide.
5-6 Review the structure of appeals processes for promotion and tenure, with a view to serve both the faculty member and the institution better, ensuring due process while minimizing the time, effort, and cost to the appellant and the University administration.
5-7 Review the structure of appeals and disciplinary processes. Notwithstanding issues that fall under tenure and academic freedom, include any issues related to appeals, academic dishonesty, or disciplinary and dismissal processes. Conduct this review with due process while also considering the cost to the University.
5-8 Establish an on-going arm’s-length committee to continue the focus on employment and structural aspects of the University and to monitor changes (even changes over time of an entire
process) arising from these and future recommendations. The committee must have authority, and reports must be made public.

5-9 Strike a joint AASUA/Administration task force to address equity issues that have already been identified by previous working groups/committees, and provide policy that commits academic staff to equity and diversity in all respects.

Relationship to Terms of Reference

This section of the report focuses on issues that fall in other areas than those listed in the terms of reference; however, these are intertwined with issues identified in previous sections.

What other academic issues are discernible at the University of Alberta?

Data
One of the challenges of a decentralized university with 18 faculties and numerous centres and institutes is that data essential to understanding the way resources are used must be collected decentrally and collated, analysed, and interpreted centrally. Unsurprisingly, the same data are differently reported, such that they cause problems with consistency, with sharing, and even with accessing. Relatively simple data collection and entry, such as providing complete data entry for courses in PeopleSoft, are often only partially complete or completed in different ways by different faculties, limiting anyone’s ability to track easily and reliably even routine functions. Data requests made by the Renaissance Committee often required laborious hand-counts and cross-referencing of Human Resource Services contracts with other data, such as the University’s data books. A simple query such as determining the number of tenure-track faculty on campus initially led to widely different responses – head counts varied by over 15%. Without accurate, immediately available data, checking the state of the University is difficult, and making decisions based on a current situation and past trends impossible. Continuing with work to digitize old records and developing data management standards that all faculties must follow when providing data for central records are critical. The lack of available data contributes to impressions of lack of transparency in the system and, possibly, of incompetence to those beyond the University community. Decentralization is valuable if standard procedures are created and followed. Agreeing on and then routinely using standard procedures is difficult with 18 faculties. With the recommended faculty reorganization (Appendix 6), these and other processes would be simpler to implement and control.

Wherever possible, recommendations from the Renaissance Committee are based on numerical data from sources that appeared robust, cross-referenced with comments from those knowledgeable in specific areas, and based on information or suggestions from stakeholders. The lack of certainty about accuracy of some information rendered deep examination of some structures impossible (such as data modeling of salaries and changes in demographics across all constituencies).

The Renaissance Committee reviewed Faculty Agreements and Human Resource Services policies from the U15 to provide context for many of the topics studied. Direct discussions with representatives of other U15 institutions provided valuable alternate perspectives. Although decisions and recommendations are made in consideration of the unique circumstances at the University of Alberta, consideration of peer institutions can add to the data set for consideration. One source of data, the CAUBO data, a consistent data set collected from Canadian universities, provided insight as to the University of Alberta’s standing relative to its peers. Despite the structure and definitions present in the data, great variability still qualifies the dependability of CAUBO data.
Summary of Concerns:

- Currently, administrative and decision-making structures of the University are limited by its ability to collect reliable data from departments and faculties and to query data if they in turn require information from other data sets.
- Without a strategy to collect meaningful data and to generate analyses of the data, the University cannot make confident or timely decisions about resource allocation or other issues that promote and sustain Scholarship.
- The office (Strategic Analysis Office) that can provide data is currently understaffed if faced with a need to resort to manual counting and review of paper files to obtain information.
- The current system (PeopleSoft) is not used to its full capacity to allow for efficient data collection and data analysis.

Recommendations:

5-1 Create meaningful, reliable data sets that can be collected from every department and faculty across campus and that, when analyzed, provide key information related to academic Scholarship, human resource management, and important initiatives.

5-2 Lead a push to collect and share uniform data among Alberta and Canadian institutions, within or outside CAUBO.

Compensation and Benefits

Discussion of compensation at every level of the university and among academic staff invariably focuses on salaries, one component of the compensation package provided to staff at the University of Alberta. This focus is perpetuated by the negotiation structure, in which decisions about monetary compensation feature almost exclusively, while discussions about working conditions and the language of the collective agreements occur in Agreement Review Committees. A broad view of compensation and the wide range of supports provided to staff have the potential to reduce the focus on only dollars when working conditions are negotiated. Early in its work, the Renaissance Committee compiled a list of Types of Compensation and Elements of Employment (Table 5-1) to ensure consideration was as broad as possible.

One of its foci was the evaluation of the system of compensation for various constituencies. A critical first step is the setting out of a clear understanding of the types of compensation currently received, beginning with the largest of the seven academic staff constituencies. The committee’s working list, which adopted a very broad view, including both monetary and non-monetary items, follows.

Table 5-1: Types of Compensation and Elements of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom of inquiry is essential to the mission of the University of Alberta. To serve the public good, scholars must have freedom to teach, discover, and communicate ideas without fear of retaliation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base salary</td>
<td>Changes over time to base are primarily the result of (1) across the board (ATB) settlements, (2) increases associated with “progress through ranks,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Comments</td>
<td>and (3) reward for “unusual performance.” Currently, #2 and #3 are bundled together into ‘merit’ increments, allocated through Faculty Evaluation Committees. #1 and the total merit pool are determined through negotiations between AASUA and the Board of Governors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salary Adjustment Fund (FSAF)</td>
<td>Also known as market and salary supplements, this fund has its maximum amount determined by negotiation, while the amount of any one staff member’s supplement is typically individually negotiated. The use of supplements is broad, and their purposes include correcting inequities in salary and aiding in faculty retention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified job duties</td>
<td>These include teaching release, secondment, and other temporary adjustments to an individual’s “typical” set of job expectations. These can be the product of negotiations involving the individual faculty member or a stipulated condition of an award. Their use is highly varied and can allow for special opportunities (e.g. unique research opportunity, large-grant writing, enhanced service, or administrative duties).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative compensation</td>
<td>Increased administrative duties are compensated in diverse ways across units. Components to ‘compensation packages’ can include modified job duties, research or personal stipend, pension supplement, extra incrementation at FEC, and paid administrative leave. The specific package given for a particular administrative duty is the product of negotiations involving the individual faculty member and an administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>Currently, faculty members are eligible to apply for a partially paid release from typical job duties every seventh year of employment (half-year leaves after three years of full service). Sabbatical approval is decided by deans and typically involves input from FECs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>The Universities Academic Pension Plan provides retirement income in addition to that received from federal programs (CPP and OAS). Monthly contributions are made both by the individual faculty member and by the University. This is a defined benefit plan, with the value at retirement determined by one's salary (up to a maximum value) and years of service. As is the case with all defined benefit, as opposed to defined contribution, pension plans, the amount one contributes does not directly determine one's retirement income. The UAPP is independently managed and includes members at three other Alberta universities (Athabasca, Calgary, and Lethbridge), as well as the Banff Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Supplementary Retirement Plan (ASRP)</td>
<td>The ASRP is a relatively new (2009) defined contribution plan paid for by the University that impacts only faculty members if their salaries are above the UAPP maximum as defined by federal legislation (in 2013, the UAPP maximum was $150,164; the ASRP applies to salaries up to currently $202,553, and this cap is determined by negotiations between AASUA and the Board of Governors). In contrast to the UAPP, this plan does not require or allow individual faculty members to contribute. The aim of this plan is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the enhancement of retirement income at the higher end of the salary scale. Details of this plan are the product of negotiations between AASUA and the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>The core benefit associated with tenure is job security, from which individual faculty members are able to assert their academic freedom in pursuit of scholarly activities. Tenure can be received either through evaluation at FEC or through negotiations at the time of appointment. (Tenured faculty members can be removed from employment under a very small number of conditions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Professional Activities</td>
<td>Under a certain set of conditions, individual staff members are authorized to conduct professional activities that go beyond the obligation to meet their standard job requirements. SPAs frequently result in additional income, and they include activities such as consulting, clinical services, and supplemental teaching at other institutions. The authorization to conduct SPA is provided for in the Faculty Agreement, although major SPAs need written approval by one’s department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Faculty members receive a number of benefits related to mental and physical health, provisions for short- and long-term leaves, and life insurance programs for them and their family. The specific details of the benefits package are a product of negotiation between AASUA and the Board and are managed by a joint management committee (ABMC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion and Worklife Services;</td>
<td>Faculty members have access to a number of services associated with enhancing work/life balance, and recognizing the changing needs of individuals over the course of their career. These services are provided by the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial planning &amp; retirement planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over Retirement</td>
<td>There is no mandatory retirement for the professoriate; instead, individuals have substantial flexibility about when they retire. The University offers several ‘enticement’ programs that increase options and the financial implications of how and when one retires. The specifics vary but have included post-retirement contracts, phase-outs, and voluntary retirement incentive plans (VRIPs). The University also may offer a position of emeritus professor, which can confer ongoing commitments from the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-autonomy of schedule</td>
<td>One item that has emerged from discussions is that individual faculty place substantial value on the ability to (mostly) control their own schedule. The Renaissance Committee recognizes that this is not necessarily the case for alternative careers or for individuals at more teaching-intensive institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to a lack of awareness of or appreciation for the full range of compensation at the University of Alberta, many academic staff lack awareness of their terms of employment as determined by the “Agreement” relevant to their constituency. A description of complaints provided by the Member
Services Officers at AASUA included many examples of procedural matters that could be reduced if staff members and administrators of departments and faculties fully understood their rights and responsibilities as described in the agreements. Ensuring that all new academic staff members, chairs, and deans participate in a thorough orientation, including a requirement to demonstrate understanding of agreements, would be beneficial. In these and all aspects of Scholarship, assistant professors require mentoring through departmental, faculty, and university systems.

Summary of Concerns:

- Staff members equate salary with compensation. Many are not aware of their complete compensation packages.
- Some academic administrators are not fully aware of their responsibilities or how the University/AASUA structure works.
- Mentorship is not recognized or supported sufficiently at the unit or university levels. Assistant professors, for example, may or may not receive structured mentoring, depending on the policies and practices of their home department.

Recommendations:

5-3 Develop an Annual Total Compensation Letter to each member of the academic staff, detailing her/his total compensation for the past year (salary, salary supplements [annual, not added to base], benefits, pension, vacation entitlements).

5-4 Make leadership programming seminars and orientation (e.g., Chair School and Decanal training) mandatory for all academic administrators, and have AASUA involved in the programming to ensure that human resources and other roles and responsibilities of academic administrators are well understood.

5-5 Recognize mentorship as a University priority, and ensure that assistant professors receive mentorship for all aspects of Scholarship; best practices currently underway in decentralized departments should be applied campus-wide.

Appeals and Disciplinary Cases

Currently, individuals who are denied/have their application declined for promotion and/or tenure by FEC may turn to the AASUA for assistance and, if they so choose, file an appeal. An appeal initially goes back to FEC for reconsideration (which is an unusual additional step compared to most types of appeal processes), or the faculty member can elect to go directly to the President’s Review Committee for a reconsideration. In the case of the FEC review, the same individuals who originally made the decision to deny/decline make the determination, with additional evidence, to grant or deny the appeal. If it is denied, then the faculty member may take his/her case to General Appeals Committee, which makes the final determination. However, if an individual chooses to appeal directly to the PRC, the appeal will be considered and a recommendation made to either support it or deny it. In either case, the decision is then taken back to FEC for reconsideration. At that point, the FEC may grant the appeal or deny it. If denied, the individual may again appeal to GAC for a final decision. Two issues arise here: the first is that this extremely complex process is time-consuming, appears to have unnecessary steps, and does not follow

---

126 (see the flow chart, Appendix C in the FEC manual http://www.hrs.ualberta.ca/MyEmployment/FECManual).
the normal tenets of natural justice; the second is that the PRC acts only in an advisory capacity and has no ability to make a binding or final decision. This analysis suggests that currently there are two additional steps within this appeal process that appear to be unlikely to serve the appellant well or change the outcome of the initial decision. It is only GAC that can both review the case completely independently and make a binding final decision.

Disciplinary/grievance procedures were described in the Renaissance Committee’s stakeholder meetings as the single most draining and inefficient use of a dean’s time. A single case can grind to a halt the gears of the offices of a chair, a dean, and the provost. Two principal issues grew clear: the process itself and a dean’s lack of authority to terminate an academic faculty member’s appointment. Disciplinary proceedings under the current collective agreement lie within the Office of the Provost. The provost alone has the final authority to determine disciplinary action, the ultimate sanction being dismissal from the University. Much of the handling of such cases has been delegated to Faculty Relations, which acts on behalf of the provost, handling the investigation if needed and working with representatives of the respondent up to the point of the final decision. Article 16 of the Faculty Agreement covers these steps in detail, but some of the sub-clauses clauses appear to place significant constraints on the investigation.

Summary of Concerns:
- The same respondents are in place at multiple levels of the appeal process for promotion and tenure, a process inconsistent with general Human Resource standards.
- The structure of appeal and disciplinary processes are expensive and lengthy, consuming an untenable amount of time at many levels of the University – staff members’, departments’, faculties’, Human Resource Services’, and the AASUA’s.

Recommendations:
5-6 Review the structure of appeals processes for promotion and tenure, with a view to serve both the faculty member and the institution better, ensuring due process while minimizing the time, effort, and cost to the appellant and the University administration.
5-7 Review the structure of appeals and disciplinary processes. Notwithstanding issues that fall under tenure and academic freedom, include any issues related to appeals, academic dishonesty, or disciplinary and dismissal processes. Conduct this review with due process while also considering the cost to the University. The Administration and the AASUA need to identify ways to streamline the Article 16 process to eliminate steps that unnecessarily protract the process and delay a disciplinary decision. An example would be to allow the provost to apply discipline without the need for a formal investigation, balanced by the AASUA’s ability to challenge disciplinary decisions through the grievance process.

Moving from Renaissance to Enlightenment and Reason

The formation and structure of the Renaissance Committee, with its broad mandate and jointly appointed members, provided a unique opportunity to examine the University system from a range of perspectives and in impartial fashion. The Renaissance Committee investigated the system altogether and in individual aspects. The diversity of issues explored and recommendations made are testament to the complexity of monitoring and updating the University’s structures. Since the establishment of the Renaissance Committee, several other Canadian institutions have formed similar committees. Continuation of such an ongoing committee that examines the aspects of the working conditions and administrative structure of the University would be of continued value to the University of Alberta. Not having one might incur a
cost. Most of the inequities and problems identified by the committee were encountered, not sought; they were logistical outcomes of the system and governance structure under study. If an institution never examines itself, it cannot hope to identify its ailments. So the Renaissance Committee further recommends that a similar committee be established from time to time, populated by academic staff beyond those directly involved with AASUA or central administration, who are likely to ask different and difficult questions. The committee must have authority and reports must be made public.

Summary of Concerns:

- There is no single, independent entity on campus to review and assess current University of Alberta status or context.

Recommendation:

5-8 Establish an on-going arm’s-length committee to continue the focus on employment and structural aspects of the University and to monitor changes (even changes over time of an entire process) arising from these and future recommendations. The committee must have authority, and reports must be made public.

Other Issues

Equity

At the start of its work, the Renaissance Committee had a strong desire to seize this opportunity to study equity matters. A recent report was extensive but made few specific recommendations. It does state:

> The University needs a new Taskforce on Equity and Diversity to address the stalled progress on equity and diversity, and it should incorporate institutional commitment to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and Two-Spirited people.\(^{127}\)

The Renaissance Committee supports this recommendation and believes that a guiding principle of the University of Alberta should be “equity for all,” and that steps be taken to address any concerns.

In the course of its work, the Renaissance Committee was not able to collect and analyze data about equity among genders, visible minorities, and other underrepresented groups in AASUA constituencies. Based on the data made available to the committee, it focused on elements of equity related to rank, constituency, and terms of employment for those scholars on campus performing similar duties. The recommendations of the committee on issues of equity in employment and compensation are presented in Section 3. The committee thinks that further work is necessary to examine issues of possible inequities among genders, visible minorities, transgender peoples, and Aboriginal peoples, on campus.

The President’s Review Committee identified leaves (maternity, parental, sabbatical, health) as an issue. This raised equity concerns. Some FECs automatically award leaves a 0.0 increment; others 1.0. It was noted that the impact of maternity/parental leaves on career progression (rank and financial) had to be considered with respect to the choice of having a family. Here, the Renaissance Committee did not have access to data to undertake work on the issue. However, again, a process and detailed documentation, based on equity and Government of Alberta standards, should be developed to address concerns about leaves. The new recommended system of compensation (section 3) addresses issues of leaves. It would be for an arm’s-length committee, such as recommended earlier, to ensure that the system works for all.

Recommendation:

5-9 Strike a joint AASUA/Administration task force to address equity issues that have already been identified by previous working groups/committees, and provide policy that commits academic staff to equity and diversity in all respects.
Reflections on the Renaissance Committee Process

The Renaissance Committee came together in December 2012 to study many aspects of the University of Alberta and to fulfill a mandate provided by the two principals, University Administration and the AASUA (see Appendix 1). Individuals were chosen through various mechanisms. The mandated outcome of the committee’s work was to be a report that would recommend future planning strategies for AASUA and the University to negotiate. Over the course of the year, the committee’s members learned a great deal about the University of Alberta and about themselves as individual members of the University community. Furthermore, a collegial bond of friendship and respect developed. After much work, a report was created to meet the 22 November 2013 deadline. In the subsequent week, effort was made to improve the report’s presentation without additions to or deletions of content. The final version of the report, bearing the date 9 December 2013, alerted the principals to any substantive changes that emerged from this improvement.
Concluding Remarks

The following represents the concluding remarks of the individuals who made up your team of representatives. The comments echo a sentiment that is hopeful and strong. The Committee is optimistic that the University of Alberta will meet the challenges that face it, and demonstrate the founding philosophy of Henry Marshall Tory, who wished for the University of Alberta to be a beacon of learning for all. The Renaissance Committee sincerely hopes that this report will indeed serve as a catalyst for renaissance at the University of Alberta.

JC Cahill
Decentralization has deep roots in this institution. During the early days of the University, the biology department grew from a single professor to two. It then quickly split into two departments, each with a single faculty member. Through my participation in this committee, I have come to believe such a fragmented approach to our organization is at the root of many of the problems we identified. There are many wonderful people at all levels at the University, caring deeply about the University, its employees, and students. However, few have the privilege of meeting and interacting with most, as the structure, traditions, and rewards of the University encourage us to hunker down in our own silos. Though dismayed about some of what I have learned, I have become more hopeful the future will bring opportunities for increased collegiality, a safe and open environment for critical debate, and a sense of belonging to a single truly outstanding unit – The University of Alberta.

Jason Carey
When asked to be on the Renaissance Committee, I saw the opportunity to bring a different perspective. I came from a smaller, bilingual university, which often struggled with the balance of offering services and (some) programs in both official languages, and keep afloat financially. Times always appeared to be hard-times for scholars and staff, and to perform Scholarship, but with ingenuity and by scraping where there appeared to be nothing left, things did get done, and done well; this framed my positive perspective of things when I came to University of Alberta. I am currently part of one of the (if not the) best, largest growth engineering faculties in Canada, but that was not always the case; a vision was established, decisions were made, and things changed (look at the skyline). During this last year, my colleagues and I questioned and examined almost every possible facet of the university. From this, I believe that the entire university has the same potential for growth to lead our province and country in Scholarship; it will mean having some difficult conversations, require leadership and bold decisions. It has been an amazing and enriching year, with nine extraordinary colleagues.

Chris Cheeseman
Working on the Renaissance Committee has allowed us to gain a depth of understanding of the current working of this University, which few others have had. I consider this to have been a rare privilege. Having examined some of the early history of the University I now realize that the vision for this institution, both then and 100 years later, has some remarkable aspirations, which I feel proud to be associated with. The last twelve months of work with my colleagues on this committee has led me to realize the level of commitment to this University at all levels of this organization. But, as the academy has grown, communication has somehow progressively been lost over the years. We are now in a position to start a debate as to how we can all move forward with a common purpose. I sincerely hope that our report will serve as a basis for that dialogue.

Terra Garneau
Wow, I had a pretty good idea of what we were being asked to do on the Renaissance Committee last fall when I put my name forward. But, I totally underestimated the amount of real down and dirty work it was going to take. Just keeping up with preparing for, and then attending stakeholder and committee meetings
took a full day per week of effort. Was it worth it to come up with the host of recommendations you see here? I suppose only time will tell in the large scheme of things. But for me, I have to say I am proud of what I contributed to this effort and I have a strong feeling of hopefulness that long term, this will make a positive impact to all of us at the University of Alberta.

Florence Glanfield
I was hesitant to say yes when I was asked to submit my name for consideration for membership on the Renaissance Committee. However, in the final stages of the work I can now say that I have appreciated the opportunities to better understand and gain new perspectives of the complexity and diversity of scholarship, research, people, teaching, and structures that exist at the University of Alberta. I am not only a faculty member but also a proud alumnus of this institution; and am often put into positions where I am asked about the work that we do at a University and how that work ‘matters’ to individuals who are not engaged in the daily life of ‘being on campus.’ I feel like I can answer the question in multiple ways now. I also believe it was an honour to come to know each colleague who was a part of the Renaissance Committee. I hope readers understand that care for both people and the institution were always the basis of framing the ideas.

Lili Liu
It has been a privilege to serve on the Renaissance Committee with colleagues from diverse disciplines, constituencies, and with varied lengths of appointments. Less than one year ago, this group of strangers quickly became a cohesive team faced with the daunting task of examining the way we function at the University. We asked challenging questions of ourselves and of you, the University community. We gained perspectives beyond the daily familiar world of our appointed positions. We exercised academic freedom with honesty and integrity, and we agreed on the issues that need to be addressed in order for this University to move forward for future decades. I commend the two Principals for creating this opportunity for a critical, arms-length review of the University of Alberta.

Lu-Anne McFarlane
Participation on the Renaissance Committee has provided its members the opportunity to consider many aspects of the university and hear the views of stakeholders at all levels. We have questioned, listened, read, talked, consulted, debated, and analyzed. The process has been enlightening and discouraging, probably in equal parts. I hope this report conveys even a fraction of the complex information and ideas considered by the committee. After all we have learned, one message resonates, “It is time for change.” I trust with information and support, the university community will embrace change and the opportunities that come with it.

Ian MacLaren
As the opportunity for the Renaissance Committee began to unfold and the collegial impartiality of its members’ willingness began to coalesce around aspects of the terms of reference and mandate, it dawned on me just how unique this administrative experience would be. With a great deal of responsibility but no authority, and at arm’s length from our principals, I felt genuine liberty to conduct responsible investigations into my institution, and my work began to remind me of research I’d done as part of a multidisciplinary project in Jasper some years ago. What I found exhilarated me, partly because I was regularly, week in and week out, sitting talking to guest colleagues whom I had never met, from so many parts of the university I’d never visited, performing functions that often I did not know the University conducted. And this exhilaration had also the wonderful context of working on the committee with colleagues whose orientation to issues and topics was original to me. Great research issues from such collaborations; I hope that a worthy report, worth its readers’ attention and consideration, emerges from this one.

Kisha Supernant
I came to the Renaissance Committee a wet behind the ears, third year Assistant Professor, unsure what to expect but determined to bring a junior faculty perspective to the discussions and issues at hand. Over the past months, I have been privileged to learn a lot about the University of Alberta and meet a broad range of people who work to make the institution a great place. I have experienced moments of dismay, shock, and inspiration as the committee worked very hard to understand the immense complexity of how the University of Alberta functions, and how it fails to function. My major takeaway, other than an appreciation and admiration for my colleagues on the committee, is that the nature of the way we organize our institutions separates us, rather than brings us together. Perhaps it is naive to think that we can begin to comprehend the diversity of Scholarship on this campus, but I truly believe we will be stronger when we can have a greater understanding of the many amazing ways we create, contemplate, explore, apply, and analyze knowledge. Ultimately, we need a university structure that supports our connectedness along with our diversity.
Appendix 1

THE ROLE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE NAMED THE RENAISSANCE COMMITTEE

Preface
The goal of the dual proposals being sent to the membership for ratification in May 2012 is to deal with the pressures exerted by the latest budget from the provincial government, where it commits to three years of funding increases of 2% to the universities’ operating grants. This commitment will, in the 2013-2014 academic year, require a cut to the consolidated institutional plan’s budget at the University of Alberta of 4.4%. So, in the near term, one of the aims of the Renaissance Committee is to evaluate what measures can be introduced to effect cost containment and avoid yet another set of budget reallocations on 1 April 2013, 1 April 2014, and 1 April 2015.

However, The Renaissance Committee is not being proposed only to investigate equitable measures of cost containment. Other areas of inquiry that require attention are the revisions of policies and procedures that clearly require the attention of Administration and AASUA jointly. These include inequities in and among FECs concerning changes that have occurred in incrementation in the past decade (such as those arising from the elimination of mandatory retirement and the establishment of the President’s Review Committee); the notable variation from one FEC to another in their treatment of incrementation and leaves; and the inequity in the treatment of entry-level academics in their progress through the ranks. The Renaissance Committee is mandated to produce a package of recommendations acceptable to both the Board of Governors and the AASUA. It has no mandate to dismantle tenure; rather, it has a mandate to determine how best to position the University in an era of government fiscal restraint. It will do its work on behalf of the academic community and the Board of Governors and will not institute any changes, only report recommendations to the Board and AASUA’s members for their approval. A draft of The Renaissance Committee’s membership will be sent to the Board of Governors Human Resources and Compensation Committee and AASUA Executive for their approval. These terms of reference will doubtless undergo change in order to maximize the efficiency and extent of the work undertaken by The Renaissance Committee.

Terms of Reference
The Renaissance Committee shall be composed of a minimum of six jointly appointed creative academics so that it operates as a “single” committee and represents as wide an array of the academic community’s interests as reasonably possible. Jointly appointed means that both Administration and the association approve of each appointment.

The committee shall be equally co–chaired by an AASUA and Administration member. The Committee shall have the discretion to delegate to sub-committees as it sees fit. Such sub-committees shall be composed of experts, resource personnel, members from different constituencies, and other persons of interest, to deal with a specific issue or topic. Core committee members shall be professors Ian MacLaren and Chris Cheeseman.

The Executive Director of the AASUA and the Vice-Provost (Faculty Relations) shall not sit on the committee but will serve as resource support for the committee.

Guiding principles for the Committee are found in the AASUA Executive motion dated 8 May 2012 and the 9 May 2012 detailed negotiations agreement:

The Renaissance Committee shall respond to the current underlying academic compensation pressures faced by the University of Alberta. Consistent with this charge and extending from it, The Renaissance
Committee shall negotiate terms that include, but are not limited to
- the introduction of a permanent teaching-intensive category of academic staff,
- the enhancement and revision of processes deployed by faculty evaluation committees,
- the redesign and simplification of salary schedules for professors, FSOs, and librarians,
- the negotiation, as discrete items, of merit pay and of adjustments to salary scales,
- the strengthening of the role of the President’s Review Committee with a view to addressing variation across the FECs with respect to the appointment of academic staff, their evaluation, and the granting to them of tenure and promotion.

This joint committee will include representation of the interests of all constituencies that AASUA comprises and will take advice from both the association and the administration.

The spirit and intent are that this committee meet on a very regular basis (e.g. every 7 days – 2 weeks).

The committee will issue a single report after its consultation and deliberation. The committee shall be provided with information, data, and resources as required to do its work. The outcome of committee meetings shall not be confidential, unless the committee deems it necessary in the circumstances to hold an in camera session (for example, to deal with sensitive issues, such as any that risk identifying individuals through a discussion of salary distributions). The outcome of committee meetings shall be reported. The committee shall be at liberty to provide separate preliminary reports on work in progress.

The draft final report shall be made available by 1 November 2013 to Council and the Board of Governors. By 20 December 2013, each of the AASUA Executive, AASUA Council, the Board Human Resources and Compensation Committee and the University Board of Governors shall be entitled to review, make comments and suggestions, reject, or approve the draft final report.

If the draft report is acceptable to both parties, then it shall be sent to the Board of Governors for approval and to AASUA membership for ratification (the report shall follow the normal procedures for AASUA ratification pursuant to Article 12 of the AASUA bylaws). If the draft report is rejected by either party, then it goes back to the committee. If the draft report is sent back to the Committee, the Committee will, by 10 January 2014, produce a final report. The report shall be made public in one or more of social media, bulletins, Rhumblines, blogs, joint website, etc.

The final report will be presented to the Board of Governors for approval and AASUA membership for ratification after it has been reviewed by the Board Human Resources and Compensation Committee and by AASUA Executive and by AASUA Council. Each of the Board Human Resources and Compensation Committee, AASUA Executive and AASUA Council reserves its right to advance it to approval/ratification without recommendation or to advise the Board of Governors/members to not approve it. Ratification by AASUA membership will follow the normal procedures for ratification pursuant to Article 12 of the AASUA bylaws. Failure by either the Board of Governors or AASUA membership to approve/ratify the final report ends this process.

The parties agree that this process is not the usual bargaining process under Article 5 and Article 19 of the collective agreements, but the parties recognize that they can proceed with an alternate process if approved by the Board and ratified by the AASUA membership. However, this approved process is on a without precedent basis, does not establish new practice, and does not bind the Board or Council’s legislated roles and processes in future negotiations.

If the ratification vote fails with either party, then formal bargaining pursuant to Article 5 and Article 19 of the collective agreements shall commence in the Fall of 2014. The parties agree that either may
present matters belonging to Article 5 (agreement review negotiations) to Article 19 (compensation negotiations) but only with the mutual consent of the parties.
### Appendix 2

**MEETINGS HELD BY THE RENAISSANCE COMMITTEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-Dec-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>First Committee Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introductory Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Feb-13</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Strategic Analysis Office and Human Resource Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>VP (Academic) and Provost (on leave) Acting VP (Academic) and Provost, Vice-Provost &amp; Assoc VP (Academic), special advisors to the Provost, and members of President’s Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Mar</td>
<td>PRC/FEC</td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences &amp; Assistant Dean (Administration) Acting VP (Academic) and Provost, Vice-Provost &amp; Assoc VP (Academic), special advisors to the Provost, and members of President’s Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences &amp; Assistant Dean (Administration) Acting VP (Academic) and Provost, Vice-Provost &amp; Assoc VP (Academic), special advisors to the Provost, and members of President’s Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean and Vice-Dean Faculty of Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Career Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans’ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs’ Council Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean and Vice-Dean Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question and Answer Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Native Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-May</td>
<td></td>
<td>IT specialist, Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May</td>
<td>USRIs</td>
<td>Faculty of Education professors knowledgeable in research on USRIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td>VP (Research) and five colleagues from that office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Analysis Office and Human Resource Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td>AASUA Equity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Faculty of Augustana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Aug</td>
<td>USRIs</td>
<td>Some members of the 2009 CLE subcommittee on USRIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Sep</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Chief Librarian, former Acting Chief Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Sep</td>
<td>AASUA Member Services Officers</td>
<td>Four MSOs discuss aspects of the collective agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Sep</td>
<td>AASUA MAC (Members’ Affairs Committee)</td>
<td>First Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Sep</td>
<td>AASUA FSO Constituency</td>
<td>Six members of this committee discussing members’ concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Sep</td>
<td>Senate Plenary Meeting</td>
<td>Briefing to the University community via its ambassadors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Sep</td>
<td>VP (Academic) and Provost (on leave)</td>
<td>Second Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Second Public Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Oct</td>
<td>VP (Academic) and Provost (on leave)</td>
<td>Third Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Oct</td>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>Five representatives of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Oct</td>
<td>Vice-President Finance &amp; Admin &amp; AVP/Finance &amp; SMS</td>
<td>Fourth Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Oct</td>
<td>APLUA</td>
<td>Five members of this committee discussing members’ concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Oct</td>
<td>CAS:T Constituency</td>
<td>Four members of this committee discussing members’ concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Oct</td>
<td>APO Committee</td>
<td>Ten members of this committee discussing its members’ concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Oct</td>
<td>Teaching evaluation</td>
<td>Olive Yonge, Campus Alberta Quality Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Oct</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Four representatives of undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Oct</td>
<td>Chairs’ Council Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nov</td>
<td>Centre for Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Discussion with Interim Director on all aspects of Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 4 meetings to interview for position of Manager, Renaissance Committee
- 35 Renaissance Committee meetings
- 5 Governance subcommittee meetings
- 17 Scholarship subcommittee meetings
- 9 System of compensation subcommittee meetings
- 6 oral reports to Board of Governors’ Human Resources and Compensation Committee
- 3 meetings with Chair, Board of Governors
- 3 meetings with AASUA Presidents and Executive Director various members attended approximately 20 meetings of AASUA Council and standing and constituency committees, and University committees
Appendix 3

DEFINITIONS OF ADMINISTRATION

The Canadian Association of University Business Officers (CAUBO), in its definition of General Operating expenditures items, lists the following that the Renaissance Committee was able to identify as administration:128

Instruction and non-sponsored research: The Instruction and non-sponsored research function in the General operating fund includes all direct costs of faculties, academic departments (including salaries of academic deans and their offices), graduate school, summer school, credit extension, and other academic functions and expenditures attributable to this function.

Library: The Library function in the General operating fund includes the institution’s Archives and other activities related to the institution’s main, branch and faculty or departmental libraries. The expenditures include the salary and wage costs of providing the library services as well as the cost of books and periodicals.

(iv) Computing and communications
The Computing and communications function in the General operating fund includes only the activities of centralized computing and communication facilities.

v) Administration and general

The Administration and general function in the general operating fund covers expenditures in the two broad areas of academic support and other support services. Other support services include administration.

The academic support area of the Administration and general function includes all activities provided by an institution in direct support of Instruction and nonsponsored research. This area includes the following types of activities:
• the positions of vice-president academic and research (or their equivalents) and their offices
• faculty and instructional support services
• research administration (including grants and contracts administration)
• registrar’s and graduate students office (including calendars, admissions, student records and related reporting)
• convocation and ceremonies
• co-op program administration
• central animal services
• central shops for instruction and research (machine shop, glass blowing, electronics shop)
• distance education support
• instructional technology and audio visual services
• academic class scheduling

The administration area of the Administration and general function includes the following activities:
• administration, planning and information costs and activities associated with the positions of president and vice-president (or their equivalents) and their offices, except for the positions of

vice-president academic and research (or their equivalents) and their offices, which are included in the academic support area.

- finance, including investment management, internal audit and accounting
- human resources (personnel)
- institutional research
- board and senate secretariat
- printing and duplicating services

Specific types of expenditures in the administration area include the following:

- professional fees including legal, audit, human resource and other consulting fees that are not specifically attributable to another function. Computer consulting fees are included if the computing facilities are decentralized.
- general university memberships including AUCC and CAUBO
- liability and E & O insurance (fire, boiler and pressure vessel, and property insurance are reported under the Physical plant function).

Student services: The Student services function in the General operating fund includes the cost of services (other than direct teaching, research and administrative services) provided to students by the institution. Generally, these services will include:

- the dean of students and the dean’s office
- counseling and chaplaincy services
- career guidance and placement services
- intramural and intercollegiate athletics (not physical education)
- student health services
- student accommodation services (not residences)
- student transportation services
- student financial aid administration
- bursaries, scholarships and prizes
- grants to student organizations, including the student union
- student programs, including music, drama and student center
- student day care center
- any other student services, social or cultural activities funded by the institution

(vii) Physical plant
The Physical plant function in the General operating fund includes expenditures related to the physical facilities of the institution. The expenditures include the physical plant office, space planning, maintenance of buildings and grounds, custodial services, utilities, vehicle operations, security and traffic, repairs and furnishings, renovations and alterations, mail delivery services, long-term space and property rental, and municipal taxes (including those for which compensatory grants are received from government).

Physical plant also includes fire, boiler and pressure vessel, and property insurance. All other insurance is reported in the administration area of the Administration and general function.

External relations: The external relations area includes all activities provided by an institution in support of ongoing external relations. These activities include fundraising, development, alumni, public relations and public information or external communications. The related administrative costs from the Office of the Vice-President(s), or equivalent, responsible for one or more of these activities should be included in this area.

The Government of Alberta, in requiring the University to provide a budget, lists the following as administrative costs:

- VP Advancement
• VP External
• Governance (including Office of the President)
• VP Finance areas of Strategic Analysis, Financial Services, SMS, Human Resources, Risk Management, Resource Planning
• Vice-provost Information Technology department\textsuperscript{129}
• VP Research Infrastructure support department
• UA International
• VP Facilities office (but no other Facilities and Operations departments)

\textsuperscript{129} This definition issued out of Ministry of Alberta Advanced Education and Technology, “Publicly-Funded Post-Secondary Accountability Reporting: Overview of Reporting Systems Common Terminology, Definitions and Classifications” (Edmonton: Government of Alberta, 2007), 23–5, and was redeveloped by the University in conjunction with what is now the Ministry of Enterprise and Advanced Education as part of the ministry’s Financial Information Reporting System (http://eae.alberta.ca/Using/search.aspx?q=financial+information+reporting+system); accessed 4 May 2013.
A RECOMMENDATION FOR HARMONIZING SCHOLAR’S REPORTING FORMS AND THE CCV

Through consultation and deliberation, the Committee saw a need to reduce the workload of individual professors and variability among units, associated with the evaluation of scholarly activities (for example FEC documents).

Recent decisions by the Tri-Council granting agencies to adopt the Common CV provide a unique opportunity for the University of Alberta to develop a framework for harmonization of internal and external reporting requirements. However, the Renaissance Committee notes that the CCV does not currently have free-form formats available for faculty to offer context and explanations regarding their scholarly activities. The committee notes, as well, that a move to standardize forms among faculties does not indicate a move towards standardization of the relative values placed upon different forms of scholarly activities. The members of the Renaissance Committee recognize and support different academic cultures and priorities among academic units at the University of Alberta.

The Committee recommends
- Standardization of the forms used for annual evaluation of the scholarly activities performed by faculty members. The form should consist of
  - The Common CV, including a five-year window of faculty Scholarship for faculty evaluation;
- A free-form format for all additional information requested, as described below.
- The standardized evaluation forms allow for the appending of additional files, as needed.

The Renaissance Committee has suggestions for inclusions in this standardized evaluation form and recognizes that not all these elements currently apply to all academic units; however, they do represent the breadth of elements requested by the Tri-Councils and account for all elements that the revised definition of Scholarship presented in section 2 of this report. The committee anticipates that individual evaluation units will place different weight on different aspects of scholarly activities, in a transparent manner consistent with the culture and expectations of different disciplines.
A Recommendation for a revised approach to Evaluation of Teaching Activities

After consultation with many stakeholders, review of the Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta Report\textsuperscript{130}, and discussion, the members of the Committee believe there are many substantive flaws with the general reliance on USRI outcomes as a mechanism to evaluate the quality of teaching. Consequently, the Committee recommends a two-year action plan to redevelop the means by which the University of Alberta evaluates the quality of teaching performed by individuals, as one aspect of the contribution to scholarly activities. The members of the RC believe the goals of evaluation are to evaluate constructively and improve delivery of course material.

The Committee suggests that a first step is to revise the USRI mechanism to meet these goals; if this timeline is not met, then the committee suggests a moratorium on administering and using USRI evaluations for evaluating teaching proficiency is to be imposed. This moratorium should remain in place until such time as the redevelopment of the USRI, or development of an alternative system of evaluation, has been completed.

The Committee further recommends that evaluation committees disallow USRIs, in their current or revised form, to be a solitary tool for the evaluation of teaching. Instead, the RC recommends USRIs form only one part of a multi-facetted teaching evaluation, as indicated in the existing Faculty Agreement and GFC policies. Literature demonstrates that peer review and mentorship are vital to improving teaching performance, even if few units on campus have formalized these processes.

The Committee recommends that departments or faculties develop and encourage teaching peer/mentorship initiatives.

The Committee recommends that participation by mentors and peers be considered as part of an individual's teaching duties during annual evaluation.

The Committee recognizes that the Centre for Teaching and Learning offers valuable service on which departments can rely to help develop such initiative, or to conduct peer evaluations.

Reporting Period: 
Name: 
Rank: 
Department: 
Date of Initial Appointment: 
Professional Status (if applicable): 
Examinee _____ Applicant in Process _____ Have Not Applied 
Other appointments (adjunct, etc.) 

Delays in activity 
Describe below any delays in activity (e.g. maternity leave, illness, leave without pay) that the evaluation 
committee should be aware of in making its assessment of your Scholarship.

One-Page Summary:

In order to help the evaluation committee to frame your scholarship in its proper context, in this section 
describe what elements define your scholarship. The University of Alberta broadly defines Scholarship as 
comprising
the ongoing exploration, discovery, interpretation, evaluation, contemplation, preservation, communication/dissemination, integration, application, and administration of knowledge. These are 
applied ethically and rigorously through research, teaching, mentorship, public engagement, and 
other work.

This section should include:
• the overall short- and long-term goals, typical length of Scholarship projects/programs/initiative 
and expected timelines for, levels and types of outcomes;
• the value and impact (potential or implied) of the Scholarship being undertaken;
• the target audience(s) of your Scholarship;
• the human and financial resources (if any) required to undertake this scholarship; and
• the quality assessments and measurement outcomes your peers should consider when assessing 
the performance (quality, quantity, impact, audience) of your Scholarship.

Describe in the above terms every applicable part of Scholarship in which you engage. (The definitions of 
Scholarship, impact, quality and audience can be found in section 2.)

One-Page Summary of Your Scholarship
1. TEACHING

(a) **Teaching Scholarship and Philosophy** (250 words maximum.)
In this section, elaborate on the elements of your teaching scholarship identified in the one-page summary. What motivations, approaches, techniques and/or initiatives, etc. guide your teaching? What are, or were, your teaching goals, and how will you meet/how have you met them? Elaborate on the intended impact and audience of your teaching scholarship.

(b) **Teaching: Year in review** (250 words maximum.)
In this section, you can elaborate on the classes you taught this year, what you tried, what worked, what did not. How were the students, any particular concerns or strengths?

(c) **Course(s) taught; course name; calendar hours; your actual hours of contact; actual number of students; shared instruction.** For example, an instructor teaching a lecture section to the full class and two seminar sections, each to approx. 25% of the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Calendar Hours</th>
<th>Your Actual Weekly Average Contact Hours (indicate if a reading course)</th>
<th>Actual Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEC E 370</td>
<td>Heat Transfer</td>
<td>3-1s-0 Lecture (1): 1.2 hours</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar (1): 1 hour</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar (2): 1 hour</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory (1): 0 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Term of Last Academic Year (Month 20xx to Month 20xx)**

**Second Term of Last Academic Year (Month 20xx to Month 20xx)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name (give names of all instructors and percentage of course instruction. Indicate with a * course coordinator)</th>
<th>Calendar Hours</th>
<th>Your Actual Weekly Average Contact Hours (indicate if a reading course)</th>
<th>Actual Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Third Term of Last Academic Year (Month 20xx to Month 20xx, including Intersession courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name (give names of all instructors and percentage of course instruction. Indicate with a * course coordinator)</th>
<th>Calendar Hours</th>
<th>Your Actual Weekly Average Contact Hours (indicate if a reading course)</th>
<th>Actual Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TEACHING** (continued)

**Evaluation**

“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 staff member.” Faculty Agreement (13.06)

(d) **Course evaluations over the last five years:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Last year</th>
<th>2 yrs ago</th>
<th>3 yrs ago</th>
<th>4 yrs ago</th>
<th>5 yrs ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total students taught in all courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total actual formal contact hours for the entire academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student weighted USRI median across all courses for question #221 (instructor effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter any other USRI question you feel are important or that you specifically asked to have included for evaluation purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) **Other evaluations over the last five years:**
Provide other examples of teaching evaluations as per the Faculty Agreement (13.06) that you have requested or have documentation to support your teaching scholarship as described above. Provide any outcome of these evaluations the committee should be aware of.

2. EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVES AND LEADERSHIP
(a) Initiatives taken to improve your own teaching:
New teaching methods implemented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Short Description and Educational Objective, Desired Impact and Audience</th>
<th>Number of hours invested</th>
<th>Method used to evaluate initiative (refer to any attachments here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Course/Laboratory development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New course number</th>
<th>Short Description and Educational Objective, Desired Impact and Audience</th>
<th>Number of hours invested</th>
<th>Method used to evaluate initiative (refer to any attachments here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If there have been peer or other evaluation of these methods, please attach letters or reports to this report.

(b) Please briefly describe initiatives taken to improve teaching within the Faculty, at the University of Alberta, and externally.
This may include informal peer mentoring, formal peer consultations (as the consultant), participation in teaching triads, leadership of education related workshops, and participation as a discussant in panel discussions. This should include the expected impact and a description of the target audience. Please append any letters of support or recognition of these initiatives to this report.

(c) Describe any activities and initiatives taken to enhance graduate student supervision and mentoring:
Please append any letters of support or recognition of these initiatives to this report.
3. TEACHING: SUPERVISION OF RESEARCH TRAINEES
(a) Describe your approach and goals in training graduate students and other trainees. For example, in your opinion what are the skills (research, teaching, other) you expect from a PhD, MSc/MA at graduation, or from undergraduate students after a co-op term? (100 words)

(b) Graduate Students Supervised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s Name</th>
<th>Name of Scholarships/awards, if any</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
<th>Year Admitted</th>
<th>Degree Sought</th>
<th>Year Degree Expected or Date Completed</th>
<th>% Supervision and Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc/MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Number of graduate students supervised who have graduated in past five years:
(Include only those as primary supervisor or primary co-supervisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year (September-August)</th>
<th>Last year</th>
<th>2 yrs ago</th>
<th>3 yrs ago</th>
<th>4 yrs ago</th>
<th>5 yrs ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) Other research Trainees supervised - undergraduate students (e.g., summer, co-op, Dean's Research Award), visiting students, Research Associates and Post-Doctoral Fellows supervised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type (student, RA, PDF)</th>
<th>Joint with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Number of other research trainees supervised during the past five years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last year</th>
<th>2 yrs ago</th>
<th>3yrs ago</th>
<th>4yrs ago</th>
<th>5yrs ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) Teaching Grants:

(1) Current grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>Principal Applicant (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) new grants received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>P.A. (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Grants applied for rejected or under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Status (rejected, under review)</th>
<th>Proposed duration</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>P.A. (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. RESEARCH

(a) **Research Scholarship and Philosophy:** (250 words maximum.)
In this section you can elaborate on the elements of your research scholarship identified in the one page summary. What are the motivations, approaches, techniques and/or initiatives, etc. that guide your research? What are, or were, your research goals and how will you meet, or have you met, these goals? What has been or is the anticipated impact of your research? Discuss the importance (if any) and extent of collaborations, roles of each collaborator and what your role is in the collaboration. What are your choices of dissemination outlet (journals, conferences, patents, conferences, end user meetings etc.) and why are these selected (impact, audience, target community etc.).

(b) **General Research Interests and Past Research Activity and Contributions:** (250 words maximum.)
List your general research interests and past research activities. List your most significant contributions to research and/or to practical applications over the last five (5) years. Contributions made more than five (5) years ago but for which the impact is being felt now (e.g., exploitation of patent, theatrical play, etc.) may be included in this section. For each, describe the significance in terms of influence on the direction of thought and activity in the target community and in terms of significance to, and use by, other researchers and end users. For collaborative contributions, describe your role. A contribution does not have to be a single publication or report. For example, a group of publications on a specific subject could be discussed as one contribution.

(c) **Research Currently in Progress:** (150 words maximum.)
List research currently in progress and discuss how they fit in your general scholarship goals as described above. In a collaborative environment describe your role and leadership status. Explain the anticipated impact of the research and what the translational plans to the target audience are.
(d) **Development of New Research Initiatives:** (150 words maximum.)
List any new research initiatives and why they were undertaken. Describe the value of these initiatives to your research and to the University. Do they align with the University’s priorities? If so, identify what resources could be provided by the University of Alberta to advance these initiatives.

(e) **Grants:** (Individual, operating, equipment, and share of other grants. For shared grants, indicate if you are the Principal Investigator (The Principal Investigator is the holder and signing authority of the grant account). Indicate if a grant is not being administered through the Faculty of Engineering, and, if not, state where it is being administered. Do not list internal university start-up funds, AIF or other graduate scholarships listed in section 3 of this form. Also, do not list unsuccessful applications and/or grants applied for but not yet awarded. **List start and finish date** (e.g., NSERC (Discovery), April 2008 - March 2012).

**Current grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>P.I. (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**New grants received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>P.I. (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grants applied for, rejected, or under review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Status (rejected, under review)</th>
<th>Proposed duration</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>P.I. (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: Research information provided on this page may only be used for information and reporting purposes. If you do not wish to have the information on this page used in this manner, please check the box below and sign.

[ ] I do not consent to having the information on this form used for information and reporting purposes.

Signature ____________________________
5. SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS
(Books, papers, articles, reviews, artworks, etc.)
Do not include articles submitted but not yet accepted. List the most recent first, using the Faculty Approved format. Underline the names of students. **One copy of each publication or manuscript is to be deposited with the Department Chair, including letter of acceptance for articles in press.**

The columns at the right must be checked so as to indicate whether or not the item has appeared on a previous annual report. In addition, it must be assigned to one of four categories as follows:
1. Full paper reviewed by reviewers and editorial board.
2. Full paper reviewed by editor only.
3. Invited paper - no review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) List the publications published or accepted in refereed journals during the past year: (For those accepted, give acceptance date and number of manuscript pages; underline the names of students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) List papers published in full in conference proceedings during the past year: (specify number of ms. pages; use * to indicate presenter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) List books (specify number of pages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Chapters in books (specify number of pages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Patents/copyrights/trademarks granted during the past year (specify number of pages and wares)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do not provide a copy of the following publications.

(f) List unrefereed papers and technical reports published during the past year:
   (specify number of pages)

(g) List presentations made during the past year, indicating by an asterisk which author made the presentation: (do not include presentations of papers listed in section 3(b) or elsewhere)

(h) Artwork (specify means of publication, exposition, purchase price, and append to this report, if desired, any commentary, reviews, and critiques of the work)

(i) Musical or theatrical works (describe your role, audience, venue, etc., and append to this report, if desired, any commentary, reviews, and critiques of the work)

(j) Clinical contributions

(k) Educational contributions (e.g. Materials for use in school)

(l) Public Engagement: (as appropriate audience, impact, and measurable or other outcomes)

(m) Media interviews, Television or Multimedia Dissemination of Scholarship (as appropriate audience, impact, measurable or other outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Reach (national, local, provincial, international)</th>
<th>Media Outlet</th>
<th>Date and duration (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(n) List and describe the impact of other contributions made during the past year (as appropriate specify number of pages, audience, impact, measurable or other outcomes)

(o) Total number of publications per year in the last five years
Quantify by calendar year (do not include current calendar year).
### 6. UNIVERSITY AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

(a) Philosophy on Service, Citizenship and Collegiality: (250 words maximum.)
In this section you can provide your reflections or philosophy on elements of Service, Mentorship and other works. What are your underlying motivations in this area? What are, or were your related goals and how will you meet, or have you met, these goals. What has been or is the anticipated impact of your service. Discuss the importance (if any) and extent of collaborations, roles of each collaborator and what your role is in the collaboration.

(b) Faculty Mentorship
The University of Alberta recognizes the importance of mentorship as a form of scholarship that improves the moral and effectiveness of all of its faculty members, builds collaboration and collegiality, and the effect it has on the University’s vision.

Indicate all efforts to mentor other faculty members in research, teaching, and service or in other areas. Indicate the objectives, value and impact of the mentorship. Append to this document any supporting documentation you wish to bring to the attention of the committee. (250 words or less)
(c) Major university, faculty and department committees and office:
(Indicate number of members, if chair of the committee, approximate hours spent/year.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Were You Chair? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Total Hours/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Initiative taken to enhance student/faculty interaction:

(e) Activities through the Faculty of Extension (course offered, collaboration):

(f) Other: (Describe; include graduate student oral and examining committee activities in this section)

(g) Number of graduate student oral and examining committees you have served on in the past year, excluding your own students listed in section 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Role</th>
<th>Departmental</th>
<th>External to Departmental</th>
<th>External to University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Candidacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc/MA Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEng Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee chair and examiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Candidacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc/MA Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEng Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Candidacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc/MA Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEng Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(h) Administrative duties: describe any Administrative duties at Department, Faculty or University Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position, your role and your reflection on the result</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. SCHOLARLY CITIZENSHIP, PUBLIC SERVICE, CONTRIBUTIONS TO ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

(a) National and regional committees including public institutions, and technical and professional societies: (List only those organizations in which you held a committee position or other office. Do not list organizations in which you had no role other than membership. Note office held and approximate hours/year.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Office Held</th>
<th>Role (explain what you did on this committee)</th>
<th>Total Hours/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Referee Services: (Have you served as a referee, consultant, and expert? List only those that do not fall in the category above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal, conference, publication, etc. name</th>
<th>Number of reviews</th>
<th>Total Hours/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Supplemental Professional Activities:

(i) (Continue on page 10 if necessary.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic Description of Project</th>
<th>Total University Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Names and nature of any continuing contractual arrangements with outside organizations.

8. CLINICAL SERVICE

a. Details of any clinical service activities (type of service, # of patients/clients served. **Do not repeat items listed in scholarly publications**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>Outcomes/impact</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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b. Describe any assessment or treatment innovations (do not repeat items listed in scholarly publications.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of program, your role and your reflection on the result</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of program, your role and your reflection on the result</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c. Clinical program development (new or existing programs. do not repeat items listed in scholarly publications.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of program, your role and your reflection on the result</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d. Details of any clinical program administrative duties

8. HONOURS AND AWARDS

9. OTHER DEMONSTRATION OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINE AND SPECIALIZATION

Conference attended

Activities Related to Personal and Professional Development (not already included in a previous section)

Other Grants: (travel, initiatives, etc. not covered in another section)

(1) Current grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>Principal Applicant (P.A.) (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(2) New grants received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>P.A. (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(3) Grants applied for rejected or under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Body</th>
<th>Status (rejected, under review)</th>
<th>Proposed duration</th>
<th>Average Amount/Year</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>P.A. (y/n)</th>
<th>Joint With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
(In addition to anything else that you wish to include on this page, please describe any special initiatives or activities that you wish to bring to the attention of the FEC, or that you believe were not adequately covered in the preceding sections.)
AN ALTERNATIVE SYSTEM OF CAREER PROGRESS AND EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE FOR FACULTY: PRINCIPLES FOR CONSIDERATION

A: INTRODUCTION

1. The members of the Agreement Review Committee did not enter into the current round of negotiations expecting to become yet another of the committees reviewing career progress. Pressures for modification to parts of the salary structure, the rank-salary tie and the evaluation system have resulted, however, in a series of proposals for consideration which, if endorsed by the members and the Board, would result in significant changes.

2. One of the fundamental changes which has taken place at the University of Alberta in the past three decades is a redefinition of scholarship. The academic world has changed. Each profession in turn has examined the nature of the undergraduate degree, has introduced graduate programs, has emphasized research into the nature and practice of the profession. The arts and sciences likewise have focused on scholarship as an integral component of university pedagogy.

3. The impact of this changed emphasis on the evaluation of performance, on career progress and on the work of Faculty Salary and Promotion Committees has been profound. This report invites consideration of some of these impacts and proposes modification to the current structures.

4. The recommendations assume that scholarship involves both research activity and teaching. A university evaluation system, to be effective, must avoid both the Scylla of encouraging popular instruction (without emphasis on required reflective inquiry) which can be the characteristic of certain kinds of schools, as well as the Charybdis of rewarding only the quantified measure of publication of research to the detriment of both scholarship and teaching. The recent report of the Carnegie Foundation, "Scholarship Reconsidered; Priorities of the Professoriate", proposes that scholarship be redefined as recognizing four components: the discovery of new knowledge, the interpretation of knowledge, the application of knowledge and teaching.

5. The recommendations in this report assume, secondly, that not all careers progress along the same line. In some disciplines, scholarship does not yield to annual quantitative analysis. Projects develop over time and publication horizons vary. Moreover, individuals may wish to emphasize different activities at differing stages in their careers. The current review process, however, appears
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to some it's reward short term research and successful
grantmanship at the expense of projects which require
longer periods of reflection and inquiry before significant
publication. The report, therefore, suggests that two
significant modifications to the existing structure be
considered. The term of evaluation should be extended to
permit longer term evaluation without, however, sacrificing
annual career progress. Basic career progress should be
separated from consideration of recognition of exemplary
performance or activity.

6. The committee also was faced with the need to recognize
variations in career activity resulting from personal
factors and decisions to bear and rear children; decisions
to move between alternative professions and the academy;
decisions that result in late entry or early leave taking
from the professoriate. The recommendations of this report
only begin to address these factors. Insofar as they
provide a more flexible model, the career path of
individuals can differ and still be rewarded. Insofar as
the career line of professor remains a function of time
(both in terms of salary and in terms of academic
promotion), career interruptions or career truncation will
still have financial implications, although negative
academic effects may be somewhat mitigated.

7. The report is also influenced by a recognition that the
current career progress and evaluation model results in an
inherently stress producing climate. By requiring a lock-
step approach and annual competition, we have developed an
evaluative model in which the pressure on the individual is
a direct function of the quality of one's peers. A system
which was designed to permit individual performance to be
measured against relatively objective standards has become a
competition in which merit is defined relatively against the
performance of peers. Without in any way wishing to detract
from a merit based reward system, the committee concluded
that the head to head competitive model might be modified.

8. Although the primary objective of this review did not
address the relationship of the current career progress
model to areas of specialized (high) market within the
university, the introduction of a flexible system will
probably have an effect on the market supplement program.
To what degree this will be the case needs to be explored.

9. This report is circulated for discussion. The Agreement
Review Committee chose not to draft amendments to the
Agreement which would have required the individual member of
the community to vote yes or no to its multiple
recommendations. Rather, the report invites discussion and response. From the response, it can be determined whether we have read the community accurately and how these principles should be modified. Comments should be addressed to the AAS:UA (347 Athabasca Hall) or the Vice-President (Academic) (3-4A University Hall). Written comments are preferred so that they can be distributed to all those who will be participating in future Agreement negotiations. Individual members of the committee will try to be available to meet with groups who wish to discuss the issues raised in the report.

The current version of the Agreement was last printed in 1988.

B: EVALUATION

1. The increment structure shall provide for two separate increment pools:
   1.1 Career increments shall be awarded annually as a recognition of progression through a career, assuming continuing acceptable performance. Career increments may be withheld for cause where performance is not acceptable.
   1.2 Merit increment shall be awarded to members in recognition of exemplary performance.
   1.3 The funds available for incrementations shall be divided according to an approximate 2:1 ratio between the two pools.

2. Although all faculty members shall be expected to be practising scholars, active in both teaching and research, the standards of performance shall be applied in a manner to recognize the differing patterns of activity at different times in one's career and in differing disciplines and sub-disciplines. It shall, therefore, be the responsibility of the department chair and the faculty member to reach agreement on relatively long term (say, three years) academic performance expectations. Such agreed upon expectations shall include quantitative and qualitative expectations in teaching, research, and service. Although the horizon of such expectations shall be long term, they shall be reviewed and adjusted annually.

3. Such individual performance expectations shall take into account Faculty wide standards for the award of tenure and for promotion.
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4.1 Performance, in the first instance, shall be evaluated by the department chair.

4.2 Recommendations shall be made from the chair to a Faculty Evaluation Committee (to replace to FSPC) for
- withholding career increments for cause
- awarding merit increments
- all increments for faculty in the rank of assistant professor.

4.3 Other increment decisions shall be made by the chair, except that such awards shall be reviewed triennially by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

5. Decisions to withhold a career increment for cause shall be appealable. Reasons for the FEC decision shall be provided in writing to the faculty member.

C: THE RANK STRUCTURE

6. The assistant professor rank shall be a probationary rank. The award of tenure shall automatically include promotion to the rank of associate professor. (The Agreement Review Committee is also recommending that the time of probation be extended from the current three years plus two years to an initial appointment of four years plus a second period, if necessary, of two years.)

7. The rank of associate professor shall be recognized as and shall become the career rank. Successful attainment of the rank (and the simultaneous award of tenure) shall indicate that the faculty member has demonstrated merit in scholarship which is reflected in a successful teaching record as well as a successful publication record.

8. The rank of professor shall be awarded for a cumulative record of qualitatively superior performance, performance recognized within the university as exemplary in teaching, in research and in service, a recognition supported, in the case of scholarship--and, perhaps, in service--by national (and international) recognition.

9. Both the rank of associate professor and professor shall be recognized as acceptable career ranks with salary levels reflecting such recognition.
10. This new rank structure, although bearing the same traditional titles of the existing ranks, is not to be identified with the rank structure we know now. Each present rank is a step in a three rank structure and is expected to lead to the next step. The associate professor rank described here is a career rank with the full professor rank awarded for superior performance for a significant part of the associate career.

11.1 The timing of promotion to professor shall be flexible. Decisions shall be made by the Faculty Evaluation Council, following an application by the faculty member, based on standards recommended by the FEC, approved by the Vice-President (Academic) on behalf of the wider University community and ratified by the members of the Faculty.

11.2 An application for promotion can be made when the faculty member has been an associate professor for at least seven years, during which at least two merit increments have been awarded.

11.3 All persons currently on staff shall be entitled to apply for promotion when they would become eligible under current regulations.

12. There shall be a minimum salary for each rank, but no maximum salary at any rank. The details of the relationship of floors to each other, the value of increments (both career and merit), and the size of the increment pool will be negotiated between the Board and the Association. The future of the market supplement program will be determined. A possible model of the structure is attached.

September 23, 1991

Agreement Review Committee

Representing the Board
Peter Maekison
Keith Denford
Tim Christian
Brian McDonald

Representing the Association
Jim Marino
Jim Robb
Frederick Van De Pitte
Gordon Unger
PROGRESS THROUGH THE RANKS: AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL

1. Instead of a single increment award - now known as a "merit increment" - there would be two awards:
   a) A Service award/progress through the ranks awards, etc. (exact terminology to be determined); and
   b) A Merit award (for "true" merit).

2. The value of the two awards would be negotiated but would likely be in the following range:
   a) Service = $1,100 - $1,300
   b) Merit = $750 - $1,000

   The total of all service and merit awards would approximate the present total increment pool.

3. Awards would be the same value at all ranks and at all salary levels. Service awards would either be zero (unsatisfactory service) or the service value. Merit awards could be 1, 2 or 3 times the value.

4. There would be a minimum salary for Assistant Professor. This would be the only such yardstick. All other benchmarks would be a function of starting salary and time (see below).

5. The "normal" career would be as follows (based on a person new to the professorate, likely just having completed the doctorate or equivalent or with some PD experience):
   
   Each appointee has a career horizon of 34 service increments. Within this maximum, the following secondary rules apply:
   a) Maximum number of service increments as Assistant Professor = maximum number of years of probation (6 under the revised Agreement);
   
   b) Maximum number of service increments as Associate Professor = 18, less number at Assistant Professor rank (normally, this would be 18-6-12); and
   
   c) Maximum number of service increments as Professor = 34, less number at Assistant Professor/Associate Professor (normally, this would be 34-6-12-16. If "early" promotion(s) were involved, the number of service increments available at the Professor level would be greater than 16).

6. A staff member would have the right to receive as many "merit" increments as are awarded to him or her, at any rank. "Merit" awards would not affect rank or maxima.
ON THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY

A review of the faculty Agreement is underway. In order to generate discussion among faculty about the principles which underlie faculty evaluation procedures, the Agreement Review Committee has developed a series of propositions for consideration. Some of these are attempts to articulate principles which are basic to existing procedures in the Agreement, but not explicitly incorporated. Others are formulations of procedures alternate to the current provisions of the Agreement. These propositions are submitted as a basis for discussion. Depending upon the results of the discussion, specific amendments to the Agreement can be developed where there is a consensus supporting a proposition.

PROPOSITION ONE: WHO IS A FACULTY MEMBER?

1.1 A faculty member is defined as a teaching scholar, expected both to engage in scholarship and to participate in teaching. Scholarship includes frontier or innovative research as well as reflective inquiry. Teaching is an integral part of each faculty member's duties, except for brief periods of time such as study leaves which are directed to study and writing.

1.2 Working in a collegial environment, a faculty member is expected to participate in service in the administrative structure of the university, and within the discipline.

1.3 A faculty member is expected to be available to utilize knowledge of the discipline in service to the public.

1.4 The clauses of the Agreement governing the categories of expected activity of a faculty member (e.g. 28) and the clauses enumerating categories of duties (e.g. 6 and 9) in the evaluation clauses shall be reflective of this definition.

PROPOSITION TWO: RELATIONSHIPS AND DUTIES

2.1 The department chair shall be recognized as the academic leader of the department, as well as the executive officer. The faculty member shall be recognized as a professional integrating a command of a discipline with the responsibilities of teaching and scholarship.

2.2 The chair and the faculty member shall meet periodically to understand each other's expectations about activities in which the faculty member will be engaged. Such meetings would take place at least annually in the early years of an
appointment, perhaps less frequently as records of performance and mutual understanding develop.

2.3 Certain duties such as teaching responsibilities and certain administrative responsibilities are assigned; others are initiated by the faculty member.

2.4 Within the overall expectations of what it means to be a university professor and within the standards of the university, such understanding of duties shall be taken into account for the purpose of annual evaluation of performance.

2.5 The authority of the chair to assign duties and approve activities shall be subject to appeal.

PROPOSITION THREE: CAREER PROGRESS

3.1 The current funds distributed in the form of increments to members of staff shall be divided into two pools. A basic increment shall be available for award to each staff member. A basic increment may be withheld for cause, such cause to be supported by a written reasoned decision, appealable to a university wide appeal body.

3.2 A pool of increments for superior achievement shall be made available in a number equivalent to, say, twenty-five or thirty-five percent of the number of staff members in the Faculty.

3.3 Basic increments shall be awarded by the department chair, with such decisions being reviewed by a Faculty Evaluation Committee every third year. (The FEC would review the cases of one third of the faculty members in each year).

3.4 Recommendation to withhold a basic increment shall be made by the chair; decisions shall be made by the FEC.

3.5 All increments for superior achievement shall be awarded by the FEC, following consideration of the recommendations of the department chair. The FEC would also have the authority to initiate consideration for increments for superior achievement at the time of the triennial review.

3.6 Any review of performance by the FEC may result in a recommendation that a staff member no longer be eligible to receive further basic increments until the FEC acknowledges that performance has improved. Such individuals may apply for reconsideration in any year.

3.7 The Agreement shall include a statement of the expectations necessary for the award of increments and promotion. Each
Faculty shall prepare guidelines for evaluation which shall govern the preparation of annual reports, (i.e., documents in which academic activity is summarized), along with the necessary guidelines to allow communication of expectations across disciplines and sub-disciplines. Such guidelines shall be approved in accordance with procedures under the administrative jurisdiction of the Vice-President (Academic) in consultation with the Association.

PROPOSITION FOUR: THE RANK STRUCTURE

4.1 The rank of assistant professor shall be defined as a probationary rank. It shall be restricted to persons newly appointed to the university. Appointment to the university as an assistant professor recognizes the judgement of the peers in the selection process that an individual shows quality of performance (normally as student, temporary lecturer and post-doctoral fellow) and promise of becoming a successful teacher and scholar.

4.2 The rank of associate professor shall be awarded at the time of granting of tenure, in recognition that the initial recognition of quality was accurate and that the quality of performance in university responsibilities is sustained.

4.3 The rank of professor shall be awarded in recognition that the scholarship of the individual is recognized in national and international forums, and the performance in scholarship, teaching and service is recognized within the university as exemplary.

4.4 Given that promotion is collegial recognition of the cumulative quality of performance, the relationship of the salary structure to timing of promotion shall be flexible.

4.5 A minimum salary for assistant professors shall continue to be determined through annual negotiation. Any maximum salary for assistant professor must be sufficiently flexible to take into account variations in starting salaries for probationary staff. (These propositions assume the continuation of a market supplement program, but the impact of market has not been a direct factor in the discussion leading to their formulation).

4.6 A minimum salary for associate professor would be linked to the normal maximum time of probation, with individuals granted tenure early receiving an automatic increase in salary necessary to reach the minimum of the associate rank. Given the provision of paragraph 3.6 a maximum salary for an associate professor may not be necessary. Alternatively, it shall be set at a level to provide sufficient flexibility to
permit the variety of career patterns which faculty follow
before reaching the level at which consideration for
promotion to the rank of professor would be considered.

4.7 The minimum salary for professor shall be reconsidered to
take into account the variety of career patterns and the
differing points in time at which individual staff members
are ready to apply for promotion.

4.8 Promotion decisions and tenure decisions shall continue to
be made by Faculty Committees as at present. The procedures
for such decisions will need to be reviewed. Negative
decisions shall continue to be appealable to a university
wide appeal committee. The Faculty Committee shall provide
a written, reasoned decision.
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EXAMPLES OF FACULTY REORGANIZATION

Below, two models for University faculty reorganization are recommended. These two models support the concepts described earlier in the section suggesting that faculty mergers would reduce cost, provide greater academic opportunities, improve governance at Deans’ Council and other major governing groups, reduce the number of stakeholders and allow for power to be vested in those who have responsibility without extraneous decentralization, and improve equity and quality assurance.

The first model makes two recommendations: merge the current faculties of Arts, Science, and Physical Education; and merge all health-related faculties. Arts and Science offer similar programs in terms of versatile degree requirements and are often combined at other universities. Physical Education has faculty members who perform research, which overlaps the sciences and humanities, so their inclusion would naturally fit into a Faculty of Arts and Science. The resources expended and duplication found on smaller campuses or faculties do not support the need for the present structure. Similarly, combining all health-related faculties, some with faculty contingents smaller than departments, would be advantageous in terms of reducing duplication and ensuring equity.

An Alternative Organization of Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>St Stephen</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Native Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Saint-Jean</td>
<td>St Joseph</td>
<td>Augustana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phys Ed.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Med &amp; Dent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Law |

Office of graduate studies and research services.

Figure App-6.1: Faculty merger option 1: the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Faculty of Health Sciences, with the current faculties of Engineering, Aies, Business, and Law. The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research would become an office of services, similar to RSO and HRS.
The second model is based on the first but extending from a suggestion provided in a dean’s stakeholder meeting. In it, the faculties of Engineering, ALES, and Business are assembled as the Faculty of Applied Sciences and Enterprise. This new faculty structure would align with other North American models in which the applied sciences combine with the benefit of business skills to create a stream of highly skilled, knowledgeable engineers and applied scientists, and business people addressing industry’s needs.

In both models, Law is left separate; its degree requirements are distinct. Finally, the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research has been recently delegating its responsibilities to departments and faculties, now apparently providing mostly services to other units. As such, these models imply that FGSR become a services-based office.

![Diagram: An Alternative Organization of Faculties]

Figure App-6.2: Faculty merger option 2; the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Faculty of Applied Sciences and Enterprise, and the Faculty of Law. The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research would become an office of services, similar to RSO and HRS.