



FACULTY SERVICE EXCELLENCE AWARD (FSEA)

Procedures and Criteria for the Selection of an FSEA Recipient

Contents

PROCEDURES

PURPOSE.....	2
NUMBER OF AWARDS	2
ELIGIBLE UFV NOMINEES.....	2
ELIGIBLE UFV NOMINATORS	2
ROLE OF SELECTION COMMITTEE	3
FORMATION OF SELECTION COMMITTEE	3
MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION.....	3
TERMS OF OFFICE	3
COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES	3
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS	3
EVALUATION.....	4
RECOMMENDATION TO SAHC & REVIEW	4
RECOMMENDATION TO SENATE.....	5
NOMINATION MECHANISM	5
NOMINATION PACKAGE	5
AWARD RECOGNITION	6
CRITERIA	
EVALUATION SCALE	7
SCORING AND REACHING A DECISION	7
EVALUATION CRITERIA	8

UFV FACULTY SERVICE EXCELLENCE AWARD (FSEA)

Procedures for the Selection of an FSEA Recipient

Final approval for the procedures rests with the Senate Awards and Honors Committee (SAHC)
Approved by SAHC: May 18, 2022

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Board policy, Academic Excellence Awards (BRP-235.03), this award recognizes and celebrates faculty excellence in service at UFV.

NUMBER OF AWARDS

One annual award; however, it is possible to not hand out an award one year if no suitable candidate is found.

ELIGIBLE UFV NOMINEES

Eligible nominees must **currently** hold one of the following positions:

- ✚ B Type faculty, including lab instructors, after probation period.
- ✚ Sessional faculty with equivalent of two years of teaching (accumulation of 14 sections).

Note the following:

- a. Winners cannot be nominated for five years following receipt of the award.
- b. No one may solicit a nomination on his or her own behalf.
- c. Nominees who are unsuccessful in their first year of nomination will be considered as candidates for the service excellence award for a second year. Nominators will be invited to:
 - Let the nomination stand and provide relevant updates to meet required documentation; or,
 - withdraw the nomination upon the nominee's request.

If the nominators are not available, the nominees will be contacted to determine if they would like to have their nomination stand for another year. Nominees who are unsuccessful in both first and second years of nomination will need to be re-nominated to be considered.

ELIGIBLE UFV NOMINATORS

- ✚ B Type faculty, including lab instructors, after probation period
- ✚ Sessional faculty with equivalent of two years of teaching (accumulation of 14 sections)
- ✚ Staff*
- ✚ Students enrolled in at least one UFV course
- ✚ Alumni
- ✚ University officers*

Nominations may not be made by, or letters of support provided by, any member of the Faculty Service Excellence Award selection committee.

*For definitions, refer to the Senate Bylaws, p. 10.

ROLE OF SELECTION COMMITTEE

The UFV Faculty Service Excellence Award selection committee (SEASC) is a subcommittee of the Senate Faculty Standards Committee (FSC) and is responsible for:

- a. Informing the UFV community of the availability of this award, the selection criteria, and application procedures
- b. Receiving applications and nominations for the award, selecting a successful candidate according to established criteria, announcing the recipient choice to FSC for information, and to the Senate Awards and Honors Committee (SAHC) for approval
- c. Making recommendations to SAHC for revisions to relevant policies, regulations, procedures, and criteria used in the selection of an award recipient

FORMATION OF SELECTION COMMITTEE - SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER

1. The Senate Faculty Standards Committee (FSC) will call, from its membership, volunteers for the Faculty Service Excellence Award selection committee.
2. The selection committee may also solicit volunteers from other areas of the university if there are insufficient volunteers from the standing committee, or if the committee wishes to bring in external expertise to assist the process. Normally, these external additions would have past experience serving on the adjudication committee, or would bring recognized expertise relevant to the award.
3. If there is more than one volunteer for a position, the selection committee chair will ask them to submit a brief paragraph about their interest in participating.

MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION

Composition – seven members:

- a. Chair of the Senate Faculty Standards Committee, who acts as chair
- b. Four voting faculty members, including at least three from the Senate Faculty Standards Committee
- c. One staff member
- d. One student

The chair of the award committee seeks to ensure the committee is fully filled, but should proceed with the adjudication process even if there are vacancies. A representative from the Secretariat office will provide support to the chair and selection committee for all administrative aspects of the award.

TERMS OF OFFICE

Committee members will serve for two years, with half the committee appointed on alternate years to ensure continuity.

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

Members of the committee will commit to attend all meetings. Members may miss one meeting but shall provide the committee chair with notes to assist in the evaluation process. Any member who misses more than one meeting will be asked to withdraw from the committee.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS - SEPTEMBER

1. Prior to the call, in April or May, nomination information from the previous year will be available on the

Secretariat web page.

2. In September, the call for nominations is initiated by the Secretariat, in conjunction with the University Relations office, and other appropriate means. The deadline for nominations is the first Friday in December.
3. Nomination information will be available through the Secretariat web page, the Faculty Standards Committee online resources, deans' offices, Faculty Services, the AVP, Academic's office and website, and other areas as appropriate.
4. The nomination deadline may be extended only when no nominations are received. The length of extension is determined by the selection committee and Secretariat office.
5. The number of nominations received may be disclosed to individuals who inquire, such as nominators.

EVALUATION - JANUARY - MARCH 1

1. The Faculty Service Excellence Award selection committee meets to review the process, guidelines, evaluation system for criteria, and set the meeting schedule to meet deadlines for SAHC's March meeting and Senate's April meeting.
2. Selection committee members will independently evaluate each nominee's package, following the procedures outlined in the [Criteria](#).
3. The selection committee will meet to make the final selection for an award recipient, following the procedures outlined in the [Criteria](#).
4. The final decision of the committee must be conducted with a *minimum of 51% committee membership* in attendance.
5. After the selection committee has made its final decision for the annual recipient, the chair of the selection committee collects all records used in the adjudication process, including individual adjudication sheets from all members of the committee. The Secretariat retains the records for a minimum of one year.

RECOMMENDATION TO SAHC & REVIEW - MARCH 1-30

1. The chair or designate of the selection committee presents the recommendation for the annual recipient to the Faculty Standards Committee for information.
2. The selection committee chair or designate is invited to attend the Senate Awards and Honors Committee's March meeting to present its recommendation for an award recipient, providing written documentation to summarize the process as follows:
 - a. Number of applications received/eligible
 - b. Name and title of the successful candidate
 - c. Parameters and details of the adjudication process in reaching decisions. This will include the final adjudication sheet completed by the committee, showing the scoring used in the selection of the award recipient to demonstrate how the winning candidate met the criteria.
 - d. The letter of nomination, all letters of recommendation, and the curriculum vitae of the successful candidate
 - e. The names and titles of the members of the SEA selection committee
3. The selection committee presents any recommendations for revisions to the process to SAHC.

4. SAHC reviews the documentation to ensure procedural requirements have been met in the selection of an annual recipient of the award, in order to inform its recommendation to Senate.

Note: SAHC does not approve the committee's selection, only ensures procedures were followed.

5. SAHC reviews and approves the selection committee's recommendations for revisions to the procedures, and makes a recommendation to Senate for any proposed revisions to the criteria used in the selection of the annual recipient.

RECOMMENDATION TO SENATE - APRIL

1. SAHC recommends the annual recipient to Senate for approval. The SAHC chair includes a brief summary about the chosen recipient, along with the recommended motion.
2. Once the award recipient is approved by Senate, the Secretariat prepares the congratulatory letter to the recipient and the letters to the unsuccessful candidates, for the VP, Academic's signature. The VP, Academic is the first to congratulate the winner. The Office of the VP, Academic notifies the Secretariat and President's office once the VP, Academic has had the opportunity to offer his congratulations to the winner.
3. The Secretariat prepares a congratulatory letter to the recipient for the President's signature. The President, on behalf of the Board, is the second to congratulate the winner.
4. Until such time as the VP, Academic and President have sent out letters to the winners and non-successful candidates, the decision will remain confidential.
5. The Secretariat notifies University Relations to begin the interview process with the winning candidate, for publicity materials. The recipient is publicly announced, with the award to be presented at an appropriate university event.
6. The Secretariat notifies the award recipient of the options for the monetary award, and initiates the required paperwork.

NOMINATION MECHANISM

It is the role of the nominator to complete the nomination form, gather the supporting documents, and confidentially submit a complete electronic .pdf copy of the nomination package, with a table of contents, to the Secretariat at UFVSecretariat@ufv.ca.

NOMINATION PACKAGE

The nomination package must consist of all of the following:

1. A letter of nomination outlining how the nominee meets the criteria for the Faculty Service Excellence award (maximum 1,000 words) which details the nominee's service over the previous 5 years, emphasizing service which goes above and beyond the basic service requirements expected of employees, and providing evidence of the ways in which the nominee's service demonstrates excellence in meeting the criteria as set out for the Faculty Service Excellence award.
2. A nominator form, signed by the nominator, indicating their eligibility type.
3. Exactly five letters of support that provide specific information supporting the criteria of the Faculty Service Excellence Award (500 words maximum):
 - At least two letters from individuals within UFV, which could include admin, faculty, staff, or students, who have significant knowledge of the individual's service; and,

- At least two letters from external partners who have direct, significant knowledge of the individual's service. A letter of support cannot come from the nominator.
 - A letter provided by a student or group of students.
 - A letter of support cannot come from the nominator.
4. A current curriculum vitae of the nominee, clearly outlining all areas of service.
 5. A consent form signed by the nominee, agreeing to be nominated.
 6. Documents that provide evidence of service, such as newsletters, media clippings, awards or Honors for service, website references, annual reports, links to committee reports, etc.

AWARD RECOGNITION

The award recipient will receive the award during an appropriate university event designated for award recipients. The award will include:

- A plaque with the award recipient's name and the year of the award;
- a framed certificate;
- \$2500 to be used at the discretion of the award recipient – please contact the University Secretary to discuss options.

CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF AN FSEA RECIPIENT

Final approval for the UFV Faculty Excellence Awards Criteria rests with Senate, at the recommendation of the Senate Awards and Honors Committee.

Approved by SAHC: May 18, 2022

Approved by Senate: June 10, 2022

Note: Highlighted areas are new for 2022-23.

EVALUATION SCALE

Level Description

- 5 Significant evidence of meeting the criteria and demonstrating excellence in all attributes
- 4 Strong evidence of meeting the criteria and demonstrating excellence in most attributes
- 3 Evidence of meeting the criteria and demonstrating excellence in some attributes
- 2 Evidence of meeting some of the attributes of the criteria but demonstrating little excellence
- 1 Little evidence of meeting the criteria and/or demonstrating excellence
- 0 Nominee does not display any of the attributes of this criteria

SCORING AND REACHING A DECISION

1. Scoring the Nominees

- a. The selection committee chair is responsible to lead decision-making, and help the committee agree on a process and declaration of a winner. The committee must agree upon the full scoring process (giving consideration to all elements noted below), prior to receiving nomination packages.
- b. Prior to finalizing a committee decision on an award winner, selection committee members independently evaluate each nominee's package of materials, based on the evidence provided. Using the scale above, members will produce a score for each award criterion, along with a brief written justification for the score.
- c. The committee meets to discuss the nominees and their independent evaluations for each candidate. During the discussion, committee members can make any adjustments they feel are required to create their own final score for each criterion.

2. Determining the Chosen Nominee

At this point, committees should discuss the total aggregate scores for each candidate. The total aggregate score is calculated by taking the score assessed by each committee member per criterion, adding these together, and dividing by the total number of committee members who submitted scores. Then, the committee should discuss whether the final scores represent to each committee member a close correlation with their view of each nominee's relative merits compared with all others.

3. Finalizing a Chosen Winner, Factoring in the Items Listed Below

- a. In using aggregate scores, if two nominees have an aggregate score that is deemed too similar (using a number as agreed upon by the selection committee), the committee may hold a discussion and/or rescore these two (or more) in an attempt to choose one.
- b. The committee may also hold further discussion about the scoring of top nominees without requiring the final selection to be based solely on the aggregate scoring.
- c. The committee will normally attempt to reach a consensus on a winner, but may agree to another approach such as holding a vote of committee members for their choice from among the top aggregate scores.
- d. The committee may choose to not select a winner if it concludes that none of the nominees reaches their chosen minimum level of meeting the selection criteria.
- e. At any point during the scoring process, it is possible that the committee may agree to rule out of contention one of the nominees because a package is incomplete; a nominee is deemed too weak in one criterion; or, that details provided in the nomination package would lead the committee to conclude that the nominee should not be selected based on the information provided.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Candidates are evaluated on the following criteria. These are baseline expectations which the award recipient must meet.

The Faculty Service Excellence award recognizes and celebrates faculty excellence in service, **while at UFV**. As outlined in the recommendations on University-wide principles for the establishment of criteria for faculty standards, service includes productive contributions in meeting the needs of one's department, faculty, and institution, and academic and regional communities. Faculty members may serve the university, their departments or programs, and their disciplines in a variety of ways, guided by the overall aim of directing, organizing, and/or enhancing the life and work of the university, their field of study and practice, and/or the communities of the Fraser Valley.

- **Collaboration across boundaries**
- **Contribution to UFV's mandate**
- **Impact**

The following are descriptive attributes of the main criteria:

1. Collaboration Across Boundaries

- Community engagement and partnerships
- **Initiatives** bring multiple partners / stakeholders together from across UFV and/or local/global communities, with a focus on Indigenization, Internationalization, and principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion
- Evidence of an inclusive approach to collaboration, including cooperation, mutual respect, mutual benefit, clear communication, and teamwork

2. Contributes mission of engaging learners, transforming lives, and building community

- Service models positive civic engagement and responsibility
- Service provides opportunities for individual and/or collective transformation
- Service creates opportunities for student engagement in service

3. Impact

- Service positively affects UFV and its stakeholders in a variety of ways, such as improved reputation, individual transformation, establishment of further initiatives or partnerships, and increased opportunities for student service
- Emphasis is on long-term impact