

RESEARCH EXCELLENCE AWARD (REA)

Procedures and Criteria for the Selection of an REA 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	4
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

PROCEDURES FOR THE SELECTION OF AN REA RECIPIENT

Final approval for the procedures rests with the Senate Awards and Honors Committee (SAHC)
Approved by SAHC: May 13, 2026

PURPOSE

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

NUMBER OF AWARDS

One annual award; however, when the award process is completed and the selection committee has no name to recommend, the award is not given in that year.

ELIGIBLE UFV NOMINEES

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

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

Note the following:

Winners can be nominated again five years following receipt of the award.

Nominees who are unsuccessful in their first year of nomination are considered as candidates for the research excellence award for a second year. Nominators are 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 Secretariat Office contacts nominees 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 need to be re-nominated to be considered.

ELIGIBLE UFV NOMINATORS

- ✚ B Type faculty 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 are not made by, or letters of support provided by, any member of the Research Excellence Award selection committee.

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

ROLE OF SELECTION COMMITTEE

The UFV Research Excellence Award selection committee (REASC) is a subcommittee of the Senate Research Committee (SRC) and is responsible for:

- a. Reviewing nominations for the award, selecting a successful candidate according to established criteria, announcing the recipient choice to SRC for information, sending recommended recipient information to the Senate Awards and Honours Committee (SAHC), and confirming award procedures and criteria have been followed.
- b. 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 Research Committee (SRC) calls, from its membership, volunteers for the Research 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 asks each person to submit a brief paragraph about their interest in participating. The selection committee decides who serves in this situation.

MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION

Composition – eight members:

- a. Chair of the Senate Research Committee, who acts as chair
- b. Associate VP, Research and Graduate Studies or designate
- c. Four voting faculty members from the Senate Research Committee
- d. One staff member
- e. One student

The chair of the award committee ensures the committee is filled but proceeds with the adjudication process even if there are vacancies. Once the review process begins and a committee member resigns, they are not replaced.

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 agree to attend all meetings. Members may miss one meeting but provide the committee chair with notes to assist in the evaluation process. Any member who misses more than one meeting is withdrawn from the committee.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS - SEPTEMBER

1. Prior to the call, in April or May, nomination information from the previous year is available on the Secretariat web page.
2. In September, the call for nominations is initiated by the Secretariat. The deadline for nominations is Monday morning after the first Friday in December.
3. The UFV Secretariat Office publishes award information on their website and works with others to promote the awards.
4. The nomination deadline may be extended only when no nominations are received. The length of extension is determined by the selection committee Chair and Secretariat office.
5. The number of nominations received may be disclosed to individuals who inquire, such as nominators.

EVALUATION - JANUARY - MARCH 1

1. Before the review process begins, the Secretariat provides conflict of interest (COI) information to the committee chair who distributes it to the committee. The Chair asks members to declare a COI once they know the names of nominees.
2. The Research 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 February meeting and Senate's March meeting.
3. Selection committee members independently evaluate each nominee's package, following the procedures outlined in the *Criteria for the Selection of an Awards Recipient*.
4. The selection committee meets to make the final selection for an award recipient, following the procedures outlined in the *Criteria for the Selection of an Awards Recipient*.
5. The final decision of the committee is conducted with a *minimum of 51% committee membership* in attendance.
6. 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 Senate Research Committee for information. The result is provided at an in-camera meeting of the committee, with the expectation this information remains confidential until a public announcement of the recipient is made.
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 REA selection committee
3. The selection committee presents any recommendations for revisions to the process to SAHC.
 4. SAHC reviews the documentation to ensure procedural and criteria 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 the criteria and 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 or designate 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 remains confidential.
5. The Secretariat notifies the Community Engagement office so they can prepare publicity materials and announce the recipient. The award is presented at an appropriate university event. The Secretariat notifies the award recipient of the options for the monetary award, and initiates the required paperwork.

NOMINATION MECHANISM

The nominator completes the nomination form, gathers the supporting documents, and confidentially submits 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 consists of all of the following:

1. A letter of nomination outlining how the nominee meets the criteria for the Research Excellence Award (maximum 1,000 words):
 - a. The nominator is responsible for describing the nominee's work in relation to their discipline in language which the multidisciplinary committee adjudicating this award can comprehend.
 - b. This letter lays out the broader research/creative program of the nominee over the previous five years.

- c. It also highlights any outstanding creative or research achievement[s] in that same period. Nominators provide a description of the nominee's research / creative endeavor, emphasizing how it meets the four criteria and related descriptive attributes, as outlined in the Evaluation Criteria. The researcher's role in any joint/multi-disciplinary projects are clearly outlined.
2. A nominator form, signed by the nominator, indicating their eligibility type.
3. Exactly five letters of support are included (500 words maximum). The nominator is responsible for soliciting letters of support from inside and outside the UFV community. The nominee may suggest a list of colleagues from whom it would be suitable to solicit letters of support:
 - a. Two letters from recognized scholars (from outside UFV) specializing in a similar field of research/creative endeavour address the quality and significance of the nominee's work in the field.
 - b. Three additional letters can be from recognized scholars but may also come from non-academic sources who have a connection to, and comprehension of, the research/creative activity being nominated (i.e. government agencies, industry, community partners), or a former/current student who has experienced the nominees' incorporation of research into the classroom.
 - c. Nominators do not submit a letter of support. They are asked to advise support letter writers to address one or more of the selection criteria and provide the criteria.
4. Instructions for nominators and letter writers:
 - The committee only considers information included in the nomination package. Therefore, regarding impact, the committee needs to understand how specific outputs (e.g. publications, policy/community-relevant reports) or forms of mentorship have been received, used by, and/or changed the research community or non-academic sectors. Writers speak to overall impact and highlight no more than the 3 most impactful works.
 - If relevant, explain if/how the nominee has shown leadership in any of these domains.
 - Consider "the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets and software) in addition to research publications and consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice" (DORA, 2025).
5. A full and current curriculum vitae of the nominee, highlighting their research/creative productivity over the previous five years. Also note details for grants/outputs within the last 5 years, including dollar values, whether determined through a competitive process and the nominee's role (e.g. Principal Investigator, co-PI, or collaborator).
6. A consent form signed by the nominee agreeing to be nominated.

AWARD RECOGNITION

The award recipient receives 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;
- \$1,000 to be used for professional development or research as determined by the award recipient, who the University Secretariat office contacts to discuss options.

CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF AN AWARD 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 13, 2026

Approved by Senate: June 5, 2026

EVALUATION SCALE

Level	Description
-------	-------------

- | | |
|---|---|
| 5 | Significant evidence of meeting and exceeding 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

- The selection committee chair is responsible to lead, facilitate decisions, and help the committee agree on a process and declaration of a winner. The committee agrees upon the full scoring process (considering to all elements noted below), prior to receiving nomination packages.
- 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.
- 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 discusses 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.

To be considered eligible for the award, the nominee achieves a score of 3 within each category (see #4 below, "Selection Criteria") and a minimum total score of 12 summed across all categories.

Then, the committee discusses 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

- 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.
- 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.
- The committee normally attempts 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.
- 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.
- 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 four criteria. These are baseline expectations which the award recipient must meet.

Emphasis is placed on work accomplished as a member of the UFV community, but achievements within the past five years that were achieved elsewhere are considered. Nominees' research/creative endeavours are assessed based on the following four criteria, relative to the discipline.

- **Originality/Innovation**
- **Academic Impact**
- **UFV/Community Impact /Influence**
- **Mentorship/Interface of Research and Teaching**

The following are descriptive attributes of the main criteria:

1. Originality/Innovation

- Uniqueness, interdisciplinarity, or transformative nature of work.
- Patents or monetary gains produced from work.
- Awards, recognition from work
- Initiation of new programs.

2. Academic Impact/Influence within the Discipline

- Reception of work among peers within researcher's discipline (reviews, stature of journals in which work was published, awards, etc.)
- Profile of outputs (journal rankings, etc.)
- Record in securing funding from external sources
- Numbers of citations from work
- Membership in discipline-specific groups
- Reviews of discipline-specific works
- Breadth of outputs including books, reports, datasets, code, tools

3. UFV/Community Impact/Influence/Scope of Research/Creative Activity

- Impact/significance of the work for the UFV community, stakeholder groups, institutional profile, community at large, including Indigenization and Internationalization, etc.
- Public demonstrations, showings, lectures, presentations of work
- Utility/use of research/creative outputs to community groups
- Securing internal funding from UFV
- Membership in community/national/international groups
- Press statements regarding work
- Policy recommendations, guidelines, standards, use of results by stakeholders
- Societal outcomes such as health concerns, cultural change
- Community engagement and partnership development

4. Mentorship/Interface of Research and Teaching

- Role and/or training for students in relation to work or while conducting work in research
- Role for students in conduct of faculty research
- Incorporation of creativity/research achievement/ knowledge of research into the learning environment and pedagogy
- Evidence of student research accomplishments and testimonials
- Impacts on curriculum or other training programs