FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY*

FACULTY OF HUMAN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

I. INTRODUCTION
The Faculty of Human and Social Development is distinguished by the fact that its constituent Schools and Programs were established to provide professional as well as academic education. We value the work of educating our students for their academic and professional advancement because of its impact in making uniquely important contributions to health and society. Increasingly, our graduates are called upon to work in teams for the interests of our communities and therefore the culture of the Faculty is one where multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary work is highly valued, and community linkages are critical. We aspire to be a Faculty that best integrates outstanding scholarship, inspired teaching and real-life involvement. The Faculty is responsive to community needs and considers social responsibility for action and change in the human services to be important. We are actively engaged in influencing policy and practice. As a result, many faculty members work in partnerships in their teaching and research programs and are engaged citizens and leaders, contributing to the betterment of a rapidly changing global society. In order to fulfill our mandate of professional education, the professional and academic values of our Faculty and the important range of activities that faculty members engage in need to be considered in the process of evaluating faculty members.

This document arises from the University of Victoria Framework Agreement which requires that each Faculty establish an Evaluation Policy in accordance with the provisions of Article 13.9 (Evaluation Policies) and Article 74 (Salary Policy). It outlines the principles and procedures used for evaluation in the Faculty of Human and Social Development in assessments of applications for reappointment, tenure or continuing status, and promotion and for the award of salary increments on the basis of demonstrated achievement. It describes the types of work that are considered in each of the categories of activity comprising the workload of persons with various types of appointment as outlined in the Framework Agreement. Article 13.1 of the Framework Agreement indicates that tenured or tenure-track faculty members holding an appointment as Assistant, Associate or Full Professor are evaluated based on teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional achievement, and other contributions. Article 13.2 indicates that Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors are evaluated based on teaching effectiveness and other contributions and that Teaching Professors are, in addition, expected to contribute regularly to scholarship related to teaching.

It is anticipated that expectations of faculty members will rise over time and with higher rank. Professors and Teaching Professors are expected to have greater experience and expertise in all areas of their work than Associate or Assistant Professors and Senior Instructors. This will be taken into account in the evaluation process. In the event of sick

*Where there is a conflict, the Framework Agreement supersedes this Faculty Evaluation Policy.
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leave, special leave, maternity or parental leave, the evaluation should take this into account by, for example, appropriately pro-rating the number of years under review.

Faculty members are responsible for reviewing the performance expectations outlined in their initial appointment letters, the annual reviews provided by their Director, the relevant School/Program Standard for the Distribution of Duties and Responsibilities document, this Faculty Evaluation Policy, the HSD Faculty Advisory Committee’s Terms of Reference and (http://www.hsd.uvic.ca/policies/index.php) relevant sections of the Framework Agreement (http://web.uvic.ca/vpac/hrissues/framework_agreement.htm). They should also familiarize themselves with the format of the student evaluations of their teaching. Information about any changes to the teaching evaluation form will be communicated to all faculty members by their School/Program Director in a timely manner.

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA
In the Faculty of Human and Social Development, teaching, research, scholarship, professional achievement, and other community and University contributions are often closely linked, and it may be difficult, if not counterproductive, to categorize a contribution in only one area. We value this integration. At the same time, the evidence of achievement, in total, must describe contributions that reflect a satisfactory quantity as well as quality of those contributions in accordance with the Framework Agreement.

1. Teaching
The Framework Agreement defines teaching effectiveness as the “effectiveness of all of a faculty member’s methods and forms of teaching and student supervision that are described and evaluated in accordance with the Evaluation Policy of the Faculty in which the faculty member holds an appointment”. The Faculty of Human and Social Development values community engaged teaching which includes transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge within and beyond the classroom setting through teaching, mentoring and other curricular activities that service communities within or outside of the university. One of the important teaching objectives in the Faculty of Human and Social Development is to develop in students a sense of professional responsibility to the public at large, and to relevant professional bodies. Because faculty members are responsible for the quality of the professional preparation achieved by graduates, the evaluation of their teaching may include an assessment of the ability to teach professional work in community settings and/or their ability to teach in the classroom and by distance education where these form part of their teaching responsibilities.

Activities that are included in teaching encompass both direct contact with students as well as indirect contact that occurs through the development of curriculum. Direct teaching contacts in classes, courses, seminars, on-line instruction and graduate supervision are of paramount importance in the evaluation process and will be weighted more heavily than other activities that are considered under the category of teaching. The follow listings include examples of activities that may be considered in the evaluation of teaching. The list is not intended to be prescriptive. It is not expected that each faculty member will engage in
all of these activities. Rather, the listings are intended to provide examples of the types of activities that might be considered under the category of teaching.

Teaching activities include, but are not limited to:

- **Course based teaching** (related primarily to direct student contact)
  - Classroom teaching
  - Distance education or blended learning teaching
  - Directed studies courses

- **Mentoring and research training**
  - Graduate student supervision
  - Service learning (practicum, internship) supervision
  - Supervision of student research or other creative activities
  - Mentoring of colleagues to improve the quality of teaching
  - Conducting peer-reviews of colleagues’ teaching
  - Research training and mentoring of community members/research partners

- **Capacity building**
  - Policy development in relation to teaching
  - Scholarship that enhances teaching
  - Involvement in the scholarship of teaching
  - Developing infrastructure to support students and teachers for practice and/or other teaching

- **Knowledge transfer**
  - Public workshops and presentations
  - Participation in expert panels, government/community committees

- **Development of curriculum**
  - Course syllabi development
  - Distance education/blended learning course development
  - Development of auxiliary course or curriculum materials
  - Development of software, media methods
  - Involvement in international student and/or professor exchanges
  - Integration of technology into teaching

- **Professional development**
  - Participation in teaching workshops, courses, conferences

**Indicators of Merit**

For the purposes of allocating Merit Increments for teaching and assessing teaching for reappointment, tenure or continuing status, and promotion processes, evidence relating to the excellence and impact of teaching activities will be considered. Illustrations of such evidence include, but are not limited to:

- excellent quantitative and/or qualitative teaching evaluations for the previous three years;
- illustrations of innovation/creativity/change/development of course materials, including course outlines, assignments, methods of assessment, class exercises, or case studies;
- teaching in locations and modalities beyond the traditional face-to-face campus boundaries;
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• effective development and use of strategies that support student learning in community and/or practice settings;
• teaching awards;
• high quality graduate student supervision and committee membership (see the Canadian Association of Graduate Studies document “Guiding Responsibilities for Graduate Student Supervision” available at http://web.uvic.ca/gradstudies/faculty/policies.php);
• significant involvement in co-op work term assessments where appropriate;
• creating an inclusive respectful environment for all students;
• positive peer reviews of teaching;
• introduction of a new course to the curriculum or significant and substantial revision of an existing course;
• balancing support of students with providing a challenging learning environment;
• illustrations of commitment to community-engaged teaching;
• involvement in international student and/or professor exchanges;
• illustrations of commitment to teaching, mentoring, collaboration, team teaching, collegial support relating to teaching;
• mentoring of colleagues to improve quality of teaching;
• participation in teaching development activities;
• illustrations of commitment to improving the learning and teaching climate;
• scholarship that supports teaching, educational leadership and innovation; and,
• examples of use of technologies to improve learning and teaching.

Indicators of Satisfactory Teaching
• favourable student and/or peer evaluation as well as the absence of unsatisfactory performance;
• taking responsibility for addressing issues raised through student and/or peer feedback;
• preparation for class or other teaching activity (e.g. online discussion);
• respectful treatment of students;
• provision of balanced constructive feedback to students;
• contributions to School/program curriculum development; and,
• willingness to take on graduate committee work (where appropriate).

Indicators of Unsatisfactory Teaching
Unsatisfactory teaching may include, but not be limited to, a continuing pattern of some of the following:
• lack of preparation for class or other teaching activities;
• cancellation of classes or other teaching activities without giving notice or providing acceptable reasons;
• lack of availability for class or consultation;
• negative evaluation of teaching performance (from students, peers, or both);
• prejudicial or discriminatory treatment of students; and,
• refusal to participate in graduate student committees.
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The Teaching Dossier

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is conducted based on a faculty member’s teaching dossier. At minimum, the teaching dossier should include:

- faculty member’s statement regarding their approach to teaching and learning (updated every three years);
- goals for teaching in the year of evaluation;
- listing of teaching responsibilities for the relevant period of review;
- evaluations of teaching effectiveness, using multiple methods of evaluation. This should include, at minimum, aggregated statistical information from student evaluations of courses. For each course, the number and percentage of students who completed teaching evaluations should be included. There is no obligation to include anecdotal or subjective student comments, but if this material is included, all comments received in the course evaluated must be included. The dossier could also include peer evaluations, evaluation of graduates/alumni, self-evaluations of teaching and learning, feedback from co-teachers and evidence of the impact of teaching activities. Evaluations of teaching could be both formative (i.e., content, process and design aspects of instruction) and summative (outcomes of instruction);
- evidence of efforts that have been undertaken to improve teaching effectiveness; and,
- summary of teaching accomplishments for the period of review, including awards, grants and nominations.

In general, the core of the teaching dossier as described above should be a maximum of three pages, single spaced. For Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors, the core of the teaching dossier may be up to a maximum of six pages. Supporting documents may be attached as appendices. The Learning and Teaching Centre (www.ltc.uvic.ca), is a valuable resource that may be used by faculty members preparing dossiers.

2. Scholarship

Scholarship is broadly defined and highly valued in this Faculty. The scholarship of teaching, integration, and application are valued as well as the scholarship of discovery (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997). In addition to the traditional controlled experimentation typical of the sciences, research may include but is not limited to studies using qualitative or interpretive methods, descriptive surveys, needs assessment studies, applied evaluation projects, action research, theoretical work integrating the empirical work and hypotheses of others, ethical or philosophical work, model building, creative arts-based projects, and literature surveys. As this Faculty values community engaged scholarship, it would not be considered unusual for a faculty member to have a research portfolio that balances publications directed at academic audiences with other professional or creative activities. The differing time lines that may be appropriate for the variety in methodologies of community engaged scholarship are recognized. Scholarship of teaching can be considered in either the category of teaching effectiveness OR research and scholarship.

Collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship is encouraged and valued in the Faculty. As with single-authored work, faculty members will receive credit for multi-authored publications and research grants. The specific nature of the contribution to the project must
be noted in the documentation. Similarly, with community-based or participatory action research (both of which involve partnerships with community members) the specific nature of the faculty member’s contribution to the project must be made explicit.

Peer review is generally considered to be an indicator of quality of the work. Hence, publications that are refereed are generally considered to be of higher value in the evaluation process. However, it is recognized that non-refereed publications make important contributions to disseminating knowledge and they, too, are encouraged. For non-refereed publications that make a significant impact on the field or discipline, evidence of the contribution (e.g., book reviews, citations, letters to the editor, etc.) and the intended or actual impact may be provided to demonstrate the quality of the work.

It should be emphasized that it is the quality, significance and impact of any contribution that is of paramount importance. Size of a research grant or payment for a professional or scholarly activity, e.g., honorarium for a workshop, royalties for a book, presentation, film, etc., do not, in themselves, constitute either positive or negative support for the merit of the activity. Faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of the quality, significance and impact of their scholarship (refereed and non-refereed, written and oral) and may include assessments from a range of users (e.g. academic peers, government officials, NGOs officers, Aboriginal community leaders, conference participants, academic and community awards, community members, patients, youth).

Publications will be given credit at the time that a letter of total acceptance has been obtained. Acceptance subject to revisions will be treated as material “in preparation”. Materials that are “in preparation” will not be considered in the evaluation until they have been accepted for publication or presentation.

The lists below are intended to provide examples. It should be emphasized that not all possible contributions of a faculty member are captured by these examples and there is no expectation that a faculty member will have publications or other types of scholarly achievements in each category.

**Examples of Scholarship**
Examples of scholarship include, but are not limited to, the following:
- refereed publications (see below);
- unreviewed material (see below);
- films, videos, computer software, web-sites, pod-casts;
- tests, questionnaires, or assessment instruments;
- research grants and contracts (see below);
- research proposals;
- conference presentations;
- invited addresses to professional associations/societies/community groups;
- editing a research or professional journal;
- developing a new practice technique;
- building university-community partnerships;
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• developing research protocols;
• distance, or blended learning, course development;
• artistic creations and productions.

**Peer-reviewed publications**
These have been reviewed by peers prior to publication and are considered substantial evidence of scholarship. They can be in either paper or electronic format. Examples are listed as follows:

- papers in refereed journals;
- books published by university or other publishing houses using referees in the publishing process;
- refereed chapters in edited books;
- abstracts and papers in published conference proceedings (not conference program) where a peer review process can be documented;
- films, videos or computer software where a peer review process can be documented.

**Un-reviewed material**
These are publications, papers and other materials that have not been peer-reviewed prior to publication. Examples are listed as follows:

- un-reviewed examples of those above;
- articles in association newsletters or journals;
- publications for clients;
- papers presented at scholarly or professional meetings;
- occasional papers;
- educational pamphlets;
- technical reports;
- program manuals;
- briefs to governments, Aboriginal communities or other bodies;
- reviews of scholarly articles and research grant applications.

**Research grants and contracts**
It is recognized that the process of application for funding is time consuming and is not always successful. For faculty members at the lower ranks in particular, or those who are beginning new research programs, consideration should be given to rewarding research grant/contract applications. It is also recognized that some research (e.g., philosophical or theoretical research, as well as some types of empirical research) may not require funding. It should be noted that peer review is important in assessing the merit of research grant/contract applications. The amount or size of the grant/contract is not as important as the fact that the contract/grant has been refereed and deemed worthy of funding.

Credit for research grants and contracts will be given at the time that written confirmation of funding has been provided.
Indicators of Merit
For the purposes of allocating Merit Increments for scholarship and of assessing scholarship as part of reappointment, tenure/continuing status and promotion processes, evidence relating to, but not limited to, the following types of contributions will be considered:

• refereed publications;
• development of new research programs and grant applications;
• presentations at scholarly or professional meetings;
• media work;
• illustrations of community-engaged scholarship.

Indicators of Satisfactory Performance

• an ongoing program of research and scholarship;
• evidence of dissemination of research and scholarship.

Indicators of Unsatisfactory Performance

Unsatisfactory research and scholarship may include, but is not limited to, the following:

• lack of publications or other scholarly activity;
• proven lack of scholarly integrity.

3. Other Contributions

The Faculty values engaged citizenship and therefore recognizes professionally-related service and community-engaged outreach as integral to the activities of faculty members. There are a wide variety of ways that individuals contribute to the University, their profession, and the community and every effort shall be made to consider contributions such as those listed below. Professional experience and activity are considered particularly important to members of a professional school, especially insofar as they provide evidence of leadership and innovative contributions, and should be rewarded.

Examples of "Other Contributions" are as follows:

• contributions to the development of the faculty member’s Program, School or Faculty;
• contributions to student life;
• student advising/mentoring;
• outreach and role-modeling for prospective students;
• challenging the prevailing hegemony;
• community-based education, development, action or advocacy;
• contributions to University governance, committees and other activities that are a part of the operations of the University;
• advocacy for students, faculty members or community members;
• attainment of positive extra-university recognition;
• activities that work to resolve relevant social problems and issues (locally, nationally or internationally);
• the organization of literary, aesthetic or celebratory activities that promote university and community collaborations and connections;
• activities that promote the use of research based knowledge outside of the university.
The following are some examples of the many kinds of professional contributions that will be considered in the process of evaluating “other contributions”:

- distinctive and important contributions to one’s profession, learned societies or commissions of inquiry;
- awards and fellowships from professional societies;
- workshops which have had a demonstrated impact on professional practice;
- program development, implementation and evaluation activities which have contributed to the profession or community;
- invited addresses to professional associations, societies and community groups;
- mentorship and role modeling activities;
- contributions to School/Program, Faculty, or University development, where the assignment is clearly related to one’s professional competencies and standing;
- serving as a reviewer for accreditation, tenure and promotion files, external reviews, etc.;
- policy development;
- organizing a major conference.

**Indicators of Merit**
For the purposes of allocating Merit Increments for professional achievement and other contributions, evidence relating, but not limited, to the following types of contributions will be considered:

- active participation in several University, Faculty or School/Program committees;
- leadership in a professional association/society;
- leadership in promoting a critical and productive academic culture;
- leadership in fostering an inclusive environment or curriculum;
- recognition/awards by community agencies or groups;
- community linkages that build on scholarly activity;
- illustrations of community-engaged outreach.

**Indicators of Satisfactory Performance**
- participation in one or more University, Faculty or School/Program committees;
- participation in activities that support the University, Faculty or School/Program;
- participation in community outreach or professional activities.

**Indicators of Unsatisfactory Performance**
- lack of participation in other activities such as University, Faculty or School/Program governance structures or profession/community/societal contributions.

### III. DOCUMENTATION AND PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE OR CONTINUING STATUS, AND PROMOTION

**General**
Processes within the Faculty pertaining to reappointment, the granting of tenure or continuing status, and promotion for faculty members are governed by the relevant Articles in the Framework Agreement. Reappointment for Assistant Professors and Senior Instructors is discussed in Article 15. Standards for tenure are outlined in Article 16.3; the
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standard and processes for securing Continuing Status for Senior Instructors is outlined in Article 15.2. Standards for promotion are addressed in Article 18, which should be read in conjunction with Article 11 regarding terms of initial appointments. Processes pertaining to reappointment, tenure and promotion are addressed in Articles 21-40.

**Documentation**

Documentation submitted for consideration for reappointment, the granting of tenure or continuing status, and/or promotion covers the faculty member’s entire academic career. This documentation typically consists of a binder that includes the curriculum vitae and has sections addressing teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and/or other contributions as appropriate to the type of appointment held and sought (see also Article 22.5 of the Framework Agreement). It is recommended that faculty members prepare a summary of contributions in each of the areas required for the type of appointment that they hold and are applying for. Faculty members are encouraged to keep the documentation they submit reasonable in size (i.e., one 4” binder).

Letters from external referees must be provided for applications for tenure and promotion. Article 23 of the Framework Agreement describes the process to be used for selection of referees and the documentation that is sent to referees. In the Faculty of Human and Social Development, a minimum of three letters from external referees are required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or to the rank of Teaching Professor. Four letters from external referees are required for promotion to Professor.

**Procedures**

A summary of the major steps in the processes regarding reappointment, the granting of tenure or continuing status, and promotion, including the deadlines associated with them, are presented in Appendix “G” of the Framework Agreement (http://web.uvic.ca/vpac/hrissues/framework_agreement.htm). Note that some of the deadlines involving applications for promotion that does not also involve tenure (e.g., for promotion to Full Professor by a tenured Associate Professor) are different from those involving applications for tenure or for promotion that will confer tenure (e.g., by an untenured Assistant Professor for promotion to Associate Professor). These are covered in separate tables.

**IV. DOCUMENTATION AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL SALARY ADJUSTMENT**

**General**

The process of awarding Career Progress Increments and Merit Increments will be undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Salary Policy (Article 74 of the Framework Agreement).

**Documentation and Basis for Evaluation**

Documentation submitted for the annual salary adjustment process should cover the relevant period for the review (as specified in Article 74.3.4, Framework Agreement). Documents to be submitted shall include:
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- a two to three page summary highlighting the faculty member’s key accomplishments during the period of review;
- a list of current research projects;
- an updated CV;
- the teaching dossier (maximum of three single spaced pages for tenure track or tenured faculty members or six pages for Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors – refer to guidelines on p. 4 of this document); and,
- a signed conflict of interest form (available at http://www.research.uvic.ca/Forms).

If the required documentation is not submitted, no assessment of merit can be made and no MIs will be awarded. If a faculty member wishes to be considered only for a Career Progress Increment she or he must submit, at minimum, a one-page summary of accomplishments in each of the general areas considered for the type of appointment held and an updated CV.

As required by the Framework Agreement (Article 74.3.5.1) faculty members other than Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors will be evaluated for Merit Increments on the basis of their teaching, scholarship, and other contributions in the ratio of 40:40:20 respectively. An alternative ratio in which no criterion in the ratio is weighted at less than 20% may be agreed between a faculty member and the Director, and approved by the Dean, in advance, for a fixed period not exceeding five years in situations where the faculty member’s workload does not reflect the usual distribution of responsibilities for the type of appointment that she or he holds. Directors will usually make such agreements with the Dean at the time of their appointment as Director, which will be in effect for the term of the appointment. Usually, faculty members will make such agreements in advance with their Director with approval of the Dean before June 1 of the year of evaluation. Faculty members should be aware that the ratio of criterion is used for evaluation for salary adjustment only (see Section II of this document regarding evaluation criteria for reappointment, tenure and promotion).

Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors will be evaluated based on their teaching and other contributions in the ratio of 80:20 respectively. An alternative ratio in which neither criterion in the ratio is weighted at less than 20% may be agreed between a Senior Instructor and the Director and approved by the Dean in advance in situations where there has been a change to the usual work distribution of the Senior Instructor or Teaching Professor. Faculty members should be aware that the ratio of criteria is used for evaluation for salary adjustment only (see Section II of this document regarding evaluation criteria for reappointment, tenure and promotion).

*Number and Distribution of Merit Increments*

The number of Merit Increments (MIs) available for distribution within the Faculty to faculty members (including senior instructors and teaching professors) is twice the number of faculty members. Within this limit, MIs are awarded for levels of achievement that exceed “satisfactory career progress”; that is, they serve to recognize meritorious performance. An award of four MIs is intended to reflect meritorious
performance overall during the period of review while awards of between one and three MIs reflect meritorious performance in one or more areas during the period of review.

The rules governing the distribution of MIs are set out in the current Salary Settlement (included as Appendix A in the Framework Agreement). As provided for in the Salary Settlement, distributions are to be achieved at the level of the overall Faculty, rather than necessarily being required within each individual School or Program. The Dean will retain sufficient flexibility to allow individual Schools or Programs to depart from the distribution specified where such departure can be justified.

Each Director will receive an initial allocation of two Merit Increments per faculty member within their School or Program, minus 10% which are held by the Dean (rounded up to the nearest whole number, if rounding is required) except for Schools or Programs in which there are four or fewer faculty members for which no MIs are held back by the Dean. These withheld Merit Increments are to be used by the Dean to make adjustments to the recommendations for the award of MIs to individual faculty members received from Directors of Schools and Programs in order to ensure equity between units and in the Faculty overall.

Processes and Deadlines
Each eligible faculty member who wishes to be considered for the award of MIs must submit all documents for review to their Director no later than February 1 of each year. Earlier deadline dates may be set by the Director as long as these are communicated well in advance to Faculty Members in the unit. Directors and the Associate Deans will submit documents for their own review to the Dean by February 1 each year.

The Director will review the documents and make recommendations to the Dean prior to March 1. If agreed to by faculty members in the School or Program prior to May 1 of the year prior to the review, the Director may seek the advice of an advisory committee on salary review regarding the recommendations to be made. The Director will undertake a qualitative assessment of each faculty member’s performance for the relevant period of review specified in the Framework Agreement (usually the preceding three years) for each of the categories of activity for which the faculty member is responsible. In developing their recommendations, Directors must consider the provisions regarding the minimum and maximum numbers of Merit Increments that may be awarded to individual faculty members in the Salary Policy (Article 74 of the Framework Agreement) and the Salary Settlement (Appendix A of the Framework Agreement).

In addition to making recommendations regarding distribution of the MIs available to their School or Program, Directors will rank all faculty members who are being recommended for an additional MI(s) above those that have been allocated to their unit. In these cases, the Director will forward the recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by the documentation submitted by the faculty member. The Dean may ask the Director to justify any recommendation both within and above the number of Merit Increments
assigned to the School or Program, and may forward to the Vice President Academic and Provost recommendations for individual faculty members that depart from those made by the Director if warranted.

The Director will send each faculty member a summary of her/his recommendation to the Dean regarding that faculty member, on or before March 1. The Dean will submit her/his recommendation to the Vice-President Academic and Provost on or before April 1. The Dean will communicate his/her recommendation to the faculty member, in the event that it is different from that of the Director. In the case of Directors, or other faculty members occupying administrative positions, the Dean will inform the candidate of her/his recommendation on or before April 1.

Article 74.8.2 of the Framework Agreement specifies that a faculty member may request that the Vice-President Academic and Provost reconsider her or his salary adjustment stating the reasons for the request in writing. This request must be submitted within 30 days of receiving the formal notice of salary adjustment. A faculty member who is not satisfied with the outcome of the reconsideration of the salary adjustment by the Vice-President Academic and Provost may appeal to the University Review Committee in accordance with the provisions of Article 74.8.3 of the Framework Agreement. Faculty members may seek the advice of the Faculty Association’s Advising and Dispute Resolution Committee in preparing their appeal.

**SALARY ADJUSTMENT PROCESS – SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT DEADLINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEADLINE DATE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Faculty members to submit summary of accomplishments and teaching dossiers for review to Director. Directors and Associate Deans to submit their summary to Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Director’s recommendations regarding Merit Increments are due in the Dean’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Director writes to individual faculty members indicating recommendation for Merit Increments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Dean submits recommendations to Vice-President Academic and communicates any changes to faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Agreement by academic unit if an advisory committee will be used in the process of salary review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Faculty members to request a change in the 40:40:20 ratio for evaluation in the coming year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REVIEW OF THE FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

This Evaluation Policy will be reviewed by the Faculty of Human and Social Development by December 31 of the year in which a new salary Settlement comes into effect, as required by the Framework Agreement (Article 13.9.2) and in a year when a new Framework Agreement comes into effect.
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