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This Faculty Evaluation Policy, required by the Framework Agreement (FA) Articles 13.8.1 and 73.3.5.1, outlines the criteria and processes for evaluating all faculty members in the Social Sciences (as defined in FA Article 2.10) for reappointment, tenure, promotion and annual salary awards. To facilitate the evaluation process, faculty members are required to update three items annually: the University curriculum vitae, the teaching dossier (see Section 2.2.6(b) below), and their three-year activity summary (see Section 3.2 below).

In all cases where Department is used, School will be included if appropriate, and references to Chair will include Director of School as appropriate.

**List of abbreviations**

- FA : Framework Agreement
- MI : Merit Increment
- RPT : Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure [Committee]
- FEP : Faculty Evaluation Policy (this document)
- FAC : Faculty Advisory Committee

1. **GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

- According to FA Article 13.1.1 for Faculty members (other than Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors), tenured and tenure-track faculty members are evaluated for reappointment, tenure, promotion and salary adjustment on the basis of teaching effectiveness, scholarly and professional achievement, and other contributions (referred to below as ‘service’).

- According to FA Article 13.2.1 for Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors, these members are evaluated on the basis of teaching effectiveness and other contributions, where teaching effectiveness is paramount.

- According to FA Article 13.1.1 & 13.2.1, evaluation criteria defined in the Framework Agreement are those criteria of (a) teaching effectiveness, (b) scholarly and professional achievement; and (c) other contributions further elaborated in this Faculty Evaluation Policy, plus in each unit’s “Departmental Standard for attaining tenure and any other Departmental policies further developing the criteria as relevant to the practice of the particular discipline”. See also Sections 1.1.2, 1.2.3 and 1.3.2 below.

- According to FA Article 73.3.5.1(e), each unit in the Faculty of Social Sciences must have a written description of the mechanism or process by which recommendations will be made with regard to allocating merit increments (MIs) to members of the unit.

- According to FA Article 16.2.4 for part-time faculty members, the expected quality of teaching, scholarship/professional activities and service is the same as for full-
time appointments. The quantity of scholarly activity and service is expected to be in proportion to a full-time appointment.

- Expectations of meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship/professional achievements and service increase with increasing seniority in rank and with time within rank (FA Article 13.4.1).
- Any adverse effect of sick leave, long-term disability, maternity, parental or special leave should be taken into account in the evaluation process (FA Article 13.8.3). In such cases candidates should consult their Chair or Dean as soon as possible. FA Article 20 describes the relevant terms and conditions for "Stopping the Clock".
- Period of review for evaluation of faculty members on leave (except leave without pay) is set out in FA Article 73.3.4.2.
- Procedural Fairness requires that "due process and natural justice" be observed and that Departmental criteria and those in this FEP be applied fairly. Due process requires that candidates have the right to know what committees and other individuals say about them by way of evaluation, to respond to what is said, and to be judged without bias by the persons who hear the case.

1.1 EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
The following criteria should be applied when evaluating teaching effectiveness [as required by FA Article 13.1.2 (a)].

1.1.1 Components of teaching effectiveness to be evaluated
- Preparation, respect for and encouragement of students, clarity of class presentations, knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject, a capacity to arouse interest in the subject among students, and an ability to motivate students to attain high standards.
- Availability and helpfulness to students outside class time e.g. office hours availability, electronic and telephone availability. (In order to protect faculty members' time for other responsibilities, reasonable limits on availability are accepted.)
- Openness to innovation and change, e.g. development of new courses, updating of existing courses, new modes of delivery, participation in teaching workshops.
- Contribution to the unit's teaching responsibilities:
  In assessing this contribution, consideration is given to such matters as willingness to teach core as well as elective courses, lower as well as upper division courses, undergraduate as well as graduate courses, large as well as small sections, and directed studies as well as scheduled courses. Consideration is also given to observance of scheduled class meeting times and Senate/Faculty-approved policies regarding course outlines and grading procedures.
- Effort and effectiveness in supervising students:
  In evaluating effort and effectiveness, consideration is given to (a) supervisory role (main supervisor, committee member, external examiner, chair of examination committee), (b) type of degree or program (doctoral, masters
with/without thesis, honours, practicum/co-op), and (c) the standards outlined in Faculty of Graduate Studies' document on Responsibilities in the Supervisory Relationship (see http://web.uvic.ca/gradstudies/faculty/pdf/Responsibilities.pdf). Post-doctoral supervisions may be included here.

- Methods of student performance evaluation:
  Consideration is given to whether student understanding of subject matter is fairly tested.
- Teaching awards (including nominations for awards).
- Evidence of contributions toward the University goals of diversity, inclusivity in the classroom, and internationalization of the curriculum.
- Scholarly works relating to teaching, curriculum development or learning that would not normally constitute part of the Faculty member’s scholarly and professional achievement.
- Presentations and addresses relating to teaching, curriculum development or learning that would not normally constitute part of the Faculty member’s scholarly and professional achievement.
- Where appropriate, demonstrated abilities to integrate a faculty member’s program of scholarship and teaching.

1.1.2 Assessment techniques

As outlined in FA Articles 13.6 and 73.3.5.1(c) (of the Salary Policy), faculty members are expected to maintain a teaching dossier. Teaching performance is assessed against the evidence in the dossier. Individual units determine the importance of dossier items relative to one another, recognizing that, for all their shortcomings, student evaluations cover several of the dimensions of good teaching outlined in Section 1.1.1 above, and are therefore to be included among the most important components of the dossier (FA Article 13.7). Statements of relative importance which may explain general rankings or give specific numerical weights are developed in consultation with the Dean. In developing their statements, units should also take into account higher standards of quality for higher ranks and number of years in rank (FA Article 13.4).

Dossier items comprise:

- Statement of teaching interests and philosophy, including teaching objectives and methods.
- Courses taught by course number, title, contact hours in lectures/labs, and number of students taught.
- Student evaluations from each regular (other than pro forma) section taught each term. At the discretion of the Chair, courses with low enrolment may be exempted from this requirement.

  According to FA Article 13.7.1 and 73.3.5.1 (c) of the Framework Agreement, only numerical scores are required to be submitted by faculty members; qualitative student comments are optional. Where qualitative comments are included in the dossier, all such comments from the course in question must be included (FA Articles 13.7.3).
Assessments of faculty members should take into account the fact that average scores on student evaluations vary systematically between certain types of courses, notably required versus elective courses.

- Supervisions (post-doctoral, graduate, honours, practicum/co-op).
- Peer evaluations by colleagues, staff of the Learning and Teaching Centre or other qualified reviewers.
  The Faculty requires peer evaluations of teaching only in cases of reappointment, tenure and promotion, although faculty members may request evaluations at any time. Faculty members should include these evaluations in their dossiers with the effect that they are taken into account in the appropriate window of assessment for salary purposes.
- Course materials such as course outlines, assignments and examinations.
- Optional/additional materials concerning teaching effectiveness.

1.2 EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Scholarly and professional performance are assessed in terms of both quality (including impact and relevance) and quantity of output. Quality of publications is generally deemed to be more important than quantity.

At the discretion of the academic unit, research output may be counted from the time of acceptance for publication as long as unambiguous evidence of final acceptance is provided. For reappointment, tenure and promotion, consideration may be given to other unpublished work that is represented by tangible output (e.g. discussion paper, completed draft) and is expected to be published. Each unit shall have a policy, which will be applied to all cases, concerning the treatment of research output accepted for publication.

In order not to discourage collaborative effort, the assessment process should recognize the value of collaborative as well as individual scholarship.

In order to provide a framework for evaluation of scholarship and professional achievements in cases of reappointment, tenure and promotion, faculty members are expected to provide a statement of research interests as part of their Scholarship Dossier.

1.2.1 Components of research activity to be evaluated

(These are not necessarily in order of importance.)
- Refereed articles in scholarly journals
- Refereed books and monographs (authored/edit)
- Refereed book chapters
- Refereed conference proceedings
- Academic software and multi-media materials
- Community-based research activities
- Research/government reports
• Non-refereed articles, books/monographs, chapters and conference proceedings
• Book reviews
• Discussion/working papers
• Scholarly recognition awards (including nomination for awards)
• Miscellaneous

1.2.2 Other professional activities to be evaluated
(These are not necessarily in order of importance.)
• Research grants awarded
• Research contracts (as distinct from paid consulting contracts that involve no research)
• Presentations to academic or professional conferences/workshops
• Discussant status at academic or professional conferences/workshops
• Organization of conference/session at academic or professional conferences/workshops
• Membership of conference/workshop program committees
• Service on committees of professional bodies in the discipline
• Professional input to the policy-making or judicial processes not included in 3.1 above e.g. submissions at hearings, expert witness testimony
• Invited academic addresses
• Membership of academic or professional panels or roundtables
• Editorships of scholarly journals
• Membership on editorial boards
• Refereeing activities
• Professional recognition awards (including nomination for awards)
• Miscellaneous

1.2.3 Assessment techniques
Individual units determine the importance of the items listed in Sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 above relative to one another, subject to the principle that advancement, preservation and interpretation of the state of knowledge through scholarly output is generally more important than other activity within the profession, and that special consideration should be given to impact and relevance of scholarly output. Statements of relative importance describing either general rankings or numerical weights are developed in consultation with the Dean. In developing these statements, units may opt to transfer selected items in Section 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 if such items are defined more appropriately as service contributions. Units should also take into account higher standards of quality for higher ranks and number of years in rank (FA Article 13.4).

1.3 EVALUATION OF SERVICE
For purposes of this policy, service contributions comprise contributions within and outside the University other than contributions included in Sections 1.1 and 1.2 above.
1.3.1 Components of service to be evaluated

**Internal Service**
- Contributions to the administration and development of the unit or Faculty through participation in committees/task forces or other assignments
- Contributions to University administrative and committee assignments
- Contributions to institutional governance e.g. membership of Senate or the Board of Governors, service to the Faculty Association
- Contributions to student life
- Miscellaneous contributions that foster the success and well-being of colleagues, the unit, and the university.

**External Service**
External service is recognized insofar as it relates to a faculty member's professional expertise.
- Attainment of extra-university recognition (other than awards acknowledged in Sections 1.1 and 1.2 above) which reflects to the advantage of the University
- Community outreach on behalf of the unit, Faculty or University, e.g., community engagements, media contributions, public addresses
- Service other than that recognized in Section 1.2.2 to organizations with business of relevance to university life
- Other contributions to the community, province or nation in a capacity which reflects to the advantage of the University of Victoria not covered in section 1.2.1 and 1.2.2.

1.3.2 Assessment techniques

Individual units determine the importance of the items listed in Section 1.3.1 relative to one another. Statements of relative importance describing general rankings or numerical weights are developed in consultation with the Dean. In developing their statements, units should also take into account higher standards of quality for higher ranks and number of years in rank (FA Article 13.4).
2. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESSES

The principal documents governing reappointment, promotion and tenure are the Framework Agreement (http://web/uvic.ca/vpac/framework/framework.htm) and this Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures (as required by the FA). Where there is a discrepancy between these two documents, the higher standard shall prevail.

Processes for reappointment, tenure and promotion are outlined in FA Articles 14 to 41. Specifically, reappointment is covered in FA Article 15, tenure in FA Article 16 and promotion in FA Article 18. Important information is also contained in FA Articles 22 and 23. The general rights and responsibilities of faculty members, not specific to reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions, are described in FA Article 6.0 on academic freedom, and these are not discussed here.

The principal bodies involved in decisions concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure are:

- **RPT Committee and Department Chair**
  The department’s Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) committee forwards the Department’s recommendations for reappointment, promotion and tenure to the Dean.

- **Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC)**
  The FAC makes recommendations to the Dean concerning tenure and promotion.

- **Dean**
  The Dean makes recommendations to the President (through the Vice President Academic) concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure.

- **Vice President Academic**
  The Vice President Academic reviews the Dean’s recommendation and advises the President concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure.

- **President**
  The President makes recommendation to the Board of Governors concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure.

- **Board of Governors**
  The Board of Governors grants reappointment, promotion and tenure.

- **University Review Committee**
  The University Review Committee hears appeals of negative decisions concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure.

2.1 Timelines for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

For all relevant dates, please see Appendix “G” in the Framework Agreement.

- Reappointment: pages 145-146;
- Tenure: page 147;
- Promotion: pages 148-149.
2.2 Information & Procedures for the Candidate

[In FA, see especially Articles 22, 23, 30, 31, and 36]

2.2.1 Overview
A junior faculty member newly appointed as a full-time Assistant Professor with eligibility for tenure typically receives a first contract of three years. If reappointment is approved during the third year, then a second contract of three years is received. The tenure decision is made no later than the final year of the second contract (i.e., no later than the sixth year in this rank at UVic; see FA Article 16.2.1). If tenure is granted then an appointment with tenure begins the following year.

For faculty members with initial appointments at UVic at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks and eligible for tenure, the tenure decision must be made not later than the fourth year in the respective rank (FA Articles 16.2.2 and 16.2.3). If tenure or reappointment is not granted then a terminal one-year contract is granted. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or from Associate Professor to Professor may occur at any time. If tenure has not been granted previously, then promotion to Associate Professor is granted tenure (FA Article 18.1).

2.2.2 Standards of Evaluation
Departments should notify untenured faculty members of the expectations and of the contents of the Framework Agreement, with special reference to the evaluation criteria for tenure and promotion as described in FA Article 13. Candidates for promotion should also examine FA Article 11 which describes the requirements for initial appointment at each rank.

Faculty of Social Sciences evaluation standards and assessment techniques are governed by this Faculty Evaluation Policy, Section 1, as well as related departmental documents.

2.2.3 Timeline/Important Dates for the Candidate
See FA Appendix “G” or section 2.1 above.

2.2.4 External Referees
[See FA Articles 22.3, 22.4 and 23]

For Reappointment
External referees are not consulted in reappointment cases.

For Tenure and Promotion
External referees are consulted in all tenure and promotion cases (except for initial appointment with tenure). Since complete dossiers (see below) are not made available to external referees, the following items are to be prepared by tenure candidates for presentation to external referees:

- the statement summarizing the candidate's case for promotion that is included in the Scholarship dossier,
• an up-to-date copy of the candidate's UVic curriculum vitae, and
• a selected set of the candidate's publications.
The candidate is to provide the Chair with one copy of each of the above-mentioned items for each of the external referees who are to write letters of evaluation.

Selection of Referees
FA Article 23 governs the selection of referees.

• FA Article 23.3 specifies that both the candidate and the RPT Committee will independently nominate at least six referees by May 1st, and simultaneously exchange their lists. By May 15 the candidate will select a minimum of two (or three in the case for promotion to Full Professor) referees from the RPT's list, and the RPT will select a minimum of two (or three in the case for promotion to Full Professor) referees from the candidate's list to produce the final set. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the minimum number of referees is four; for promotion to Full Professor, the minimum number of referees is six. If replacements become necessary, the final list should normally maintain balance between the two nomination lists (FA Article 23.5).

• In selecting referees, the RPT Committee and the candidate should avoid potential conflicts of interest, including those identified in FA Article 23.2.2 (e.g., co-authors, former supervisors, former students) (FAC Annual Report 1999-00 Sections 1 and 2), and ensure the referee is at arm's length (FAC Annual Report 2000-01 Section 1.1).

• For referees nominated by the candidate, the candidate shall disclose any previous or current relationship between the candidate and a person nominated as a referee (e.g., co-author or co-investigator), and the candidate shall provide a written justification for the choice of referee (FA Article 23.3.2).

• It is equally important that those asked to provide a recommendation have sufficient expertise in the specific field of the candidate's research to be able to provide a detailed evaluation of that scholarship. All candidates for tenure and promotion are asked to provide information about the referees in their application for tenure or promotion.

• Referees may also be selected to provide assessment relevant to teaching effectiveness, professional achievement and other criteria (FA Article 23.1).

2.2.5 Bias
Candidates who have concerns about potential bias in the RPT Committee should consult the Chair and FA Articles 21.3.7 and 67.10. Candidates who have concerns about potential bias in the FAC should consult the Dean and FA Article 32.4.7 and Section 2.5.2 below.

2.2.6 Dossiers
FA Article 22.5 requires that candidates present documentation of their activities to the Departmental RPT, one part of which is their standard University curriculum vitae.

Candidates are expected to submit scholarship, teaching, and other/service contributions dossiers, as described below. All dossiers are reviewed by the
department RPT, and except in reappointment cases, are then also reviewed by the FAC and the Dean.

- It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that the information is complete and accurate (FAC Annual Report 1998-99 Section II.4; FAC Annual Report 2000-01 Section 3; FAC Annual Report 2001-02 Section 1).

- **Mentoring:** It is recommended that a mentor be chosen by the candidate to assist in the preparation of the dossiers (FAC Annual Report 1997-98 Section 4; FAC Annual Report 2002-03 Section 4), at least for junior faculty members.

**a) Scholarship Dossier**

- **Table of contents.**
- **For tenure or promotion cases only:** a 3-4-page statement prepared by the candidate summarizing the candidate's case for tenure or promotion, including a statement of primary research interests, the relation between research and teaching and other activities, the direction that the candidate's work is likely to take in the future, and summary of the strengths of the candidate's scholarship. The candidate should also offer insight into rankings of the journals in which he or she has published. (This statement will be sent to external referees.)
- **Up-to-date UVic curriculum vitae** (this is the version that will be sent to external referees in tenure or promotion cases).
- **Statement summarizing the collaborative relationship between the candidate and co-authors of publications; for each co-authored publication indicate whether the co-authors were involved in a student-supervisor relationship with the candidate, and indicate the candidate's relative contribution to the publication** (FAC Annual Report 2001-02 Section 2; FAC Annual Report 2002-03 Section 7)
- **A copy of all published articles, chapters, and books; for items in press or accepted for publication but not yet in print, a provided preprint will be accompanied by a copy of the letter of acceptance**
- **If applicable, a copy of any manuscript submitted for publication including documentation regarding its publication status**
- **Components of research activity to be evaluated, as listed in Section 1.2.1**
- **Other professional activities to be evaluated, as listed in Section 1.2.2**

**b) Teaching Dossier**

As a guide to preparing teaching dossiers, faculty members are referred to 'The Teaching Dossier Kit' available from the Learning and Teaching Centre or at [http://web.uvic.ca/terc/resources/publications/teaching.htm](http://web.uvic.ca/terc/resources/publications/teaching.htm). The Faculty does not require more than the previous six years of teaching materials in tenure and promotion cases, therefore it is not necessary to retain materials in the dossier for more than six years.

The teaching dossier is updated each year to 31 December. The dossier includes the following, annually updated items:

- **Brief statement of teaching interests and philosophy, including teaching objectives and methods.**
• Summary of courses taught by course number, title, contact hours in lectures/labs, and number of students taught (as on curriculum vitae).
• Summary of supervisions, including post-doctoral, honours and practicum/co-op supervisions as well as graduate supervisions by type of graduate student supervision (as on curriculum vitae).
• Numerical summary of student ratings by course (details of how these are to be presented are determined by the department).
• Peer evaluations as required for reappointment, tenure and promotion, or as requested by the faculty member.
• Summary of evidence of openness to instructional innovation and change during the year, e.g. development of new courses, updating of existing courses, new modes of delivery, participation in teaching workshops.
• Teaching awards (including nominations for awards).
• Brief summaries of other optional material included in the Annex of the teaching dossier.
• Annex: Examples of other option materials.
  o Course materials: e.g. course outline/syllabi, assignments and examinations.
  o Detailed numerical results of student evaluations.
  o Qualitative student comments from student evaluations.
  o If any comments from a course are included, ALL comments from the course must be included (FA article 13.7.3).
  o Evidence of student consultation and advising concerning program or career planning.
  o Self-reflection on teaching performance in light of course and teaching objectives, challenges faced in particular courses etc.
  o Unsolicited letters written by students or others regarding teaching performance.
  o Other evidence concerning teaching accomplishments.

c) Other Contributions/Service Dossier
• Table of contents.
• Statement describing the importance of the most significant other/service contributions and the activities associated with these contributions.
• Components of service to be evaluated, as described in Section 1.3.1 above.

2.2.7 Other Information Provided on behalf of the Candidate
The candidate may supply the Departmental RPT and the FAC with any information deemed relevant to the case. This extends beyond the original submission of documentation. Specifically, the candidate may make both written and oral presentations to the Departmental RPT (FA Article 25.4, 25.5) and to the FAC (FA Article 32.4.9(a) and 32.4.10). In making an oral presentation, the candidate may be assisted by another member chosen by the candidate (FA Article 25.7 and 32.4.13). Letters of support may be included with the candidate’s submission, but will not be considered if submitted directly to the RPT or FAC by anyone other than the candidate.
Tenure
In addition to the dossiers described in Section 2.2.5, for non-tenured faculty members eligible for tenure, the following additional information provided by the Chair is reviewed:

- Copies of annual performance reviews (FA 14.1 and 25.1).
- Copies of written responses made by candidates to those reviews (FA 14.1.5).
- Chair’s assessment of the candidate (FA Article 24).

Promotion
In addition to the dossiers described in Section 2.2.5, the Chair’s assessment of the candidate is reviewed (FA Article 24; see also Section 2.3.3 below).

2.2.8 Information Available to the Candidate Before RPT’s Decision is Made
The candidate has a right to receive a list of all documents being considered by the Departmental RPT and to receive copies of any document. This includes copies of the referees’ letters. If a referee has requested confidentiality the letters will be prepared in a manner to conceal the identity of the referee (FA Article 25.3). The candidate then has a right to respond to that information (FA Articles 25.4, 25.5 and 25.7).

2.2.9 Information Available to the Candidate After RPT’s Decision is Made
The candidate has a right to receive a copy of the recommendation form forwarded by the Departmental RPT to the Dean (which includes an explanation of the RPT’s decision), any separate letters of recommendation made by any RPT member (including the Chair) and a list of all of the documents considered by the RPT (FA Article 30.0).

The candidate also has a right to a written explanation of recommendations made by the FAC (the FAC Case Report), any separate letters of recommendation written by FAC members and a complete list of documents used by FAC in making its recommendation to the Dean (FA Article 35.0). The candidate may make a written submission to the Dean with regard to the recommendation of the FAC not later than seven calendar days prior to the Dean’s deadline for making his or her recommendation (FA Article 36.0).

2.2.10 Appealing Negative Decisions
Procedures
The procedures for appeal to the University Review Committee are described in FA Article 40. Normally, appeals of departmental decisions should be made to the Dean rather than to the University Review Committee. The Dean may consult the FAC before making a decision on an appeal.
A faculty member may wish to consult with the Faculty Association about appealing a negative decision. The role of the Faculty Association is not formal but it will provide advice to members.

Reappointment
A faculty member denied reappointment has a right to appeal the Dean's decision to the University Review Committee no later than December 15 of the final contract year (FA Article 37.3). A faculty member denied reappointment has a right to appeal the President's decision to the University Review Committee no later than February 15 of the final contract year (FA Article 38.5).

Tenure
A faculty member denied tenure has the right to appeal the Dean's decision to the University Review Committee no later than February 15 of the final contract year (FA Article 37.3). A faculty member denied tenure has a right to appeal the President's decision to the University Review Committee no later than March 15 of the final contract year (FA Article 38.5).

Promotion
A faculty member denied promotion has a right to appeal the Dean's decision to the University Review Committee no later than May 01 (FA Article 37.3). A faculty member denied promotion has a right to appeal the President's decision to the University Review Committee no later than June 15 of the academic year in which the case is heard (FA Article 38.5).

2.3 Information & Procedures for Department Chair

2.3.1 Overview
The department Chair

- Requests faculty members in his/her unit for notification if they wish to or will be considered for tenure and/or promotion by the spring deadline of April 15th, or by September 15th for reappointment.
- Forwards the list of candidates who wish to or will be considered for tenure and/or promotion to the Dean by April 30, and a list of candidates who will be considered for reappointment by September 30.
- Strikes and chairs the RPT committee (FA Article 21.3.6, and Section 2.4 below)
- Convenes RPT Committee to nominate referees by May 1st and ensures that the list is agreed to by May 15th.
- Reviews candidate's documentation and ensures that it is complete (recommendation from FAC Annual Report 1998-1999 Section III.1).
- Provides candidate with
  - a list of documents other than those submitted in the candidate's dossier that will be considered by the RPT committee (FA Article 25.1) – see Appendix D in this FEP;
  - any addenda to this list (FA Articles 25.2); and
any copies of such documents if requested by the candidate (FA Article 25.3).

- Provides copies of any ensuing written response by the candidate to the RPT (FA article 25.4).
- Provides assessment of candidate 10 days before the first meeting of the RPT committee (FA Article 24 and Section 2.3.3 below).
- Notifies the candidate of the RPT’s vote and provides copies (2) to candidate, one to sign and one to keep. See FA Article 28 regarding the preparation of the department’s recommendation; template recommendations forms are provided in Appendices B and C in this FEP.
- Ensures that the documents submitted to the FAC are complete and that the candidate has agreed to the List of Documents (Appendix D in this FEP).
- Forwards all materials to the Dean’s office.

In helping the candidate prepare his or her materials, please refer also to Section 2.5.7 (Questions Frequently Asked by the FAC) below.

2.3.2 Timeline/Important Dates for the Chair

See FA Appendix G.

2.3.3 Chair’s Assessment (FA Article 24.0)

According to FA Article 24.0: “Unless the Chair of the Department is disqualified by conflict of interest or reasonable apprehension of bias, the Chair shall prepare an assessment of whether a candidate has met the requisite Departmental standards and provide a copy of the assessment to the Departmental RPT Committee and the candidate at least 10 working days prior to the first meeting at which the candidate will be considered.”

The Chair’s assessment is to provide both the candidate and the RPT committee with a review of the history of the candidate’s progress toward departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion.

2.3.4 Letters of Reference from External Referees

- **For tenure recommendations:** Chairs will include with each Departmental RPT recommendation for tenure at least three external letters of reference solicited by the Departmental RPT Committee from a list of persons mutually agreed to by the candidate and the RPT Committee in accordance with FA Article 23, and a copy of the letter sent to the referees.

- **For promotion to Associate Professor:** Chairs will include with each Departmental RPT recommendation for Associate Professor at least four external letters of reference solicited by the Departmental RPT Committee from a list of persons mutually agreed to by the candidate and the RPT Committee in accordance with FA Article 23, and a copy of the letter sent to the referees.

- **For promotion to Professor:** In the case of candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor, the Department will make every effort to secure six letters of reference from a list of referees that has been mutually agreed to by the candidate and the
RPT Committee and approved by the Dean in accordance with FA Article 23. A minimum of four letters must be received and submitted; the fact of a referee not responding will not be held against the candidate. The letter of request will be signed by both the Chair and the Dean.

- All letters of reference will be available to both the Departmental RPT Committee and the FAC.
- When a candidate re-applies for promotion in a subsequent year and a letter is sought from the same referee a second time, then an update of the original letter may be requested.
- All letters requested and received must be submitted.
- An English translation of a referee’s letter which is not in English should be provided for the FAC through the Dean’s office, as well as the original letter.
- Unsolicted letters directed to the RPT or the FAC will not normally be considered by the Committee. When they are considered, the candidate must be provided with a copy of the letter (with the author’s identifying information removed) and be given an opportunity to respond.

2.4 Information & Procedures for Unit RPT Committee

2.4.1 Membership
Membership in Departmental RPT committee is to be determined according to the procedures presented in FA Article 21.

Conflict of Interest
Conflict of interest on RPT is to be avoided. This has been interpreted to include the conflict that would occur as a result of having as committee members people who are themselves candidates for tenure and/or promotion (FAC Annual Report 1998-99). Conflict of interest might also occur if a research collaborator is called upon to evaluate her/his own research where such research forms a substantial part of the candidate’s dossier. Allegations of conflict of interest will be considered in the deliberations of the FAC (FAC Annual Report 1998-99). Examples of research collaborators include co-authors, former supervisors and former students.

When in doubt, consult FA Article 21.3.7 (Candidate’s Question Regarding Composition of Committee) and FA Article 67 (Conflict of Interest and Reasonable Apprehension of Bias) for procedures.

Outside Member(s)
FA Article 21.3.5 provides Departments with the option of adding a member or members from other Departments or Faculties.

Participation
Members of the RPT should participate fully in discussions and voting. Individuals should not vote if absent from any part of substantive deliberations concerning the merits of a case (FAC Annual Report 1997-98 Section 1).
2.4.2 Procedures

Procedures are governed by FA Articles 23, and 25 to 30. The RPT typically follows the following steps:

1. The RPT meets to establish general procedures for cases of reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
2. All procedures are confidential.
3. Before deliberations on a case begin, members review the available documentation.
4. When meetings on a case begin, any procedural issues specific to that case will be discussed first and the manner of dealing with them established.
5. When deliberations begin, the Chair will (i) review the criteria to be used, as presented in FA Article 13 and in this FEP, and (ii) provide a factual summary of the available materials. This is followed by discussion among all members of the RPT. Discussion may be completed within one meeting, although additional meetings may be necessary.
6. Candidates may make a written or an oral presentation to the RPT (FA Articles 25.4 and 25.5). When making an oral presentation, the candidate may be assisted by a faculty member chosen by the candidate (FA Article 25.7).
7. At its discretion, the RPT may request an interview with the candidate (FA Article 25.6).
8. Voting will be a simple expression of “yes” or “no” by secret ballot (FA Article 26). Abstentions are not permitted.
9. A vote is taken and the written statement of reasons is prepared according to FA Article 28.0. Template recommendation forms are provided in Appendices B and C in this FEP.

2.4.3 Timeline/Important Dates for the RPT Committee

See FA Appendix G.

2.5 Information & Procedures for Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC)

See FA Articles 32, 33, 34 and 35.

2.5.1 Role of the FAC

[See FA Article 32.4.8 (c).]
- FAC does not evaluate cases for reappointment.
- The FAC is an advisory committee to the Dean, passing its recommendation regarding promotion or tenure in a given case to the Dean, who then passes this recommendation on to the Vice President Academic, along with her/his recommendation on the case.

2.5.2 Membership on FAC

[See also FA Articles 32.1 and 32.3]
- The Dean is not a voting member of the FAC. The Dean’s participation is that of an interested observer, who may join the discussion on request or to provide input on procedural matters (see FA Article 32.5).
• The Committee shall be composed of five elected tenured members from the Faculty of Social Sciences, plus two elected alternates from the Faculty of Social Sciences. An alternate will replace any regular member when a candidate under consideration comes from the same Department as that regular member or when that regular member has a potential conflict of interest in a specific case. Not more than four of the seven members of the Committee (regular members and alternates) shall be of the same rank.
• The Committee shall select its own Chair and Vice-Chair from among its voting members.
• Chairs and Acting Chairs of Departments and faculty members on leave shall be ineligible for membership on the Committee.
• Persons being considered for promotion in a given year shall not serve on the FAC in that year.
• No more than one person from each Department shall be permitted to sit on the Committee.

Conflict of Interest and Advocacy
Members of the FAC who belong to the same Department as the candidate should remove themselves from the Committee during consideration of the candidate’s case. Members in a conflict of interest must withdraw and be replaced by an alternate. No member of the FAC should act as an advocate either for or against a candidate.

Candidate’s Request for an Outside Member on the FAC
If the focus of a candidate’s work lies in another Faculty, then the candidate may request that a member of that other Faculty be included on the FAC considering the case (FA Article 32.3 (d)). In such cases, the FAC will also be constituted of five members: four members will be regular members of the Faculty of Social Sciences FAC, and one member will be seconded directly from the other faculty. In such cases, the Social Sciences FAC will decide internally which of its five members will step down from the deliberations. The seconded member shall have voting privileges on the Committee.

This request will be initiated by the candidate through a written request to the Dean of Social Sciences and must be submitted at the same time as submitting an updated CV, Teaching Dossier, and other documentation to the Chair (Sept 15). The Dean of Social Sciences will then forward this request to the FAC for action. The Dean will then request that the FAC of the other faculty second someone from that faculty to the Social Sciences FAC for service on the requesting candidate’s review (FA 32.4.7 (d) and (e)).

2.5.3 Election of Members to the FAC
Participation on the FAC is considered a collegial duty and necessary responsibility of all tenured faculty members in the Social Sciences. All tenured faculty members in the Faculty of Social Sciences are considered eligible to serve as members of the FAC for two-year terms. The exceptions are those who currently occupy
administrative positions, who are on study leave or other approved leave, or who have served on the committee within the last three years.

A list with the names of the eligible tenured members of the Faculty of Social Sciences will be circulated by the Dean’s office during the month of April for a vote by all regular faculty members in the Faculty of Social Sciences for the positions required to be filled in a given year. Ballots will be returned no later than two weeks after the day of circulation, at which time the scrutineers will tally the ballots and notify the successful candidates. The scrutineers shall be the Dean and the Chair of the previous year’s FAC. Faculty in Social Sciences will be informed of the final results of the election no later than April 30.

All regular faculty members of the Faculty of Social Sciences are eligible to vote in the election of members to the FAC. Voters must mark their ballots for up to four candidates of their choice. The scrutineers will ensure that the elected seven will be from different Departments in the Social Sciences, and that not more than four of the seven will be of the same rank.

Where the seven persons with the largest number of votes include more than one from the same Department or more than four from the same rank, the scrutineers will ensure the appropriate representation by rank and by departmental origins by simply moving down the final vote tally until the specified representational mix is achieved. In the case of a tie vote, the tie will be resolved by the toss of a coin. The required number of FAC member positions will be filled by the candidates with the highest number of votes, according to the order of the final vote tally.

Candidates who are unable to undertake this commitment must appeal to the Dean, providing reasons why they are unable to fulfill this faculty responsibility. If the Dean excuses an elected member, the next eligible candidate according to the procedure established above will take that member’s place, as needed.

2.5.4 Timeline/Important Dates for the FAC
See FA Appendix G.

2.5.5 Internal Procedures of the FAC
The procedures of the FAC are governed by FA Articles 32-35. FAC is not involved in Reappointments.

General Procedures
• No formal business of the FAC will be conducted without the Dean or the Dean’s representative being present at the meeting.
• Meeting times for the FAC shall be decided upon by the FAC at its first meeting in the Fall term.
• The quorum of the Committee will normally consist of five members. If for the deliberations on a specific case illness or conflict of interest prevents the achievement of a quorum, and an Alternate cannot serve, the Committee will
continue on with four members for that case only. In the event that illness
requires a member of the Committee to withdraw from the Committee, the Dean
will select the next eligible person(s) from the ballot results to achieve a quorum.

- Voting will be a simple expression of ‘yes’ or ‘no’. A member who is absent will
  not vote by proxy. Abstentions are not permitted. Voting shall be by secret ballot.
  [FA Article 33].

- The policy on “Conflict of Interest and Reasonable Apprehension of Bias” in
  Article 67 of the Framework Agreement, will apply to the proceedings of the
  Committee.

- The FAC will consider initially all applications for tenure and then applications for
  promotion. In the latter instance, the FAC will aim to consider cases for promotion
  to Associate Professor and then cases for promotion to Professor.

- Unsolicited letters directed to the FAC will not normally be considered by the
  Committee. Letters concerning a case should come to the FAC as a part of the
  presentation by the relevant RPT Committee. Where an unsolicited letter is
  considered by the FAC, the candidate must be provided with a copy of the letter
  with the author’s identifying information removed and be given an opportunity to
  respond.

FAC Members’ Files

- All information is strictly confidential.

- For each case under consideration by the FAC, the Dean’s office will prepare
  a folder for each FAC member and the Dean that contains copies of the
  following documents from the candidate’s submission:
  - Candidate’s memo agreeing to be considered for promotion (not
    required for tenure unless it is an early consideration).
  - Candidate’s full UVic curriculum vitae.
  - Candidate’s written submission to the RPT committee summarizing
    his/her case for tenure or promotion.
  - Chair’s assessment of Candidate (FA Article 24)
  - Letters from external referees.
  - Signed copy of the RPT Committee’s recommendation.
  - Copy of sample letter sent to referees asking for an assessment of the
    candidate.
  - Copy of additional communication with referees (when applicable).
  - Copy of messages from potential referees declining to provide an
    assessment (when applicable).
  - Summary statement from Teaching Dossier.

Procedures on Individual Cases

- A Case Manager will be assigned for each case brought for consideration to the
  FAC. It is the responsibility of the case manager to review the available material
  using the Checklist of Documents (see Appendix D).

- Before meetings on a case begin, all members review the available
documentation.
Typically, when meetings on a case begin, any procedural issues will be discussed first and the manner of dealing with them established.

When deliberations on the merits of a case begin, the Case Manager presents (i) a review of the criteria to be used, as presented in FA Article 13 and Sections 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 of this FEP, and (ii) a factual summary of the available materials. This is followed by further discussion among all members of the FAC. This process may take one or several meetings and may involve requests for additional information. Any additional information is made available to the candidate.

The candidate may make a written or oral presentation to the FAC (FA Articles 32.4.10(a), and 32.4.9(a)), and the FAC may request an interview with the candidate and/or the Chair (FA Article 32.4.11 and 32.4.12). The candidate shall be present when the Chair is interviewed (FA Article 32.4.12). When making an oral presentation, the candidate may be assisted by a faculty member chosen by the candidate (FA Article 32.4.13).

A preliminary vote is taken by secret ballot. If the vote is negative, the candidate is notified immediately by the Case Manager and is given the opportunity to make a written or oral submission to the FAC.

Following any further discussion and requests for information, a final vote is taken at least 24 hours later.

The case manager drafts a Case Report of less than one page for approval by the FAC and for submission to the Dean.

The FAC written recommendation, accompanied by reasons for its recommendation, will be signed by all members of the FAC considering the case and will be forwarded to the Dean, the Departmental Chair, and the candidate.

The Dean provides the candidate with a copy of the Dean’s written recommendation by the dates specified in FA Article 37.2.

Annual Report of the FAC
The Chair of the FAC will report to the Faculty by April 30 of each academic year.

2.5.6 Materials considered by the FAC for Tenure and Promotion

- Candidate’s Dossiers, as described in Section 2.2.6 above.

- Checklist of Documents: The files for tenure and promotion cases must be accompanied by a completed checklist (see Appendix D in this FEP), signed off by the Chair of the Department’s RPT Committee and the candidate.
• Departmental RPT Committee Recommendation form (Appendix B or C in this document), signed by all parties.

2.5.7 Questions Frequently Asked By the FAC

In addition to the criteria listed in Section 1 and in the accompanying Unit documents, the candidate and/or Chair may wish to consider and strive to answer the following questions in the submitted materials.

About Teaching
• At what levels does the candidate teach? If only at the lower or upper level, why?
• Is there anything unusual about the courses taught by the candidate?
• Does the candidate teach at the graduate level? Is this of any special significance to the department?
• Does the candidate have special strengths as a teacher? How are these strengths regarded by the department?
• Has the department identified any problems in the candidate's teaching? How have the problems been addressed? Have they been resolved?
• Where does the candidate rank in the department as a teacher?

About Scholarship
In assessing applications for tenure, particularly from colleagues who have only recently completed the Ph.D., the Committee expects to find evidence of scholarly achievement but does consider to some extent scholarly promise. Questions that tend to arise in this consideration might include the following:
• To what extent do the candidate's publications derive from the PhD?
• Has the candidate embarked on new directions of research since the PhD?
• Is rate of publication of significance in the candidate's field or are other considerations more important?
• What is the typical rate of publication in the candidate's field?
• What is the rank of the publishers (books) and journals (articles) in which the candidate has published?
• Is the candidate publishing in the appropriate journals given the field?
• What weight is given to books in the candidate's field? What distinction is made between monographs and textbooks?
• What is the candidate’s relative contribution to multi-authored publications?
• What are the Unit’s expectations regarding the mix of single and multi-authored publications?
• Is there something unusual about the candidate’s research program that requires unusual lead time before translating into publication?
• Is the candidate engaged in community-based research for which knowledge dissemination and translation is better suited in other than peer reviewed scholarly outlets?
• What is the impact and relevance of the program of scholarship?
In some disciplines research grants are regarded as one measure of scholarly achievement; in other disciplines research grants are not a significant indicator of scholarly progress. Since there is no uniformity of practice in weighing research grants, each candidate’s departmental chair and RPT Committee can facilitate the work of the FAC by addressing this question in the application for tenure or promotion. For example:

- What is the pattern of research funding in the candidate’s specialized field?
- To what extent are external research grants in the candidate’s field (including amount, source, review process) esteemed as a mark of scholarly achievement?
- What is the standing of the candidate’s grant record compared to colleagues of comparable rank and experience at the University of Victoria and in other universities in Canada?

About Other/Service Contributions

The committee looks for evidence of service to the candidate’s discipline, the community, the university, the faculty, or the unit that reflects to the advantage of the University of Victoria. Questions that may arise include:

- Have the items under consideration also been counted as scholarship under the heading of “other professional activities”?
- How are the activities related to the candidate’s professional life?
- Has the candidate made exceptional contributions? How?
- What is the significance of extra-university awards or recognition?
- What has been the impact of public presentations made on behalf of the university, the discipline, the faculty, or the unit?
- What has been the impact of the candidate’s business involvements?
- How have the candidate’s other contributions reflected to the advantage of the University of Victoria?

2.6 Information & Procedures for the Dean

[See FA Article 37]

2.6.1 General Considerations

The Dean

- Attends all meetings of the FAC, but does not participate in the discussions. The role of the Dean in these meetings is to listen to the discussion and to provide procedural and policy information to the FAC.
- Makes recommendations on reappointment, tenure and promotion to the Vice President Academic.
- Receives candidate’s question regarding composition of the FAC [FA Article 32.4.7(b)] and responds accordingly.

2.6.2 Timelines/Important Dates for the Dean

See FA Appendix G.
3. SALARY RECOMMENDATION PROCESSES

3.1 General Principles

- According to FA article 73.3.5.1(d), faculty members other than Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors are evaluated on the criteria of teaching effectiveness, scholarship and professional achievements, and service 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 an individual faculty member and the Chair, approved by the Dean, in advance for a fixed period not exceeding five years. Variations from the 40:40:20 ratio can be considered only in cases where workloads or institutional expectations differ from the normal distribution of faculty responsibilities and must be approved by the Chair and the Dean. With regard to Chairs, such an agreement is made between the Dean and the Chair, normally at the time of appointment of the Chair and for the term of the appointment.

- According to FA Article 73.3.5.1(f), Senior Instructors and Teaching Professors are evaluated on the basis of teaching effectiveness and service in the recommended ratio of 80:20 respectively. An alternative ratio in which no criterion is weighted less than 20% may be agreed between the Senior Instructor and Teaching Professor and the Chair, approved by the Dean, in advance for a fixed period not exceeding five years. Variations from the 80:20 ratio can be considered only in cases where workloads or institutional expectations differ from the norm.

- Period of review is set out in FA Article 73.3.4, and is the three years preceding January 1st of the year in which the review is made (FA Article 73.3.4.1).

- In cases where a faculty member has been on leave including sick leave, except leave without pay, for more than one teaching term during the three-year period, the review of the teaching effectiveness and service shall be the four years preceding January 1st of the year in which the review is made (see FA Article 73.3.4.2). A teaching term typically refers to a fall or spring term (unless the faculty member has negotiated a “swap”). For example, if a faculty member is sick January to August but would not normally teach in the summer, this implies that the member has been on leave for one teaching term; whereas a member who has been sick October to February and usually teaches in the Fall and Spring terms would be on sick leave for two teaching terms.

- In cases where a faculty member has been on leave without pay in any of the three years preceding January 1st of the year in which the review is made, see FA Article 73.3.4.3.

3.2 Activity Summaries

- The Activity Summary is submitted annually for the purpose of salary evaluation.

- The Activity Summary provides a synopsis of relevant information from the curriculum vitae about the teaching, scholarship and professional achievements, and service during the three years preceding January 1st of the year of review (or
four years for teaching and service contributions in the cases of faculty members who have been on leave (including sick leave), other than leave without pay, during the relevant three-year period).

- In order to facilitate the review and recommendation process, at the call of the Chair, faculty members are asked to submit to their Chair an Activity Summary of their teaching, scholarly and professional achievements, and service contributions in the period of review.

- The Activity Summaries of all members of a unit are forwarded with the recommendations of the Chair to the Dean.

- The general format and contents of Activity Summaries are outlined below. Individual units may wish to provide further details and clarifications on what to include and how to weight the various sub-components.

- Faculty members who choose not to submit any section of an Activity Summary of their achievements in the period of review normally forfeit a positive score in the appropriate section of the weighting ratio [see FA Articles 73.3.6 and 73.3.7].

- The Activity Summary is contained in a faculty member's Official Performance File as an additional item of information to those listed in FA Article 41.1.3.

Contents of the Activity Summary:

1. Teaching
   - Items of the Teaching Dossier for the relevant period of review (as noted above).
   - Detailed materials from the Annex of the Teaching Dossier are not required unless requested by either the Chair or the Dean.

2. Scholarship and Professional Achievements
   - Items in sections 7(a) - 7(c) of the University of Victoria curriculum vitae for the period of review, showing contributions organized according to their relative importance as determined in the unit’s document.
   - Only scholarship that is published or accepted for publication (with documented evidence) is recorded.
   - Research grants and scholarly professional recognition awards (including nominations for awards) during the three-year period of review.

3. Service
   - Items in sections 9(a) and 9(b) of the University curriculum vitae for the period of review, organized to separate internal from external service.

3.3 Allocation of Merit Increments (MIs)

- A fixed number of merit increments (MIs) is allocated to each unit. The aggregate allocation of MIs to the Faculty equals twice the number of regular faculty members excluding limited term appointments (FA Article 73.6.3), and less a proportion held back by the Provost for distribution to ensure equity among the Faculties (FA Article 73.6.7.1). The Dean retains for distribution 2 MIs per Chair and Associate Deans (and Director of the Advising Centre when the
Director is from Social Sciences), plus 7% of the number of MIs received by the Faculty in order to ensure equity between units and in the Faculty overall, allocating the remainder to units on a pro rata basis.

- According to FA article 73.6.5, the maximum number of MIs that may be awarded to a faculty member in one year is four and MIs are awarded only as whole increments.
- According to FA Article 73.6.6, MIs must be distributed among member as set out in FA Appendix “A” Salary Settlement (3.4.4). The Framework Agreement states that “[the Dean] will retain sufficient flexibility to allow some individual departments or schools to deviate from this distribution where such distribution can be justified”, but the stated distribution must be maintained within the Faculty.

### 3.4 Policy for the Annual Evaluation of Chairs and Directors

Procedures for evaluation of Chairs and Directors in the Faculty of Social Sciences will conform to general University of Victoria procedures found at [http://web.uvic.ca/vpac/policies/evaluation_deanschairsdirs.htm](http://web.uvic.ca/vpac/policies/evaluation_deanschairsdirs.htm). Chairs and Directors do not fall under the category of excluded positions as per Framework Agreement (Article 3.2.1) and therefore have all the rights of a Member under this Agreement. Chairs and Director are evaluated by the Dean.

FA Article 73.3 explains salary adjustment procedures for all regular faculty members. Chairs and Directors have a higher workload of service and therefore normally receive a reduced teaching load and will have less time for research. This shall be reflected in the evaluation ratio (see FA 73.3.5.1) during their term of office which shall be 20:20:60 (teaching, scholarship, service) unless negotiated otherwise with the Dean.

Chairs and Directors are expected to follow the same activity summary reporting as for regular faculty members in the Faculty outlined in the Framework Agreement and Faculty Evaluation Policy. The Department’s Merit Committee may rank the Chair’s quality and productivity of scholarship, teaching performance and service contribution to the discipline and profession (not including service to the academic unit, university, or any other service directly related to their administrative position) taking into consideration the Chair’s reduced time available for scholarship and teaching when considering quantity of output.

In May, each Chair and Director will submit for approval a statement of goals as well as the activity summary report.

The Dean’s Office may also annually solicit feedback on administrative performance from those reporting to the administrative position. In the case of Chairs this could be in the form of an e-mail to all regular ongoing members of faculty and staff in the relevant Unit. In the case of Directors this could be an e-mail to support staff reporting to the Director, the Advisory Committee (where appropriate), and a request for comment from the Office of the Vice President Research.
Annual evaluation may be based in the appropriate ratio on a combination of:

- annual assessment of statement of goals and progress made towards their achievement;
- departmental ranking of teaching, scholarship and service to discipline and profession; and
- feedback received from those reporting to the administrative position.

This policy will be revised as may be required after any modification to the Framework Agreement.

3.5 Other Matters

- As a necessary basis for application of the weighting ratio, each unit is responsible for developing a system of rating faculty members in the separate categories of teaching effectiveness, scholarship and professional achievements, and service.
- At the time of making recommendations to the Provost, the Dean provides to the Chair information concerning the Dean's recommendations on behalf of the unit and of the Chair.
- Other procedures are outlined in the Salary Policy, which is FA Article 73.
4. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Template letters to Referees
Draft Sample (Apr04)

TENURE ONLY

Dear Dr. ______________,

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. ____________, Assistant Professor in the Department/School of ________________, who is being considered for tenure at the University of Victoria.

There are various criteria which are considered in the evaluation of a candidate for tenure. The assessment of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness and other contributions to the University, the academic profession, and the community can be made within the University. For the assessment of scholarship we seek the assistance of external referees. This assessment will complement that of the candidate's department whose members are not normally present during consideration of the case beyond the department itself.

Candidates for tenure at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:

- a record of performance that meets or exceeds the written expectations of her or his department and that are in accord with the Evaluation Policy of the Faculty in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment;
- continued development with regard to scholarly or creative achievements of high quality that are normally but not necessarily demonstrated by presentation or publication in a suitable academic forum.

I would be grateful therefore if you would provide me with your evaluation of the scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. ____________. In your assessment it would be helpful if you would indicate:

- whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance;
- the candidate's calibre relative to other individuals with the same length of experience with whom you are acquainted;
- whether Dr. ____________ would qualify for tenure at either your own institution or at an institution comparable to the University of Victoria;
- the quality of the journals and/or publishers the candidate has published with;
- typical rates of publication in the candidate’s areas of research;
- the relative importance of individual versus collective authorship in the candidate’s field;
- comments on any other aspect of the candidate's qualifications you consider relevant.

For your guidance I am enclosing the candidate’s curriculum vitae, statement of research, a selection of publication reprints provided by the candidate, a copy of the department’s
criteria for tenure with respect to research activity, and a list of the components of research activity considered in our Faculty Evaluation Policy.

Your reply will be made available to committees and individuals at the University involved in considering Dr. ______ for tenure and will be treated as confidential. However, in accordance with the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. ______ will, upon request, be provided with a summary of all referees’ comments written so as not to disclose the identity of the referees.

I would appreciate receiving your response by _______. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to the following number: ____________. If you would prefer, you may send your response via email to __________________. In any case, please also send a paper copy with an original signature.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
TENURE AND PROMOTION

Dear ____________,

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. _______, Assistant Professor in the Department/School of ________________, who is being considered separately for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Victoria. I would appreciate independent insights regarding your evaluation for tenure and promotion since they will be considered separately by the University of Victoria using the criteria noted below.

There are various criteria considered in the evaluation of a candidate for tenure and promotion. The assessment of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness and other contributions to the University, the academic profession, and the community can be made within the University. For the assessment of scholarship we seek the assistance of external referees. This assessment will complement that of the candidate's department whose members are not normally present during consideration of the case beyond the department itself.

Candidates for tenure at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:

- a record of performance that meets or exceeds the written expectations of her or his department and that are in accord with the Evaluation Policy of the Faculty in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment;
- continued development with regard to scholarly or creative achievements of high quality that are normally but not necessarily demonstrated by presentation or publication in a suitable academic forum.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:

- scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline.

I would be grateful therefore if you would provide me with your evaluation of the scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. _________. In your assessment it would be helpful if you would indicate:

- whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance;
- the candidate's calibre relative to other individuals with the same length of experience with whom you are acquainted;
- whether Dr. ________ would qualify for tenure and/or promotion at either your own institution or at an institution comparable to the University of Victoria;
- the quality of the journals and/or publishers the candidate has published with;
- typical rates of publication in the candidate’s areas of research;
• the relative importance of individual versus collective authorship in the candidate’s field;
• comments on any other aspect of the candidate's qualifications you consider relevant.

For your guidance I am enclosing the candidate’s curriculum vitae, statement of research, a selection of publication reprints provided by the candidate, and a list of the components of research activity considered in our Faculty Evaluation Policy.

Your reply will be made available to committees and individuals at the University involved in considering Dr. _____ for tenure and promotion and will be treated as confidential. However, in accordance with the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. _____ will, upon request, be provided with a summary of all referees’ comments written so as not to disclose the identity of the referees.

I would appreciate receiving your response by _______. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to the following number: ____________. If you would prefer, you may send your response via email to __________________. In any case, please also send a paper copy with an original signature.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Dear Dr. ____________,

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. ________, Assistant Professor in the Department/School of ________, who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

There are various criteria which are considered in the evaluation of a candidate for promotion. The assessment of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness and contributions to the University, the academic profession and the community can be made within the University. For the assessment of scholarship we seek the assistance of external referees. This assessment will complement that of the candidate’s department whose members are not normally present during consideration of the case beyond the department itself.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:

- scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline.

I would be grateful therefore if you would provide me with your evaluation of the scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. ________. In your assessment it would be helpful if you would indicate:

- whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance;
- the candidate's calibre relative to other individuals with the same length of experience with whom you are acquainted;
- whether Dr. ________ would qualify for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at either your own institution or at an institution comparable to the University of Victoria;
- the quality of the journals and/or publishers the candidate has published with;
- typical rates of publication in the candidate’s areas of research;
- the relative importance of individual versus collective authorship in the candidate’s field;
- comments on any other aspect of the candidate's qualifications you consider relevant.

For your guidance I am enclosing the candidate’s curriculum vitae, statement of research, a selection of publication reprints provided by the candidate, and a list of the components of research activity considered in our Faculty Evaluation Policy.

Your reply will be made available to committees and individuals at the University involved in considering Dr. ________ for promotion to Associate Professor and will be treated as confidential. However, in accordance with the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of
Privacy legislation, Dr. ______ will, upon request, be provided with a summary of all referees’ comments written so as not to disclose the identity of the referees.

I would appreciate receiving your response by _______. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to the following number: __________. If you would prefer, you may send your response via email to _________________. In any case, please also send a paper copy with an original signature.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Dear Dr. __________,

We are writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. __________, Associate Professor in the Department/School of __________, who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor.

There are various criteria which are considered in the evaluation of a candidate for promotion. The assessment of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness and contributions to the University, the academic profession and the community can be made within the University. For the assessment of scholarship we seek the assistance of external referees. This assessment will complement that of the candidate's department whose members are not normally present during consideration of the case beyond the department itself.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:

• scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline;
• outstanding achievements with regard to scholarship that has attained recognition at a national or international level.

We would be grateful therefore if you would provide us with your evaluation of the scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. __________. In your assessment it would be helpful if you would indicate:

• whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance;
• the candidate's calibre relative to other individuals with the same length of experience with whom you are acquainted;
• whether Dr. __________ would qualify for promotion to the rank of Professor at either your own institution or at an institution comparable to the University of Victoria;
• the quality of the journals and/or publishers the candidate has published with;
• typical rates of publication in the candidate’s areas of research;
• the relative importance of individual versus collective authorship in the candidate’s field;
• comments on any other aspect of the candidate's qualifications you consider relevant.

For your guidance I am enclosing the candidate’s curriculum vitae, statement of research, a selection of publication reprints provided by the candidate, and a list of the components of research activity considered in our Faculty Evaluation Policy.

Your reply will be made available to committees and individuals at the University involved in considering Dr. ______ for promotion to Professor and will be treated as confidential.
However, in accordance with the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. ______ will, upon request, be provided with a summary of all referees’ comments written so as not to disclose the identity of the referees.

I would appreciate receiving your response by ______. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to the following number: ___________. If you would prefer, you may send your response via email to __________________. In any case, please also send a paper copy with an original signature.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
Department/School

Dean
Faculty of Social Sciences
List of Components of Research Activity from
FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

1.2.1 Components of research activity to be evaluated

- Refereed articles in scholarly journals
- Refereed books and monographs (authored/edited)
- Refereed book chapters
- Refereed conference proceedings
- Academic software and multi-media materials
- Community-based research activities
- Research/government reports
- Non-refereed articles, books/monographs, chapters and conference proceedings
- Book reviews
- Discussion/working papers
- Scholarly recognition awards (including nomination for awards)
- Miscellaneous

1.2.2 Other professional activities to be evaluated

- Research grants awarded
- Research contracts (as distinct from paid consulting contracts that involve no research)
- Presentations to academic or professional conferences/workshops
- Discussant status at academic or professional conferences/workshops
- Organization of conference/session at academic or professional conferences/workshops
- Membership of conference/workshop program committees
- Service on committees of professional bodies in the discipline
- Professional input to the policy-making or judicial processes not included in 3.1 above
e.g. submissions at hearings, expert witness testimony
- Invited academic addresses
- Membership of academic or professional panels or roundtables
- Editorships of scholarly journals
- Membership on editorial boards
- Refereeing activities
- Professional recognition awards (including nomination for awards)
- Miscellaneous
Appendix B: Recommendation Form Relating To Reappointment Of Assistant Professor

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Recommendation Form
For REAPPOINTMENT of Assistant Professor

NOTE: To accompany the "Position Status Change Request Form All Employee Groups"

To: Dean of Social Sciences  Date:

From:

This file is to recommend that

who was initially appointed to the University of Victoria

On __________ at the rank of __________

and who is presently at the rank of __________

be re-appointed at the rank of __________

for a three-year period effective __________

SIGNED BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE ARPT COMMITTEE

PRINTED NAME and SIGNATURE

DATE

PRINTED NAME and SIGNATURE

DATE

Of whom ____ voted in support of this recommendation

____ voted against this recommendation

Attach to form a statement of evaluation by the ARPT Committee of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness, scholarship and other contributions.
**Appendix C: Recommendation Form Relating to Promotion and/or Tenure**

**UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA**
**FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Recommendation Form
Relating to PROMOTION and/or TENURE

1. **CANDIDATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Unit:</th>
<th>Present Rank:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of first appointment at University of Victoria:

Date of appointment to present rank:

2. **RECOMMENDATION OF ARPT COMMITTEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ARPT Committee recommends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not recommend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That [Candidate Name] be granted tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ARPT Committee recommends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| does not recommend            |         |

That [Candidate Name] be promoted to the rank of [Rank].

**Vote of ARPT Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in favour of tenure</th>
<th>Number in favour of promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number against tenure</td>
<td>Number against promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM (FA Article 22.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation Required</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae – updated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unless already returned to Dean’s Office)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Teaching Dossier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Professional Achievements Dossier (including copies of publications that the candidate wants to have considered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributions Dossier (including copies of other documents that the candidate wants to have considered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation Submitted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checklist of documents, and the documents listed on the checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. LIST OF REFEREES

Please identify those referees with an asterisk (*) to whom the unit has written.

(i) Suggested by Candidate | Suggested by ARPT Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Suggested by Candidate | Suggested by ARPT Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(iv)</th>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(v)</th>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(vi)</th>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (vii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:

### (viii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:
6. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
(Present in as much detail as possible a statement relating to all aspects of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.)
7. **SCHOLARSHIP**
(Present in as much detail as possible a statement relating to the candidate's scholarship and professional achievement.)
8. OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

(1) Unit

(2) University

(3) Other
9. STATEMENT OF ARPT COMMITTEE

We have carefully read the above submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typed/Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. DATE OF SUBMISSION OF THIS RECOMMENDATION TO DEAN OF SOCIAL SCIENCES:

11. SIGNATURE OF THE CANDIDATE:

(a) I have been given the opportunity to read this recommendation. To the best of my knowledge the supporting documentation provided by the unit is accurate and complete.

Date: ___________________________ Signature: ___________________________

(b) I have been given the opportunity to read this recommendation. I find the supporting documentation provided by the unit to be inaccurate/incomplete and will communicate my concerns in writing to the Faculty Advisory Committee within five working days of this day, as per the Framework Agreement, Article 31.4.9a.

Date: ___________________________ Signature: ___________________________
Appendix D: Checklist of Documents to Accompany Candidate’s Materials to the Dean’s Office

Checklist for (name) __________________________ (unit) __________________________

Recommendation for □ Tenure and/or □ Promotion

Items included:
□ This checklist itself.

CANDIDATE’S MATERIALS:

□ Candidate’s memo agreeing to be considered for promotion (not required for tenure unless it is an early consideration).
□ Candidate’s UVic curriculum vitae (please check particularly the following items).
  Item 7a:
    □ Are all listed in refereed journals with specific dates and pages?
    □ Are reprints of all publications in dossier?
    □ Has the chair/director indicated status of journals?
  Item 7b:
    □ Are copies of books in the dossier?
  Items 7c-e:
    □ Is the information specific and relevant?
    □ Are there items that should be in the dossier (e.g., book reviews or chapters)?
  Items 5 and/or 10:
    □ Are grant dates, sources and amounts specific?
□ Dossier on scholarship.
□ Dossier on teaching.
□ Dossier on other/service contributions.
□ Candidate’s written submission to the RPT committee summarizing his/her case for tenure or promotion.

DEPARTMENT’S MATERIALS:

□ Chair’s assessment of Candidate (FA Article 24)
□ List of Documents considered by the RPT Committee [25.1]
□ Copy of letter sent to referees asking for an assessment of the candidate.
□ Copy of additional communication with referees (when applicable).
□ Copy of messages from potential referees declining to provide an assessment (when applicable).
□ Letters from external referees (note particularly the following FAQs).
  □ Are all letters present, or are missing letters explained?
  □ Is the status of the referee clear, and is the referee’s relations to the candidate known (arm’s length)?
☐ Signed copy of the RPT Committee’s recommendation (Note particularly the following FAQs):
  ☐ Is it completely filled in and signed by all members of the RPT (9) and the candidate (11)?
  ☐ Is the information about teaching effectiveness clear? Are relevant materials in the dossier, if appropriate?
  ☐ Are all references to scholarship consistent with section 7 of the curriculum vitae? Are all publications referred to in the dossier?
  ☐ If grant reviews or publishers’ reviews of the candidate’s work exist, have they been included in the dossier?
  ☐ If the unit’s recommendation is split, is this explained?
  ☐ Are anomalies explained (e.g., publication gaps, incomplete or unpublished manuscripts, relation to referees, relation to Ph.D. thesis, etc.)?
  ☐ If the composition of RPT committee is different for different cases in the department, is this explained? (FAC 2002-03 Sec. 5).

☐ Copies of Annual Performance Reviews and candidate’s responses to them.

If applicable,
  ☐ additional documents considered by RPT [25.2]
  ☐ candidate’s written response to the completed list of documents [25.4]

If applicable,
  ☐ candidate’s written submission to FAC in response to Department’s statement of reasons [32.4.9]

☐ Copy of unit’s document regarding expectations for tenure and promotion (for the FAC’s reference only).

Chair of RPT Committee signature: ______________________________

I have had an opportunity to examine all the material listed above.

Candidate signature: ______________________________

Date: _______________