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The primary mission of the Faculty of Business (FOB) is educating men and women to assume positions of high levels of responsibility in the global business community. As a leading academic institution with this mission and the desire to be recognized for its excellence in pursuit of it, the Faculty’s primary specific goals, especially as they relate to the career expectations placed on faculty members, include the following:

• The development, maintenance and continual up-dating of internationally-oriented management education programs of high standard and acceptance;
• Continual improvement in the quality of international management instruction through the development of instructional methods and materials and the development of effective teachers; and;
• The creation and application of concepts and knowledge about the theory and practice of managing in a global environment.

The current document outlines the criteria and processes for evaluating regular faculty members for reappointment, tenure, promotion and annual salary awards within the FOB.

A Caveat for the Use of This Document

At the outset, it is important to recognize that the policies and procedures prescribed in this document cannot be exhaustive; they cannot anticipate and offer guidelines for every possible reappointment, promotion and tenure case. Moreover, it can not and should not be interpreted literally in all cases. The task of developing, rewarding and maintaining world-class faculty calls for the exercise of judgment on many considerations, and in a variety of combinations. In addition, it should be apparent that a statement such as this is a product of its time, so modifications will be made as circumstance change.

Nevertheless, in order to be of value to the FOB, the precepts of this document must be taken seriously by the committees, senior colleagues and administrators who carry the largest share of the responsibility for decisions regarding the careers of junior\(^1\) colleagues. The intention here is to offer policies and guidelines based on an assumption of mutual trust and respect among colleagues within a system that justifies trust and respect. An express purpose of the document is to provide as much clarity as possible about the principles regulating salary awards, reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions in the FOB. The document intends to strike a multilateral balance between justifiable flexibility, transparency, predictability and reliability, and

\(^1\) The terms “junior colleague” and “senior colleague” are used to refer to the rank and tenure status of FOB colleagues, not to their chronological ages.
a sense of faith that well-intending colleagues will interpret its fundamental values in the spirit with which they are offered. After all, these procedures are based on the collective wisdom of many colleagues, from both within the FOB itself as well as from elsewhere.²

**General Overview**

In accordance with *Framework Agreement* Article 13.1.1, faculty members other than senior instructors and faculty with limited-term appointments are evaluated for salary increases on the basis of

(a) teaching effectiveness,
(b) scholarship and professional achievements, and
(c) other contributions,

in the ratio of 40:40:20 unless the faculty member has pre-negotiated an alternative ratio with the Dean in advance of the period under review. Senior Instructors are evaluated for salary increases on the basis of:

(a) teaching effectiveness and
(b) other contributions

in the ratio of 80:20 unless the Senior Instructor has pre-negotiated an alternative ratio with the Dean in advance of the period under review.

Limited-term Faculty Members are evaluated for salary increases on the basis of:

(a) teaching effectiveness;
(b) coordination of teaching and contribution to development of teaching materials; and
(c) other contributions

in the ratio of 60:20:20 unless the Limited-term Faculty Member has pre-negotiated an alternative ratio with the Dean in advance of the period under review. Such altered ratios may be agreed upon in cases where the faculty member or instructor anticipates an unusual distribution of duties during a limited (and agreed-upon) period of time. Moreover, any adverse effect of sick leave, maternity

---

² This document draws on policy statements from the Darden School, University of Virginia; the School of Business, Queen’s University; the School of Business, University of Michigan; the Ivey School, University of Western Ontario; the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration, The University of British Columbia and the Rotman School, University of Toronto. Additions and significant modifications have been made to suit our purposes, but our debt to these other schools for their assistance and materials should be recognized. The document is also heavily advised by two rounds of extensive collaboration with FOB colleagues during the Winter and Spring of 2000 and by many revisions proposed by Executive Committee, Faculty Retreats and Faculty Council meetings. As noted throughout, it is constrained by and subordinate to the Framework Agreement negotiated by the University of Victoria and the University of Victoria Faculty Association.
or parental leave should be taken into account in the evaluation process.\textsuperscript{3}

The following sections will present the values and expectations of faculty members in relation to the three primary areas of activity: teaching, research and other contributions.

\textbf{TEACHING IN THE FOB}

Excellence in teaching must incorporate a thorough comprehension of the subject matter and literature of the field, a demonstrated ability to understand and evaluate the importance of the research of others, and competence in designing and delivering curricula and courses that effectively relate such knowledge to the problems and practice of management. Moreover, excellent teachers possess an ability to introduce the products of new research into his or her teaching, where appropriate. They also have a high capacity to understand the problems of learners.

\textbf{MULTIPLE ELEMENTS OF TEACHING}

Teaching excellence in the FOB requires more than proficiency in the classroom delivery of content to students. In addition to classroom performance, a strong record of teaching requires that an individual participate in the dissemination of knowledge via other means, such as, for example, course and program development (leading to appropriate outlines and syllabi), creative instructional writings, the preparation of textbooks, collections of readings, cases or case books, technical notes, simulations (and teachers’ guides to the use of such materials), graduate student supervision and even the delivery of seminars and public appearances. A record of excellence in teaching will require achievements in more of these alternative approaches to the dissemination of knowledge as an individual’s career advances. That is, while competent classroom teaching may be sufficient for cases of renewal, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, demonstrated excellence in more of the aforementioned products, genres and outlets will be expected for the demonstration of excellence in teaching for promotion to Professor on the basis of one’s teaching (as opposed to one’s research record). The following sections expand on the meaning and significance of these other genres and outlets.

\textbf{Development of Course Materials}

\textsuperscript{3} This provision is in accordance with an agreement reached by the Joint Committee on the Evaluation of the Framework Agreement, and reported in a memo from the Vice-President Academic and Provost, dated April 23 2001, addressed to Academic Deans and the University Librarian.
Although course materials often take the form of cases, the development of other materials and learning techniques such as lectures, exercises, simulations, videos, computer programs, Web-based activities and CD-ROMs, for example, may also occur and will be valued.

Case writing can also be a valuable activity. Of particular importance are field-based cases presenting the cutting-edge issues of management reality in today’s complex, global organizations. Field-based cases usually either demonstrate concepts and theories in practice or contribute to the development of new concepts and theories. Original field-based cases are valued more highly than revisions or updates to extant cases, cases that are written without field research, or cases that are written only from public documents.

In assessing the impact of an individual’s course materials, several factors are considered. It is not sufficient that materials be developed; they should also meet the market test within the Faculty and by our peers from other academic institutions. For example, these market indicators may include being:

- registered in a recognized case distribution service, or other instructional aids to ensure their ease of adoption within and outside the Faculty;
- used in courses at the Faculty of Business by the faculty member and his or her colleagues;
- used at other business schools, training institutions or on in-company programs;
- published in a textbook (by the faculty member or by someone else), or in a journal;
- the basis for new courses developed at the Faculty of Business or elsewhere; or
- based on external funding that was successfully obtained for the development of materials in the first place.

Supervision of Graduate Students

Project supervision is another element of teaching in the FOB, especially in the MBA Program. Effective supervision of MBA projects goes well beyond assisting with the particulars of the research project that students are working on and involves a significant mentoring relationship. Supervision includes helping candidates to learn about a specific field within their major area of interest; to learn how to structure, implement, conduct and present a specific piece of research; and, often, to learn how to write. The quality of the work a candidate has demonstrated in supervising graduate students forms part of the overall assessment of the candidate’s teaching contribution, as does the number of students supervised.

Evaluation of Teaching

The Framework Agreement (Art. 13.1.2) delineates the procedures by which colleagues’ teaching records are to be evaluated. Subsection (a) of that Article specifies four key points. The first point is that the FOB’s own Evaluation Policy (i.e., the current document) is to determine the specific teaching-related activities and standards to be applied for this purpose. The second point (Art. 13.1.2.b) states that the evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be “... conducted on the
basis of a faculty member’s teaching dossier that, in addition to teaching evaluations, may include such items as peer reviews, class visits, reviews of syllabi and examinations, evidence of innovative teaching and teaching awards.” Third, the Agreement states that “… evidence of teaching effectiveness may include complete aggregated statistical results of all teaching evaluation questionnaires administered ... in a course during the period of review...” in accordance with FOB policy. Finally, if a colleague wishes to include anecdotal or subjective evaluations of a course, made by students or former students in that course, “… all the comments from that course must be included” in the colleague’s dossier (see Framework Agreement Art. 13.7.2 and Art. 12.7.3). The faculty member is not obliged to submit or include such anecdotal or subjective student comments.

In the FOB, students in degree programs and participants in executive development programs play an important, but not the only, role in assessing and providing feedback regarding the content and delivery of teaching through the use of standardized course and teacher evaluation questionnaires. In addition, qualitative input will be sought from fellow faculty members, program directors and course coordinators to form an overall assessment of a colleague’s teaching record.

Summary of Teaching Requirements in the FOB

In summary, the core concept underlying teaching in the Faculty of Business is the dissemination of knowledge to students in our various programs as well as to students of business at other institutions. It consists of far more than the delivery of content in classroom settings. Knowledge can be disseminated by any of a wide variety of means. While mastery in the classroom is expected at all stages of a colleague’s career, excellence in teaching must be defined and demonstrated more broadly as a colleague’s career advances, particularly if teaching excellence is to serve as a primary basis for a case of promotion to Professor. Specifically, teaching effectiveness in the FOB encompasses all of a faculty member’s teaching-related activities. These include:

- delivery of courses in any of the Faculty’s programs (Undergraduate, Master’s, Executive);
- curriculum and course content development;
- the development of teaching materials for classroom use, including textbooks and case writing;
- innovative approaches to teaching contributing to an enhanced learning environment;
- supervision and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students, including directed studies courses and serving as an external examiner either at or outside Uvic;
- policy development in relation to teaching;
- involvement in international student exchanges;
- participation in teaching workshops.

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted on the basis of the faculty member’s teaching dossier. The teaching dossier shall follow the guidelines provided in the
Appendix of this document.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Whereas the essence of teaching is the dissemination of existing knowledge, the goal and essential activities related to research and scholarship are the development of new knowledge. Therefore, evidence of excellence in research and scholarship rests on a candidate’s capacity to develop important knowledge from investigation or from a unique synthesis of existing knowledge. Such excellence may be demonstrated through a wide range of efforts to advance knowledge or understanding through specific project research, in-depth descriptions and analyses of business practices, or the development or improvement of analytical tools relevant to practitioners in the business world. It may be shown also, in part, through stimulating, guiding, and influencing the research of others.

Theoretical and Applied Research

The Faculty of Business places a high value on research into both theoretical and applied problems. Applied research involves the study of problems of importance to workers, entrepreneurs, business managers and executives, union officials or government administrators. The work of outstanding researchers and scholars at business schools normally reflects a problem orientation; it addresses issues of substance in the theory or methods of their fields or, more generally, in the experience of working individuals. The work will not be merely a demonstration of research skill, however impressive, but will have high value for those who would use it to solve problems of theory and practice. Outstanding scholars and researchers, in addition, will communicate their ideas and findings and to relate them to the research of others; show a willingness to translate complex ideas and findings into practical consequences; and show capacity to influence and help the research of others.

In developing a strong research career it is not unusual for new faculty to start from a more theoretical base, moving toward an applied orientation over time. Such a developmental sequence is not necessary however, because of the equal value placed in the FOB on theoretical and applied scholarship. Regardless of their preferred emphasis on either basic or applied problems, faculty members at all ranks are expected to be active in research, publication and presentation of their scholarly activities in some form or another through any of a range of outlets (as discussed below).
Creative Professional Contributions

The Faculty of Business is a professional faculty that seeks to serve a variety of professional and practitioner communities in addition to the many scholarly communities of its faculty members and the various student constituencies represented in its regular and continuing educational programs. It is important that a professional faculty encourage, recognize and reward scholarly achievements that significantly influence the practice of management and administration. These “creative professional contributions” are recognized by the Faculty as a legitimate undertaking by regular tenure-track faculty members and are to be evaluated by the same procedures that are used to assess traditional scholarly research activity. Moreover, while the criteria to be used for evaluating creative professional work differ from those of traditional research activity that is directed at academic communities, the standards used to appraise creative professional activity will be as rigorous as those applied to traditional academic research.

In short, the category of activity referred to in the Framework Agreement as “scholarly achievement” is comprised of two sub-categories for the purposes of reappointment, promotion, tenure and salary adjustment decisions concerning FOB colleagues (who are in regular tenure-track positions). For the sake of reference, they are referred to herein as “academic” and “creative professional” scholarly contributions. It is expected (but not necessary) that scholarly achievements directed primarily at the academic community will comprise most of the research and publication activity of colleagues before they become Professors.

Two primary forms of creative professional activity are recognized in the FOB. The first form is referred to as Professional Innovation/Creative Excellence. This category represents creative professional contributions that have made a substantial impact on the practice of a profession. Examples relevant to the practice of management might include: taking a theoretical advance in futures pricing in finance, inventory control in operations management, or job design in organizational behavior and acting as a key actor in the introduction of such changes to real-world practice. In order to qualify as a creative professional contribution of this form, the faculty member in question must clearly be responsible for the translation, application, and successful conversion of theory into practice, or vice versa.

The second form of creative professional work is referred to as Contributions to the Development of Professional Practice. This category entails leadership in a business profession.

---

4 Ideas for this section borrow heavily from a University of Toronto document entitled Guidelines on Creative professional Achievement (1995) and a University of British Columbia document entitled Appointments, Promotions and Tenure: Policies and Procedures (1994). These documents were used with permission.
that results in true innovation, such as changes in public policy, changes in professional standards or accreditation procedures, or changes in the fundamental ways the profession is practiced. Contributions of this sort require much more than merely serving a professional constituency through its various associations: it requires making an impact on the way the profession is conducted.

Each of these orientations to scholarly achievement (theoretical, applied, creative professional) has its uses at particular stages in the development of knowledge in a particular field of management. Therefore, no single method will be preferred over others simply on the basis of its inherent characteristics. Candidates with outstanding capacity for research are expected to know and use in their work the methods appropriate to the problems and questions studied and will be rewarded for doing so effectively. They will also have demonstrated an ability to initiate major research projects and to see them through to completion and publication.

Other Research-Related Issues

Research may be an independent or cooperative effort. We place a high value on collegiality at the Faculty of Business. Faculty are encouraged to collaborate with colleagues from within and across disciplines and functional areas, and from outside the Faculty to conduct and publish research projects that are larger, longer, riskier, and potentially more important than could be conducted by researchers working alone. At the time of promotion and tenure decisions, candidates must be careful to indicate the nature and significance of the roles they played, relative to the contributions of their collaborators, in the production of the various joint projects (such as publications) in their portfolios.

Just as the FOB seeks to avoid the appointment of tenure-track persons who specialize in day-to-day classroom teaching, the idea of a segment of the faculty being oriented exclusively toward research on a long-term basis is also rejected. It is recognized as necessary, however, for faculty involved in research activities to devote sufficient time to such activities. The Faculty recognizes this need and will provide periods of time for individual faculty to conduct research. These periods are normally from four months to a year in duration.

Evaluation of Research Contributions: Quality and Quantity

The Framework Agreement (Art. 13.1.2) indicates that “Each Faculty’s Evaluation Policy shall specify the factors that should be evaluated under scholarly achievement...” The Faculty values research in its broadest sense: that which leads to publication in high-quality refereed, and scholarly journals, high quality practitioner journals, books and refereed conference proceedings. No specific recommendation or requirement is made concerning the number of publications a candidate should have before obtaining re-appointment, promotion or tenure.⁵

⁵Recall the earlier discussion in this document for the necessity of a justified norm of trust, and the
Nevertheless, RPT committees must strive to adhere to a norm of distributive justice and fairness in the evaluation of candidates’ files, both as they consider multiple cases within a particular academic year as well as when evaluating cases in different years. Candidates for RPT decisions must have a justified basis for believing that the standards to be applied to their research records will not vary significantly from the standards that have been applied in previous years or that are currently being applied to their colleagues’ research portfolios during any given year. On the other hand, the records of candidates who are simultaneously being considered for promotion, tenure or reappointment in a given year are not to be compared with one another as a basis for formal assessment. Rather, each file should be considered against the Faculty’s broader, established standards.

There is frequently debate in business schools about the comparative quality of academic journals, and particularly about the comparative value or importance of professional versus academic journals. Faculty should be seeking to make an impact on the management and academic communities by publishing in the most respected management and academic journals. They should submit their articles to the most important and prestigious professional and academic journals in their fields. In determining the quality and reputation of journals, the RPT Committee will assess characteristics such as reputation within academic or practitioner circles, the acceptance rate for article submissions, readership circulation, and frequency of citation mentions. Research published in cognate disciplines (such as economics, computer science or psychology, for example) will be credited on an equal footing with research published in business journals. The RPT Committee needs to be alert to changing means of faculty publishing and disseminating of the results of their research. The growing popularity of electronic publishing, for example, has the potential to significantly change the fashion in which faculty reach audiences of importance to the FOB.

Work in Progress and Completed Work

Research output has at least two component parts:

- **Work in progress.** This includes presentations of research in progress and working papers. A working paper does not represent a final product. Presentation of research at major academic and practitioner conferences is an activity valued by the Faculty of Business but does not constitute a completed research product in the same way as does an external publication.

- **External Publications.** External publication is essential as a market test for research. The emphasis in evaluating research is, and should be, on quality and the impact that the research has on our target audiences rather than quantity.

Outlets for Scholarship

requirement for judgment rather than for hard-and-fast formulas and rules in the development of colleagues’ careers. As stated earlier, it must be the quality, not merely the quantity, of the individual’s research activities that is considered in evaluating candidates’ scholarly contributions.
While most researchers employ a variety of outlets for disseminating their scholarly activity, the following are among the most important for FOB colleagues:

- **Articles:** The RPT Committee is primarily concerned with the quality of a faculty member’s research and the impact of this work on practitioner and academic audiences. The quantity of research articles and the presence of a clear focus on a particular issue(s) or topic(s) will affect the impact that a faculty member can achieve. Articles accepted by the top management and academic journals are preferred over those in other journals. Given the Faculty’s formal devotion to international business, colleagues must be given credit for publications accomplished off-shore equal to the credit normally attributed to domestic periodicals of comparable status. Accordingly, the same standards of excellence must be applied to assessing the quality of journals and other research outlets on other continents as are applied to North American outlets;

- **Books:** Books reporting the results of research or presenting original conceptual frameworks or theories (as opposed to textbooks) that are subject to a review process with an independent publisher or with external reviewers are encouraged. Other indications of the quality and/or impact of books include awards, book reviews conducted by external experts, adoptions at leading institutions and the level of sales generated. Authored books are granted more academic credit than are collections of pre-published articles;

- **Book Chapters.** Scholars in many business disciplines publish their work in collections of original papers that have been either solicited on a refereed or non-refereed basis or accepted on a competitive basis similar to that employed by periodicals (see Point 1, immediately above). To have a chapter solicited by a book editor is usually a reflection of the status of the author involved: it usually indicates that some segments of the academic community recognize that individual’s work as valuable. To have a chapter selected for a book on the basis of head-to-head competition reflects the same sort of judged market value and importance as is attributed to articles selected competitively in standard periodicals (see Point 1). Hence either variety of book chapter is to be valued by the Faculty as a legitimate form of scholarly contribution. On the other hand, a paper that has already been published (in a journal, for example) and subsequently reprinted in a collection of other papers should not receive as much credit as the paper was originally accorded when it was first published;

- **Refereed Conference Proceedings:** In some fields these proceedings reflect the ideas and research that have the greatest impact on the field. The RPT Committee will assess the quality of the refereeing process and the impact of the proceedings on the field.

Research presentations at the major conferences in one’s area, even if they are not published in proceedings, are important in obtaining feedback from peers on research in progress, and developing a faculty member’s reputation and network of external colleagues. These
presentations also contribute to the Faculty’s reputation of having an active research program and world class faculty. Often contributions in these areas are most difficult to assess, but they should be acknowledged and supported.

**Non-Publishing Indicators of Quality of Scholarly Accomplishment**

In addition to the quality and quantity of published works created by colleagues, other indicators also reflect upon the value of their work in their disciplines. Three examples include citations, external funding and the existence of a coherent research program and plan:

1) **Citations**: Citations reflect the amount of attention received by an article or book and by a faculty member’s research in the academic community. As such it is one measure of a faculty member’s research impact on the School’s audiences;

2) **External Funding**: The Faculty of Business values the acquisition of external funding for research from private and public sectors. Some indicators of performance in this area include the amount of funding obtained and whether proposals were subject to a competitive, external review process such as with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Because of the scarcity of research funds available in Canada, the high time cost and difficulty of producing serious grant proposals, and the high uncertainty of the granting process, faculty should be rewarded for their attempts to gain external grants as well as for their success in attaining them;

3) The existence of a **focused research plan** as well as a coherent stream of research projects is another indicator of excellence in the evaluation of a candidate’s scholarly record. Such a program of research usually features a sequence of grant applications, data collection activities, working papers, presentations and publications. The RPT Committee, in assessing research and scholarly contributions, will consider the full range of a faculty member’s scholarly pursuits.

While faculty at all levels are expected to be active in research, it is recognized that some colleagues will be unable to be as productive as other colleagues, given the periodic demands placed upon them for leadership and service activities. If these other demands are expected to be significant and on-going, faculty should attempt to negotiate with the Dean a ratio for their formal performance assessment different from the 40:40:20 default ratio specified in the Framework Agreement (see Art. 73.4.5.1.d). Upon receiving tenure, colleagues are encouraged to undertake research that is riskier -- and that requires longer periods of planning and completion -- than they would normally attempt before securing tenure. Finally, in recognition of both the high importance to the Faculty of outside research funding and the high risks associated with attempting to generate it, faculty members are to be rewarded for attempting to gain such funding.

**Summary of Research and Scholarship Requirements in the FOB**
Along with teaching effectiveness in its many forms, scholarly achievement is a primary criterion for salary adjustments and for being re-appointed, promoted and tenured in the FOB (Framework Agreement, Article 13.1.1). The Faculty embraces a comparatively liberal definition of scholarship and expects colleagues at all ranks to be actively involved in research and other scholarly activities, and in the publication and presentation of the results of those activities. In faculty members’ research activities, the Faculty values:

- theoretical, applied, and creative professional research;
- both quantitative and qualitative research;
- both independent and cooperative research;
- both shorter-term, narrowly-focused research and “riskier” longer-term, more broadly-focused, interdisciplinary research projects;
- both work in progress and completed, published research.

Conceptual and empirical work are to be valued equally and research methods are to be chosen according to the nature of the question being asked: no method will be deemed a priori as inherently superior or inferior to another.

A variety of outlets for published work are held as legitimate:

- refereed journal publications;
- scholarly books (excluding textbooks);
- book chapters;
- refereed conference proceedings;
- unrefereed publications;
- presentations at research conferences;
- citations;
- external funding;
- research-related fellowships and awards;
- recognition by learned and professional societies;
- the existence of a focused research plan.

The evaluation of research and other scholarly activities shall be conducted on the basis of a faculty member’s curriculum vitae and supporting materials provided by the faculty member.

**“OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS”: SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP**

Every faculty member has the right and obligation to be involved in the life of the Faculty, the University and the larger community. Accordingly, there are many demands placed upon the individual to “serve” other than through research and teaching. Activities such as membership on committees, acting as a teaching section head or program director, counseling and supporting student activities, and serving in a professional capacity outside the University all contribute to the
development of the Faculty and its programs. Collectively, these activities are referred to herein as service and leadership contributions. The Framework Agreement (Sec. 13.1.1) considers these activities under the label other contributions.

In some ways all faculty members carry a service role in the Faculty. Participation in the Faculty Council and its related committees is expected because it is the official decision-making body in all policy and governance matters. In general, the expectation is that all faculty will carry their fair share of this type of service activity.

Evidence of contributions in service may be obtained from an analysis of the importance to the Faculty and University of the positions an individual has held, the challenges faced in those positions and performance in the face of these challenges. Judgments regarding the quality of the service will include consideration of the initiative shown, the ability to conceive and to implement needed change, and the ability to obtain cooperation. Major leadership assignments within the Faculty will normally receive release time from teaching. These include program directors and the Associate Dean. Selection for these assignments is a function of individual desire and ability.

There are also many scholarly activities in which our faculty are engaged that are not easily classifiable as either research or teaching but which contribute to, or are a part of, these “other” endeavors. These activities are important elements of an academic career and contribute directly to the reputation of the faculty member and the Faculty. Examples of important duties include:

- active involvement in professional and/or academic societies;
- appointment to a position on an executive or as a board member of academic/professional organizations;
- organization of academic and practitioner-oriented conferences or serving in some program capacity at these events;
- editorial responsibilities (including membership on editorial boards) and reviewing for the target journals in one’s area of expertise.

In summary, “Other contributions” comprises service to the Faculty, the University, the profession, and the community, and shall include:

- membership on committees;
- acting as a teaching section head or program director;
- counseling and supporting student activities;
- serving in a professional capacity outside the University, consistent with Framework Agreement Article 66 on conflict of commitment;
- active involvement in professional and/or academic organizations;
- organization of academic and practitioner-oriented conferences or serving in some program capacity at these events;
- editorial responsibilities (including membership on editorial boards) and reviewing for journals and other academic publications;
• active collegial engagement with and involvement in the Faculty beyond the minimum teaching and committee service requirements.

The evaluation of service shall be conducted on the basis of a faculty member’s curriculum vitae and supporting materials provided by the faculty member.

COMMITTEES FOR RPT DECISIONS IN THE FOB

The Framework Agreement (Article 32.2.1) provides a range of alternative committee structures for faculties such as the FOB that are not organized on a departmental basis. FOB policy on this matter is for an “… elected committee comprised of Faculty Members who hold Regular Academic Appointments in the Faculty that are higher than the candidate to be evaluated” (Article 32.2.1b). FOB Policy also permits the augmentation of this committee by “… additional voting … Faculty members, elected by the Faculty, who are Faculty Members in another Faculty of the University that are higher in rank than the candidate to be evaluated” (see Framework Agreement, Art. 32.2.1.bii).

For the sake of reference, this committee shall be referred to as the Junior RPT Committee. It should be composed of a minimum of three members plus one alternate, who would be called upon to serve in the event that one of the primary members becomes unable to serve, for any reason. It will deal with cases of appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. It will also deal with the rank and tenure status of new hirings seeking the rank of either assistant or associate professor. To the extent possible, the membership of this Committee should overlap to some degree over consecutive years. No person may serve more than four consecutive years on the Committee. It will serve as a committee of the whole in the preparation of recommendations to the Dean on the dispensation of all cases of re-appointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor arising that year.

A second committee, comprised of at least three elected full professors (plus one alternate), and referred to herein as the Senior RPT Committee, may also be required in a given year, to deal with cases of candidacy for promotion to Full Professor. It will also deal with tenure and rank decisions for cases involving new colleagues recruited to the FOB from outside, and who wish to be granted tenure and Full Professor rank upon entry into the Faculty. FOB Policy also permits the augmentation of the Senior RPT Committee by “… additional voting … Faculty members, elected by the Faculty, who are Faculty Members in another Faculty of the University that are higher in rank than the candidate to be evaluated” (see Framework Agreement, Art. 32.2.1ii). In cases in which the candidate believes that a committee constituted according to these provisions is inappropriate, s/he may challenge the composition of that committee by reference to the provisions of Article 32.4.7(d), which effectively permits the Dean to augment the Committee with persons deemed qualified from outside the University. That Article reads as follows: “Where the Dean determines that the membership of the Committee needs augmentation under Article 32.4.7(a)(ii), she or he will add a member to the Committee who is knowledgeable with regard to either the
candidate’s methods or field of research or the candidate’s teaching methods.”

A separate (third) committee is to be constituted to deal with appointment matters. As per the Framework Agreement Articles 32.4.1 and 32.4.2, a committee must have a minimum of three Faculty Members and an alternate Faculty Member to serve on a Committee when a regular member is unable to serve. To ensure new hires to the faculty help to meet our teaching mandate, the Director of the Undergraduate Program (BCOM) and Director of the Graduate Program (MBA) will serve as ex-officio members on the Appointments Committee. The Faculty of Business chooses to select a total of four (4) members, including the two ex-officio Directors as above, to ensure that after consideration of availability and eligibility, there will be an adequate number of members to serve.

Sections 22 and 23 of the Framework Agreement spell out the procedures to be followed by the candidate, the Dean and the RPT committee(s) for the preparation of the candidate, the selection of external referees and other administrative matters related to RPT decisions.

**ANNUAL SALARY REVIEW PROCESS**

**Period of Review**

The period of review is as specified in the *Framework Agreement* Article 73.3.4

**Documentation Required**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to ensure that the documentation required for the salary evaluation is up-to-date and submitted to the Dean’s Office by March 31 of each year. In particular, each faculty member must provide the Dean with:

(a) an Annual Activity Report highlighting his/her accomplishments during the period of review (three years preceding January 1 of the year in which the review is made as under Article 73.3.4.1);

(b) a copy of his/her C.V.;

(c) a teaching dossier.

A faculty member on leave must adhere to the above, ensuring that his/her C.V. is up-to-date and that his/her teaching dossier is available and up-to-date for the period of review. Failure to provide the documentation required for salary evaluation will normally make the faculty member ineligible for a Career Progress Increment (CPI) and Merit Increments (MIs), as the Dean and the Advisory Committee on Annual Review will not have the necessary information for an informed assessment.

**CPI and MI Recommendations**
The evaluation process regarding Career Progress Increments (CPIs) shall adhere to the guidelines and evaluation standards specified in section 73.5 of the *Framework Agreement.*

The evaluation process regarding Merit Increments (MIs) shall adhere to the guidelines and evaluation standards specified in section 73.6 of the *Framework Agreement.*

**Feedback to Faculty Members**

At the time the Dean submits his/her recommendations to the Vice-President Academic, the Dean shall provide each faculty member with a summary of the evaluation of that member which shall contain:

(a) notice of whether a CPI is recommended and the number of MIs recommended for the faculty member, and
(b) written justification prepared by the Dean on Performance Review as part of the evaluation of the faculty member.

Appendix on Teaching Dossier follows....
APPENDIX: TEACHING DOSSIER

As outlined in Section 13.6 of the Framework Agreement, each faculty member is expected to maintain a teaching dossier. The teaching dossier must include:

• A summary of the member’s teaching responsibilities and contributions for the period under review;
• The numerical summaries for the standard Faculty of Business student evaluations of courses taught by the faculty member during the period of evaluation.

It may also include:

• Evaluations of courses taught outside the Faculty;
• Student comments on course evaluations by other means. If comments from course evaluations are included, all the comments from that course must be included;
• Supporting documentation such as course materials that demonstrate innovative approaches to teaching, syllabi of newly-developed courses, details of teaching awards, unsolicited letters or e-mails from students, peer evaluations, etc.

It is suggested that faculty use the following outline in preparing their teaching dossier, remembering that the dossier should be restricted to the period under review and that not all sections need be included:

• Teaching Responsibilities (courses taught, numbers of students, graduate student supervision);
• Approach to Teaching;
• Teaching Goals and Objectives;
• Curriculum / Course Development and Innovation in Teaching;
• Numerical Summaries of Student Course Evaluations;
• Supporting Documentation.

This outline is based on model dossier #3 from The Teaching Dossier Kit, UVic Learning and Teaching Centre, 5th edition, August 2000. Faculty may wish to consult that document when preparing their teaching dossiers. It is available on the Learning and Teaching Centre Web site at http://web.uvic.ca/~terc/resources/publications/teaching.htm.

To assist the Dean and the Advisory Committee on Annual Review, who must review faculty teaching dossiers every year, faculty are strongly encouraged to limit supporting documentation to those items truly required to demonstrate teaching effectiveness and innovation beyond the normal expectations.