

Faculty Evaluation Policy



**University
of Victoria**
Science

July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2025

Ratified: July 21, 2023



Contents

Contents

1. PREAMBLE	4
2. WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIONS	4
2.1. Introduction	4
2.2. Normal Workloads	4
2.3. Alternative and Reduced Workloads.....	5
3. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION	5
3.1. Introduction	5
3.2. The evaluation criteria.....	5
3.3. Evaluation of Teaching	6
3.3.1. Peer Reviews of Teaching.....	6
3.3.2. Reviews of Course Materials.....	7
3.4. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity	8
3.4.1. Evaluation of Research (Research Stream).....	9
3.4.2. Evaluation of Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream)	10
3.5. Evaluation of Service.....	11
4. DOCUMENTATION OF PERFORMANCE	11
4.1. The Official Performance File	11
4.2. Review of Career Progress.....	12
4.3. The Curriculum Vitae.....	12
4.4. The Teaching Dossier.....	12
4.5. Summary statement for salary adjustments	13
4.6. Summary statement for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion	13
5. SALARY EVALUATION PROCESS	13
5.1. Introduction	13
5.2. Evaluation-based salary adjustments.....	14
5.3. Evaluation Period.....	14
5.4. Meeting with Chair (Agreement sections 50.33-50.34)	14
5.5. Chair’s evaluation.....	15
5.6. Chair’s recommendations to Dean (Agreement section 50.36)	15
5.7. Dean’s evaluation and recommendation	16
6. REAPPOINTMENT, CONTINUING APPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION	16
6.1. Introduction	17

6.2.	General considerations	17
6.2.1.	Documentation to be considered by ARPT committees.....	17
6.2.2.	When to apply for Tenure and/or Promotion.....	17
6.2.3.	Evaluation of prior employment (CA 33.23.1)	18
6.2.4.	Referees (Agreement sections 33.5-33.22)	18
6.3.	Reappointment processes for Research Stream and Teaching Stream Faculty (CA 27).....	18
6.4.	Tenure/Promotion processes for Research Stream and Teaching Stream Faculty (CA 28 & 29) ...	19
6.4.1.	Tenure/Promotion deadlines	19
6.4.2.	Tenure/Promotion Criteria for Research Stream Faculty	19
6.4.3.	Tenure/Promotion Criteria for Teaching Stream Faculty.....	19
7.	APPENDIX A1: DEPARTMENT ARPT CHECKLIST	21
8.	Appendix A2: Department ARPT checklist.....	25
9.	Appendix A3: Department ARPT checklist.....	26
10.	Appendix B Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor .	27
11.	Appendix C: Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from tenured Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.....	29
12.	Appendix D Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor	31
13.	Appendix E: Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Assistant Teaching Professor to tenured Associate Teaching Professor	32
14.	Appendix F: Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor.....	34

1. PREAMBLE

This document describes the Faculty-wide framework for evaluating members of the Faculty of Science consistent with the 2022 - 2025 University of Victoria and University of Victoria Faculty Association Collective Agreement (hereafter, "Agreement" or CA). The Agreement can be found at:

<https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/collective-agreement.pdf>.

Article 1 of the Collective Agreement summarizes the institutional values. Academic responsibilities are described in Articles 2 and 12 of the Collective Agreement. This policy does not replace the Agreement, which takes precedence.

Minor administrative exceptions to the requirements of the Faculty Evaluation Policy (hereafter FEP) may be made on consent of the affected Faculty Member and their Dean, provided there is no breach of the Collective Agreement. Exceptions that go beyond minor administrative matters must be waived on consent of the Provost (or designate) and the President of the Faculty Association (or designate). Affected Faculty Members have the right to consult with the Faculty Association before providing their consent. (CA 25.4).

Transitional provisions for RPT/CA and Salary Evaluation under the 2022-2025 Collective Agreement are provided for salary adjustments effective July 2024, and for reappointment/promotion effective July 1, 2024, July 1, 2025 and July 1, 2026. They can be found at:

<https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/faculty-relations/conditions-of-appointment/lou.2021salaryevaluationprocess.pdf>.

2. WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIONS

2.1. Introduction

In evaluating Faculty Member's performance for the purpose of salary adjustments, Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion, the evaluation will be based on the distribution of responsibilities for the Member. Each of the three components of Academic Responsibilities are important in supporting the scholarly mission of the institution, and expectations for workload and for performance of each Member relate to all categories relevant to the position.

2.2. Normal Workloads

Sections 13.12 and 13.13 of the Agreement detail the Normal Workload Distribution for Research Stream and Teaching Stream Faculty, respectively.

Research Stream Faculty in Science currently holding a Canada Research Chair (CRC) will normally have a Teaching/Research/Service Workload distribution of 20%/60%/20% or can request research funds *in lieu* of teaching release. The Workload distribution for other Research Chair positions is informed by the terms of reference of the position.

Workload distributions for Department Chairs and Associate Chairs in the Faculty of Science are determined at the time of appointment. Normally these administrative positions are

recommended to include a minimum of 40% Service for Department Chairs and a minimum of 30% Service for Associate Chairs.

The constitution of each component of the Workload is defined in Unit Standards, as described in sections 13.1-13.10 of the Agreement.

In assessing Teaching Workload, Departments will consider all forms of a Member's Teaching portfolio including both graduate and undergraduate, classroom or otherwise. The weighting of these components in the evaluation of Teaching is specified within the Unit Standard.

According to the Agreement section 13.15 it is recognized that minor, short-term fluctuations in the Workload associated with Teaching and Service may occur from year to year based on the operational needs of the Department. The Workload of each Faculty Member shall be equivalent to the Normal Workload identified in the Unit Standard when averaged over a maximum of five years.

2.3. Alternative and Reduced Workloads

As described in sections 13.16 and 13.57-13.74 of the Agreement, it is possible for a Faculty Member's Workload distribution to deviate from their Normal Workload under an Alternative Workload Agreement for a specified period.

Sections 13.75-13.90 of the CA describe the possibilities and processes for Reduced Workloads. In accordance with section 25.27 of the Agreement, assessment of performance against evaluation criteria must take into consideration the presence of any Reduced Workload or Alternative Workload arrangement or any approved leave or reduced period of service applicable to a Member during the evaluation period. Such arrangements shall not impact the qualitative expectations for performance, but shall alter the quantitative expectations pro-rata to the Normal Workload expectation. For assessment with respect to Re-appointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure and Promotion where the standard to be achieved is absolute, that standard must be achieved notwithstanding a Reduced or Alternative Workload.

3. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

3.1. Introduction

Evaluation of performance of Faculty Members takes place prior to decisions regarding Reappointment, Continuing Appointments, Tenure, Promotion, and biennial awarding of Salary adjustment. The following section defines the criteria used in Members' evaluations in the Faculty of Science.

3.2. The evaluation criteria

In accordance with Article 25 of the Agreement, the criteria for evaluation of Members' performance are:

- a) Teaching performance, as described in sections 25.7-25.14 of the Agreement.

- b) Research, scholarship and creative activity (for Research Stream Faculty) as described in sections 25.16-25.18; and Scholarly Activity (for Teaching Stream Faculty) as described in section 25.19-25.21.
- c) Service, as described in section 25.22 of the Agreement.

3.3. *Evaluation of Teaching*

UVic, through its Division of Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation, LTSI, provides support and resources to faculty and instructors at all career stages to enhance student learning and further develop teaching. Details can be found at <https://www.uvic.ca/learningandteaching/faculty/index.php>.

Resources within the Faculty include assigned mentors, other faculty members, faculty peer evaluators, and the Chair's Office. Members are encouraged to seek advice on the preparation of documentation for evaluation.

Evaluation of Teaching includes, but is not limited to, consideration of evidence as described in Sections 25.7-25.18 of the Agreement. In the Faculty of Science, the following additional evidence will also be considered as applicable:

- a) mentoring and supervision of Highly Qualified Personnel, such as postdoctoral researchers, and research assistants.

Scholarly works relating to teaching, curriculum development, or learning will normally be considered part of research or scholarly activity (see FEP 3.4.1.a and 3.4.2.a).

A Unit Standard may expand the evaluation of Teaching provided any expansion is in compliance with the FEP and the Agreement.

Teaching Performance is evaluated both by achievement (quality of instruction) and activity (e.g., number of courses taught), with more emphasis placed on the former.

The use of Course Experience Survey frequency distributions shall be consistent with sections 25.32-25.35 of the Agreement.

3.3.1. *Peer Reviews of Teaching*

The collective agreement distinguishes between *formative peer reviews of teaching* and *summative peer reviews of teaching*, where the former is used primarily to help the instructor improve the delivery of the instruction and the latter is used primarily for evaluation purposes. While a Member can elect to include a formative review of teaching in their teaching dossier, it cannot replace a summative peer review of teaching.

It is important that peer review of teaching, when used as part of an evaluative process, be fair, equitable, transparent, and rigorous, and be undertaken in a way that is consistent and supported by current learning and teaching research within the Departments. Specific guidelines shall be found in the Unit Standards.

In the Faculty of Science, if more than one course is being evaluated for a summative peer

review of teaching, it is required that at least one of these courses should, if applicable, be at the 100 or 200 level. It is also preferable that different courses taught by the Member are reviewed.

Summative and formative peer reviews of teaching are performed by evaluators, who are Faculty Members generally in the Faculty of Science with a strong record of teaching, and who are appointed by the Dean on recommendation by the unit (CA 25.12). Units are encouraged to consider equity, diversity, and inclusion principles when selecting potential peer evaluators.

The Faculty of Science appoints a minimum of one peer evaluator per unit. All peer evaluators share the responsibility of providing both summative and formative peer reviews of teaching. Each unit will determine the minimum number of peer evaluators appropriate for their unit.

The evaluators will receive training coordinated by LTSI, and are provided by the Faculty with an assessment template. The assessment template can be expanded by the units according to their unit standard.

For each peer evaluation, the peer evaluator(s) are assigned by the Chair according to principles defined in the Unit Standards. Peer evaluators must have an arms-length relationship to the Member. The requirement for an arms-length relationship excludes colleagues whose judgment may be perceived as biased from being selected as peer evaluators. A Member can oppose the assignment of a particular peer evaluator based on CA 49.29-49.38 (Reasonable Apprehension of Bias).

Peer evaluators can be assigned to perform evaluations outside their home unit(s) and do not have to be subject experts in the field under review.

It is the responsibility of both the Member and the Chair to ensure that the required peer evaluations are carried out on a timely basis. The schedule for peer reviews of teaching for the purposes of renewal, tenure, and promotion is given by the Agreement.

In addition to formal peer reviews, Faculty Members are encouraged to make use of the expertise and experience of colleagues to obtain informal evaluation of their Teaching at any stage of their career.

3.3.2. *Reviews of Course Materials*

The evaluation of Teaching includes a scheduled review of course materials to “ensure program requirements are met, course materials are current, best pedagogy is engaged and support is given in enabling instructor attention to universal design methods, equity principles, decolonization and/or Indigenization, and optimal assessment methodologies” (CA 25.15). The schedule is given in CA 25.10.

In the Faculty of Science, this review will be conducted by a unit pedagogy committee consisting of 2-3 members per unit. The composition of the committee is determined either by the unit standard or the respective departmental policy.

The unit’s pedagogy committee reviews materials for each assigned course and provides comments to assist the Member in developing best pedagogy and ensuring compliance with the

University's expectations and standards. The feedback by the pedagogy committee shall lie on mentorship and constructive feedback on teaching pedagogy (Art 25.5c and 25.15).

Expectations and standards regarding course syllabi and course outlines are provided in the [university calendar](#). University Course Outline regulations are currently (Summer 2023) under review and are likely to evolve in the coming months and years.

The Member provides the following materials to members of the pedagogy committee for each respective course:

1. The most recent course outline, including the methods and weights of assessment, and a list of learning outcomes for the course.
2. Any other material required according to the Unit Standards, such as examples of final exams, lecture materials, or the final grade distribution.
3. The Member may choose to provide a brief explanation of their contribution to course development, delivery and administration, including a description of the role in developing the course materials, if applicable.
4. The Member may choose to include a description of the instructor's attention to pedagogical best practices, such as universal design methods, equity principles, decolonization and Indigenization, and optimal assessment methods.

The deadline for submission of these materials is December 1st, to be included in the annual evaluation.

The unit pedagogy committee shall provide their assessment of the course to the Member and to the Chair or Director within 20 working days of the scheduled review date.

The assessment by the pedagogy committee must include their assessment of:

- the course's suitability to meet the stated learning objectives,
- the adequacy of the assessment methods,
- contributions of the instructor to the course development, delivery, and administration, if applicable and provided, and
- the instructor's attention to pedagogical best practices such as universal design methods, equity principles, decolonization and Indigenization, if applicable and provided.

The Member shall respond on the pedagogy committee's assessment in writing to the Chair or Director to address any areas indicated for improvement, and may provide commentary on their views of the assessment. Comments by the Member must be received by the Chair or Director within 5 working days of receiving the course evaluation, and will be included with their assessment in the Teaching Dossier.

The enforcement and extension of deadlines for this process are at the discretion of the Chair or Director.

3.4. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

As articulated in section 25.16 of the Agreement, “*Research means continuing mastery of one’s field of knowledge and the awareness of current scholarship in one’s own and closely related fields, and the nature, quality, and extent of one’s research, scholarship and creative activity as described in the FEP and Unit Standard applicable to the Faculty Member. Research includes, but is not limited to discipline-based research, discipline based education research, clinical research and community-engaged research*”.

Similarly, 25.19 of the Agreement states, “*Scholarly Activity means activities which enhance teaching ability or effectiveness including: continuing mastery of one’s field of knowledge and the awareness of current Scholarship in one’s own and closely related fields; and the nature, quality, and extent of one’s own work; independent research on the scholarship of teaching and learning; and activities enhancing one’s ability to engage in research-enriched teaching, and the nature, quality, and extent of one’s own work, as described in the FEP and Unit Standard applicable to the Faculty Member*”.

As an expectation of the Research component or Scholarly Activity component of Academic Responsibilities, the Member will keep abreast of current developments in their respective fields and are expected to make contributions on an ongoing basis to Research or Scholarly Activity as defined in 25.16 or 25.19 of the Collective Agreement, respectively.

In evaluating Research and Scholarly Activity, proper weight should be given to the quality, as well as the amount of Research or Scholarly Activity, for example, the number of peer-reviewed publications. Thus, for example, a single ground-breaking research publication may have more intrinsic value than a large number of derivative publications, and this should be reflected in the evaluation. Also, it is important to assess the contributions of a Member to publications in which colleagues collaborate, either within a discipline or across disciplinary boundaries. The Faculty of Science is committed to the principle that there is merit in collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship, and that there may be a uniquely synergistic character to such work.

The onus is on the Member to explain collaborative and/or inter-disciplinary research in their Summary Statement (see sections [4.5](#) and [4.6](#) of this Policy) and this must be considered when making evaluations.

3.4.1. *Evaluation of Research (Research Stream)*

Evaluation of Research includes, but is not limited to, consideration of evidence in the CV as described in Sections 25.17-25.18 of the Agreement.

In the Faculty of Science, the following additional evidence will also be considered as applicable:

- a) authorship of refereed research publications in recognized scholarly journals, where the expectation for the number of papers published will be appropriate to the discipline; publications on the scholarship of teaching in respected journals is considered a form of scholarship;
- b) authorship of invited and contributed book chapters, monographs, and electronic media;
- c) the presentation of posters or contributed talks at conferences (regional, national, or

international);

- d) the delivery of invited seminars or lectures at scientific conferences or at other universities or institutions;
- e) the securing of external, peer-reviewed research funding; the percent contribution to a Member's research from multi-applicant grants should be clearly stated;
- f) contributions to knowledge mobilization, as indicated by, for example, patents obtained or research partnerships with non-academic collaborators;
- g) documented activities and outputs related to clinical scholarship, including clinical practice, conducting of clinical trials, development of technology that impacts health and well-being;
- h) other evidence, including external non-peer reviewed funding, patents applied for but not yet issued, and non-refereed publications.

A Unit Standard may expand the evaluation of Research provided any expansion is in compliance with the Agreement.

3.4.2. *Evaluation of Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream)*

Evaluation of Scholarly Activity includes, but is not limited to, consideration of evidence in the CV as described in Sections 25.19-25.20 of the Agreement. In the Faculty of Science, the following additional evidence will also be considered as applicable:

- a) authorship of refereed publications on the scholarship of teaching in recognized scholarly journals;
- b) the presentation of posters or contributed talks at conferences (regional, national, or international);
- c) the delivery of invited seminars or lectures at scientific conferences or at other universities or institutions;
- d) documented activities and outputs related to clinical scholarship, including clinical practice, conducting of clinical trials, development of technology that impacts health and well-being;
- e) the securing of external, peer-reviewed funding for scholarly activity; the percent contribution to a Member's research activity from multi-applicant grants should be clearly stated;
- f) other evidence, including external non-peer reviewed funding, and non-refereed publications;
- g) documented activities demonstrating the enhancement of the Member's ability to engage in research informed teaching;
- h) documented activities demonstrating continuing mastery of the Member's field of scientific research that enhances teaching effectiveness.

A Unit Standard may expand the evaluation of Scholarly Activity provided any additional aspects align with the requirements outlined in the Agreement.

3.5. Evaluation of Service

Evaluation of Service includes, but is not limited to, consideration of evidence in the CV as described in Section 25.22 of the Agreement. In the Faculty of Science, the following additional evidence will also be considered as applicable:

- a) documented mentoring of colleagues, and;
- b) contributions to public awareness of the Member's discipline or research area, or to public debate of issues related to academic matters.

In the Faculty of Science, service performed external to the university should not completely replace service performed in support of the unit, Faculty, or University. Members' participation in service at the Unit, Faculty, or University-level is a requirement of collective governance.

A Unit Standard may expand the evaluation of Service provided any additional aspects align with the requirements outlined in the Agreement. A Unit Standard may also specify the relative contributions of service external to the university and internal to the university.

4. DOCUMENTATION OF PERFORMANCE

4.1. The Official Performance File

Based on section 18.3 of the Collective Agreement, a Faculty Member's Official Performance File, OPF, shall include:

- a) the Member's Curriculum Vitae;
- b) the Member's Teaching Dossier, which includes:
 - Course Experience Survey frequency distributions;
 - Peer reviews of teaching (see section 3.3.1 of this Policy) and any responses to them;
 - Reviews of Course Materials consisting of the description of the course(s) (see 3.3.2), the assessment by the pedagogy committee, and any response to the assessment;
- c) recommendations with regard to Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure, or Promotion decisions made by a Department committee, the University Academic Appointments Committee, Appointments Committee, Dean or the President of the University, including all documents specified in the list of documents provided to the candidate with the committee recommendation,
- d) recommendations for salary adjustments by a Chair, Director, Dean, or the Vice-President Academic and Provost, including decisions by the Vice-President Academic and Provost with regard to a Member's request for a salary review,

- e) annual reviews of a Faculty Member and any responses to them,
- f) reports with regard to the Member by a body appointed under the *Discrimination and Harassment Policy and Procedures* (GV0205); the Policy on Scholarly Integrity; and any other University policy.

A Member's OPF will be deemed to include any publications of the Member that are referred to in the Member's curriculum vitae, without the need to physically include a copy in the OPF.

4.2. Review of Career Progress

A detailed description of the Annual Review process, including the generation of a written report and the opportunity to respond, is provided in sections 26.2-26.11 of the Agreement.

All written material relevant to an Annual Review is to be contained in the Member's OPF.

Information regarding responses and dispute resolution of the Annual Review are provided in sections 26.5-26.10 of the Agreement.

Section 26.11 of the Agreement states that upon the request of a Faculty Member with Tenure or Continuing Appointment, or upon the initiative of the Chair, an annual meeting will be held to discuss the Faculty Member's career progress. Upon the request of a Faculty Member, or upon the initiative of the Chair, the latter will provide the Faculty Member with a written summary of the discussion.

4.3. The Curriculum Vitae

Section 26.11 of the Agreement states that upon the request of a Faculty Member with Tenure or Continuing Appointment, or upon the initiative of the Chair, an annual meeting will be held to discuss the Faculty Member's career progress. Upon the request of a Faculty Member, or upon the initiative of the Chair, the latter will provide the Faculty Member with a written summary of the discussion.

The standard CV and Teaching Dossier (based on the UVic Standard format) are available electronically:

<https://www.uvic.ca/science/facultystaff/forms/index.php>

As articulated in section 25.29 of the Agreement, the CV records a Member's Research/Scholarly activity, and Service contributions. Members are required to update their CV's annually and submit them to the Unit's Office by January 31st as electronic documents, without hardcopy, as a MS Word document, an rtf file, or a pdf file.

4.4. The Teaching Dossier

As per section 25.31 of the Agreement, each Member must maintain a Teaching Dossier (TD), which is contained in the Member's Official Performance File. Within the Faculty, Members are required to submit their Teaching Dossiers to the Unit's Office annually by January 31st as

electronic documents, without hardcopy, as a MS Word document, an rtf file, or a pdf file.

The Teaching Dossier includes the Member's course review submission (FEP article 3.3.2) and all associated correspondence (CA 25.15).

A Member's Teaching Dossier will be deemed to include Course Experience Survey frequency distributions, without the need to physically include a copy in the OPF. Rather, Chairs and Deans may access this data electronically.

In addition to the Teaching Dossier defined by the Faculty's template, Members may attach, as appropriate, student comments on teaching, and comments from former students. If student comments for a course are to be added to the Teaching Dossier, section 25.35 of the Agreement stipulates that **all** comments from that course must be included. Members may also attach a statement concerning programs to which they contribute.

4.5. Summary statement for salary adjustments

Consistent with section 50.33 of the CA, Faculty members shall provide a summary statement (maximum 3 pages, 12 pt font, single spacing) which provides a descriptive narrative of their performance during the evaluation period for salary adjustment. The statement shall be submitted to the Unit no later than January 31st in the evaluation year. In general, the summary should complement and/or clarify, rather than reiterate, information evident in the Member's CV and Teaching Dossier. The summary should pay particular attention to describing the importance and impact of work outlined in the CV and Teaching Dossier in the context of the discipline, especially when it is measured in ways beyond traditional academic publishing. This should include a description of contribution to multiple PI collaborations and funding. Service contributions external to UVic should also be clearly explained.

4.6. Summary statement for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion

At the time of evaluation, a Member shall provide a statement of no more than 3 pages in length, to be part of their Official Performance File. The purpose of this document is to provide a brief descriptive narrative of their Research/Scholarly Activity and Teaching that goes beyond the information provided in their CV, and to provide their sense of the importance and impact of their work in the context of their general discipline. Members are asked to use this document to explain the nature of and contributions to the collaborative research listed in their CV. This document will be included in the material sent to external referees.

5. SALARY EVALUATION PROCESS

5.1. Introduction

As per section 50.26 of the Agreement, evaluations for salary adjustment take place biennially. According to section 50.31 of the Agreement, the Faculty of Science is in Group B; that is, salary reviews are undertaken in even numbered years.

As a matter of disciplinary and departmental practice, evaluation committees may refer to reliable sources of external information that are not included in the applicant's application, to support the rigorous academic review of the application, provided the sources to be considered are identified in the Unit Standard. Examples of appropriate sources include, but are not limited to, journal impact factors and citation indices, course experience survey frequency distributions (as per 25.32-25.35 of the Agreement), and any other sources identified in the Unit Standards.

In assessing research, the evaluation committees should consult the [Declaration on Research Assessment \(DORA\)](#) for guidance, and recognize that the scientific content of the research output is more important than publication metrics, or the identity or the journals in which it is published. In addition, the committees should consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

5.2. Evaluation-based salary adjustments

The three possible salary adjustments based on Evaluation of Members are:

- (a) Career Progress Increment (CPI) (see Agreement sections 50.13-50.18);
- (b) Performance Pay Increment (PPI) (see Agreement sections 50.19-50.22); and
- (c) Outstanding Performance Recognition (OPR) (see Agreement sections 50.23-50.24).

As described in section 50.10 of the Agreement, a Member at Reduced Workload will have their salary adjustment reduced by multiplying the value of the increments awarded by the FTE value of the appointment.

5.3. Evaluation Period

Section 50.32 of the Agreement describes the Evaluation Period, considerations for Members on Leaves, considerations for Members with Alternative or Reduced Workloads, and considerations for Members whose appointments at UVic do not cover the whole Evaluation Period.

For clarity, any assessment of performance against evaluation criteria must take into consideration the presence of any Reduced Workload or Alternative Workload arrangement or any approved leave or reduced period of service applicable to a Member during the evaluation period. Such arrangements shall not impact the qualitative expectations for performance, but shall alter the quantitative expectations pro-rata to the Normal Workload expectation.

5.4. Meeting with Chair (Agreement sections 50.33-50.34)

No later than February 21st in the evaluation year, each Member shall meet with their Chair to discuss their performance during the review period. The Member and the Chair may agree to a discussion format other than an in-person meeting where warranted. In the case of faculty with Eligibility for Tenure or Continuing Appointment, this discussion can occur during the Annual Review meeting (Agreement section 26.2-26.10), providing the combined meeting is held before February 21.

5.5. Chair's evaluation

As per section 50.35 of the Agreement, after meeting with the Member, the Chair will assess the Member's performance as either:

- a) "meets expectations". This assessment implies the Member has fulfilled their Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activity, and Service Expectations as defined in their Unit Standard.
- b) "does not meet expectations". Failure to meet expectations in any of the three duty types (Teaching, Research or Scholarly Activity, Service) warrants this assessment.
- c) "exceeds expectations". This assessment requires demonstrated performance that is substantially above the expectations (in one or more of Teaching, Research or Scholarly Activity, Service) relative to career stage, as defined in their Unit Standard.

To achieve equity in the evaluation process both within a Department and between Departments, evaluation of Members shall be conducted in relation to their stage of career (Agreement section 25.26) and Workload Distribution (section 2 of this Policy; see also Agreement sections 25.27 and 50.32.5), correlated against evaluation criteria (section 3 of this Policy.).

5.6. Chair's recommendations to Dean (Agreement section 50.36)

By March 1 of the year of evaluation, Chairs will provide to the Dean:

- a) The assessment rating for each Member.
- b) For any Member assessed as "does not meet expectations", a memo outlining the performance concerns which support the assessment and any supporting documentation (Agreement section 50.36.2).
- c) Recommendations for PPI: Members assessed as "exceeds expectations" are eligible for PPI. Across the Faculty up to 30% of the members (excluding chairs and associate deans) will receive PPI awards (see CA 50.21 and section 5.7 of this Policy); Chairs shall provide a ranked list of all Members who "exceed expectations" and provide a memo for each Member outlining their assessment. Members whose years of service exceeds the eligibility window for CPI are still eligible for PPI.
- d) Recommendations for OPR: Members assessed as "exceeds expectations" are also eligible for OPR. Across the Faculty up to 10% of the members (excluding chairs and associate deans) will receive OPR (see CA 50.22 and section 5.7 of this Policy); Chairs shall provide a memo for each outlining their assessment, contextualized by the OPR criteria outlined below. Members whose years of service exceeds the eligibility window for CPI are still eligible for OPR.

Members will be notified by the Chair of their assessment and salary recommendation after approved by the Vice-President Academic and Provost (Agreement section 50.39).

Since the proportion of PPI and OPR awards available to the Faculty is fixed (see section 5.2 of

this Policy and CA Article 50), the assessment of achievement is, in fact, an exercise in determining the relative ranking within the faculty; that is, in determining who in the Faculty is most deserving of PPI and OPR. If, or as, the levels of performance in the Faculty increase, so will the effort and achievement required to attain a given salary adjustment. As such, a Member who receives a PPI and/or an OPR in a particular year may not necessarily receive either or both in the subsequent evaluation period, even if their performance remains at a similar level.

5.7. Dean's evaluation and recommendation

In accordance with section 50.37 of the Agreement, the Dean will make recommendations to the Provost for CPI, PPI, and OPR based on the ranked lists from the Chairs. The Dean's recommendations regarding OPR do not have to follow the Chairs' nominations (see CA 50.37).

In addition to the ranked lists, the Dean will take into consideration:

- the proportional distribution of PPI and OPR among the Departments,
- the proportional distribution of PPI and OPR among academic ranks, and
- the proportional distribution of PPI and OPR among research-stream faculty and teaching-stream faculty.

The Dean shall evaluate the Chairs and determine assessments as per section 5.5 of this Policy and using the allocation of PPI described in CA 50.22. In the performance evaluation process under Section 50, the Research and Teaching components of the Chair's Academic Responsibilities are evaluated by the Dean in relation to the Chair's peers in their Department. The Service component is evaluated in relation to the other Chairs and Directors in the Faculty.

In the Faculty of Science, the OPR recognizes a singular achievement in any one of the Teaching, Research or Scholarly Activities, Service responsibilities, as opposed to a cumulative record, within the evaluation period. Examples of such achievements *could* include, but are not limited to:

- a) a major external award or recognition;
- b) a significant publication or research achievement (e.g. patent);
- c) a significant curricular development or achievement (e.g. a new program, an innovative development in curriculum or teaching reform);
- d) election to a significant professional, national or international leadership role;
- e) a significant national or international recognition;
- f) an output of high societal impact.

The Dean shall notify the Vice-President Academic and Provost of their recommendations, seeking approval of the assessments and OPR awards no later than May 1 in their scheduled year of evaluation.

6. REAPPOINTMENT, CONTINUING APPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

6.1. Introduction

This Policy provides guidance to a Member on the attainment of Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure and Promotion. Alongside the Unit Standard and the Agreement, it provides the basis for discussion between a Member and their Chair about their responsibilities and evaluations of achievement. The FEP is not a comprehensive reference and the Faculty Member is responsible for reviewing and following the relevant provisions in the Agreement and expectations set out in this FEP and the Member's Unit Standard.

Although the Chair and, possibly, peer-mentors are expected to provide guidance, the responsibility for successful performance – and the articulation and demonstration of said success – rests with the Member. Whenever a Faculty Member is appointed with eligibility for Tenure or Continuing Appointment, the Department Chair is responsible for providing the Faculty Member with a written statement of current performance expectations. By May 15 of each year, the Chair will meet with the eligible Faculty Member to discuss performance as described under sections 26.1-26.10 of the CA. Notwithstanding this statement, the FEP and Unit Standards, which may change from time to time, define the criteria that will be applied in considerations for granting Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Promotion and Tenure.

6.2. General considerations

6.2.1. *Documentation to be considered by ARPT committees*

In addition to the CV, Teaching Dossier, and Research Statement or Teaching Statement in the case of Teaching Stream faculty, up to five publications, chosen by the candidate to best represent their scholarly contributions, are to be included in the candidate's submission to the Department ARPT committee. A description of the documentation considered for evaluation is provided in section 3 of the FEP.

As a matter of disciplinary and departmental practice, ARPT committees may refer to reliable sources of external information not included in the applicant's application to support the rigorous academic review of the application, provided the sources to be considered are identified in the Unit Standard. Examples of appropriate sources include but are not limited to journal impact factors and citation indices, and CES frequency distributions.

6.2.2. *When to apply for Tenure and/or Promotion*

The critical question in determining when to apply for Tenure and/or Promotion is always: Has there been sufficient time for a Faculty Member to demonstrate their performance at their current rank at the University of Victoria for the decision in question? Research-Stream Faculty Members may apply for Tenure and/or Promotion at any time within the range given in the CA 28.5-28.10, provided there is sufficient evidence to assess Research, Teaching, and Service at the University of Victoria to reach a decision. Teaching-Stream Faculty Members may apply for Tenure and/or Promotion at any time within the range given in the CA 29.5-29.10, provided there is sufficient evidence to assess Scholarly Activity, Teaching, and Service at the University of Victoria to reach a decision.

The candidate also has to demonstrate a record of positive performance for at least two years in current rank at the University of Victoria, unless an exception was granted by the Dean (see 28.12, 28.14, 29.12 and 33.23.1).

A candidate on an approved leave who will be able to engage in all aspects of the consideration process may apply for consideration during their period of leave (CA 33.4.1).

As per section 28.15 of the Agreement, if an application for Promotion to Professor is denied, the Faculty Member can reapply only after two years.

6.2.3. Evaluation of prior employment (CA 33.23.1)

CA 33.23.1 states that the ARPT Committee shall consider the candidate's record of Research or Scholarly Activity since inception; and will consider performance in Teaching and Service since appointment at the University of Victoria.

6.2.4. Referees (Agreement sections 33.5-33.22)

For Tenure and Promotion of Research Stream and Teaching Stream Faculty, the Faculty of Science requires at least four external letters of reference solicited by the department's ARPT Committee. To ensure that four letters are available in a timely fashion, at least six letters should be solicited.

As described in Section 33.7.1. of the Agreement, in the case of a consideration for Tenure and/or Promotion of a Teaching Stream Faculty Member, two teaching peer reviews, no older than 24 months, can be used as a substitute for one of the letters of reference. The peer review of teaching process must be done in accordance with the guidelines established in the Faculty Evaluation Policy art. 3.3.1. The peer reviewer(s) must be approved by the Dean.

As described in Section 33.10.1. of the Agreement, in the case of Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor, one of the four letters of reference may be supplied by a referee who holds an academic appointment at UVic, but who must be external to the candidate's unit.

The letter sent to referees should clearly state that Promotion and Tenure are coupled, and that Promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Teaching Professor will be granted with Tenure. Letters to referees should follow closely the forms given in Appendices B-D of this Policy.

Reference letters are deemed to be current if they are less than one year old. Where a Member has been on an approved leave, other than a Leave Without Salary or Political Leave, and that leave resulted in a reference letter(s) being older than one year, the Member may request the letter(s) be used in the current submission provided the letter(s) is not older than 24 months at the time of submission to the ARPT committee.

6.3. Reappointment processes for Research Stream and Teaching Stream Faculty (CA 27)

An Assistant Professor or Assistant Teaching Professor who holds an appointment with eligibility for tenure is eligible for Reappointment for a term that does not extend beyond the year in

which the Faculty Member must formally be considered for tenure. Sections 27.2-27.3 and sections 27.6-27.7 describe the evaluation criteria and evaluation standards that must be applied by the Department of the Assistant Professor or Assistant Teaching Professor, respectively.

An Assistant Professor or an Assistant Teaching Professor under consideration for Reappointment must demonstrate a record of performance that meets or exceeds expectations as described in CA 27.3 or 27.7, respectively. Section 3 of this Policy outlines the criteria to be utilized for this evaluation.

The Member must also demonstrate reasonable progress toward meeting the written expectations of the Department with regard to the granting of Tenure.

In the Faculty of Science, Reappointment recommendations of the Department's ARPT committee are submitted to the Dean, who uses this input to make recommendations to the Provost.

6.4. *Tenure/Promotion processes for Research Stream and Teaching Stream Faculty (CA 28 & 29)*

6.4.1. Tenure/Promotion deadlines

An Assistant Professor and an Assistant Teaching Professor with eligibility for Tenure must be considered for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Teaching Professor not later than the sixth year in this rank at the University (CA 28.5-28.10 and 29.5-29.10), subject to any deferrals due to leaves specified in Article 31.1 of the Agreement.

6.4.2. Tenure/Promotion Criteria for Research Stream Faculty

Standards for Granting Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor are found in section 28.12 of the Agreement. Unit Standards may further elaborate on discipline-specific requirements to demonstrate "Teaching effectiveness and a continued commitment to excellence in teaching", "Research that has made a substantial contribution to their academic discipline" and "Service that furthers the goals of the University and the Member's academic discipline" (28.12).

Agreement sections 33.23-33.35 outline the information considered by the ARPT committee in its deliberation and the assessment process to be followed. Section 4 of the FEP provides a description of the documentation to be used for the evaluation in the Faculty of Science.

For promotion to Professor, it is normally expected that one or more students will have successfully completed graduate degrees under the Members' direct supervision.

6.4.3. Tenure/Promotion Criteria for Teaching Stream Faculty

Standards for Granting Tenure and Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor are found in section 29.12 of the Agreement. Unit Standards may further elaborate on discipline-specific requirements to demonstrate "excellence in Teaching, including initiative in the development or delivery of the academic program of the candidate's Unit", "Scholarly Activity that contributes to

their disciplinary field or Scholarship of Teaching; and/or leadership in the improvement of teaching at the Department, Faculty or University level” and “Service that furthers the goals of the University and the Member’s academic discipline” (29.12).

Agreement sections 33.23-33.35 outline the information considered by the ARPT committee in its deliberation and the assessment process to be followed. Section 4 of the FEP provides a description of the documentation to be used for the evaluation in the Faculty of Science.

7. APPENDIX A1: DEPARTMENT ARPT CHECKLIST

Reappointment of Assistant Professor (Research *and* Teaching Stream)

Please submit all documentation to the Dean of Science in the order of the checklist

Candidate: _____

Department: _____

	Position Status Change Request Form
	ARPT Recommendation form signed by all members of the ARPT Committee
	Annual Reviews as applicable and any responses to them
	Curriculum Vitae
	Teaching Dossier
	TD: Two or more peer evaluations of teaching
	TD: Course Reviews
	TD: CES frequency distributions
	Statement from candidate describing teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service contributions
	Other documents that the candidate wishes the Committee to consider (specify, or indicate "none"):

 Chair of ARPT Committee
 I have examined all of the materials listed above

 Date

 Candidate

 Date

8. Appendix A2: Department ARPT checklist

Continuing Appointment of Teaching Stream Assistant *and* Associate Professor

Please submit all documentation to the Dean of Science in the order of the checklist

Candidate: _____

Department: _____

	Position Status Change Request Form
	ARPT Recommendation form signed by all members of the ARPT Committee
	Annual Reviews as applicable and any responses to them
	Curriculum Vitae
	TD: Teaching Dossier
	TD: Course Reviews
	TD: Two or more peer reviews of teaching
	CES frequency distributions
	Statement from candidate describing teaching, research, and service contributions
	Up to five (p)reprint samples of scholarly activity
	Other documents that the candidate wishes the Committee to consider (specify, or indicate "none"):

 Chair of ARPT Committee
 I have examined all of the materials listed above

 Date

 Candidate

 Date

9. Appendix A3: Department ARPT checklist

All Tenure/Promotion (Teaching and Research Stream)

Please submit all documentation to the Dean of Science in the order of the checklist

Candidate: _____

Department: _____

	Position Status Change Request Form
	ARPT Recommendation form signed by all members of the ARPT Committee
	Referee letters (minimum of 4)
	Statement from candidate of their relationship to each of the suggested referees
	Sample of letter sent to referees soliciting reference
	Annual Reviews as applicable and any responses to them
	Curriculum Vitae
	Teaching Dossier
	TD: Course Reviews
	TD: Two or more peer reviews of teaching
	TD: CES frequency distributions
	Statement from candidate describing teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service contributions
	Up to five (p)reprint samples of scholarly activity
	Other documents that the candidate wishes the Committee to consider (specify, or indicate "none"):

 Chair of ARPT Committee
 I have examined all of the materials listed above

 Date

 Candidate

 Date

10. Appendix B Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Re: Promotion of Dr. [Name] to Associate Professor with Tenure

Thank you for agreeing to assist in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr [Name], Assistant Professor in the Department/School of [DeptName], who is being considered for both tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

The University of Victoria Faculty Association Collective Agreement (Collective Agreement) defines standards required for the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The Collective Agreement is a public document that may be found on the web at

<https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/Collective%20Agreement.pdf>

According to the Collective Agreement (Art 28.12), to become a Tenured Associate Professor, a Faculty Member must meet the requirements in s. 21.6 and have a record of performance in each of their Academic Responsibilities that meets or exceeds the criteria for Promotion as indicated in the Unit Standards. The record shall show positive performance for a minimum of two years in their current rank while at the University of Victoria. The candidate's record shall evidence:

- a) Teaching effectiveness and a continued commitment to excellence in teaching;
- b) Research that has made a substantial contribution to their academic discipline; and
- c) Service that furthers the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline.

The Faculty Evaluation Policy (Section 2 of the document included in this package) lists the criteria used to evaluate achievement with respect to the standards within the Faculty of Science. Finally, the Departmental expectations for achievement required to attain tenure are contained in the candidate's Letter of Expectations; a copy of this letter is also included in the package.

With these standards and criteria in mind, I ask that you offer your evaluation of the research, and professional achievements of Dr. [Name]. To further assist you in your evaluation, a curriculum vitae and other supporting documents are included with this letter. Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the candidate's qualifications.

I will need to make your comments available to the Departmental Committee on Appointments, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and to the Dean of Science. Your letter will be considered confidential, unless you specify otherwise. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and

Protection of Privacy legislation, if your response is designated confidential, and if Dr *[Name]* requests the information, I would be required to give Dr *[Name]* a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.

I would appreciate receiving your response by *[Date]*. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
Department/School of *[DeptName]*

encl: CV, up to 5 research papers, summary statement, other supporting documents (if applicable)

11. Appendix C: Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from tenured Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Re: Promotion of Dr. [Name] to Associate Professor

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. [Name], tenured Assistant Professor in the Department/School of [DeptName], who is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor. The criteria for promotion in the Faculty of Science at the University of Victoria are defined in Section 1 of its Faculty Evaluation Policy, which in turn is a reflection of the terms laid down in the Collective Agreement between the University and its faculty members.

<https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/Collective%20Agreement.pdf>

According to the Collective Agreement (Art 28.12), to become a Tenured Associate Professor, a Faculty Member must meet the requirements in s. 21.6 and have a record of performance in each of their Academic Responsibilities that meets or exceeds the criteria for Promotion as indicated in the Unit Standards. The record shall show positive performance for a minimum of two years in their current rank while at the University of Victoria. The candidate's record shall evidence:

- a) Teaching effectiveness and a continued commitment to excellence in teaching;
- b) Research that has made a substantial contribution to their academic discipline; and
- c) Service that furthers the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline.

The Faculty Evaluation Policy (Section 2 of the document included in this package) lists the criteria used to evaluate achievement with respect to the standards within the Faculty of Science. Finally, the Departmental expectations for achievement required to attain tenure are contained in the candidate's Letter of Expectations; a copy of this letter is also included in the package.

With these standards and criteria in mind, I ask that you offer your evaluation of the research and professional achievements of Dr. [Name]. To further assist you in your evaluation, a curriculum vitae and other supporting documents are included with this letter. Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the candidate's qualifications.

I will need to make your comments available to the Departmental Committee on Appointments, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and to the Dean of Science. Your letter will be considered confidential, unless you specify otherwise. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, if your response is designated confidential, and if Dr [Name] requests the information, I would be required to give Dr [Name] a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.

I would appreciate receiving your response by [Date]. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director Department/School of [DeptName]

encl: CV, up to 5 research papers, summary statement, other supporting documents (if applicable)

12. Appendix D Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Re: Promotion of Dr. [Name] to Professor

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr [Name], who is a tenured Associate Professor in the Department of [DeptName], and who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor.

The criteria for promotion to Professor in the Faculty of Science at the University of Victoria are defined in Section 1 of its Faculty Evaluation Policy, which in turn is a reflection of the terms laid down in the Collective Agreement between the University and its faculty members.

<https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/Collective%20Agreement.pdf>

According to the Collective Agreement, to become a Tenured Professor, a Faculty Member must meet the requirements in s. 21.9, and have a record of performance in each of their Academic Responsibilities that meets or exceeds the criteria for Promotion as indicated in the Unit Standards. The record shall show positive performance for a minimum of two years in their current rank while at the University of Victoria, unless an exception is granted by the Dean. In addition to the requirements in s. 21.9, the record of performance must evidence outstanding achievements, as defined in the Unit Standard, with regard to either:

- a) Teaching; or
- b) Research that has attained recognition at a national or international level.

With these standards and criteria in mind, I ask that you offer your evaluation of the research and professional achievements of Dr. [Name]. To further assist you in your evaluation, a curriculum vitae and other supporting documents are included with this letter. Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the candidate's qualifications.

I will need to make your comments available to the Departmental Committee on Appointments, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and to the Dean of Science. Your letter will be considered confidential, unless you specify otherwise. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, if your response is designated confidential, and if Dr[Name] requests the information, I would be required to give Dr[Name] a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.

I would appreciate receiving your response by [Date]. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director Department/School of [DeptName]

encl: CV, up to 5 research papers, summary statement, other supporting documents (if applicable)

13. Appendix E: Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Assistant Teaching Professor to tenured Associate Teaching Professor

Re: Promotion of Dr. [Name] to Associate Teaching Professor with Tenure

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the teaching and professional achievements of Dr. [Name], continuing Assistant Teaching Professor in the Department/School of [DeptName], who is being considered for both tenure and promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. The criteria for promotion in the Faculty of Science at the University of Victoria are defined in Section 1 of its Faculty Evaluation Policy, which in turn is a reflection of the terms laid down in the Collective Agreement between the University and its faculty members.

<https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/Collective%20Agreement.pdf>

Article 29.5 of the Collective Agreement states that:

To become a Tenured Associate Teaching Professor, a Faculty Member must meet the requirements in s. 21.15 and have a record of performance in each of their Academic 86 Responsibilities that meets or exceeds the criteria for Promotion as indicated in the Unit Standard. The record shall show positive performance for a minimum of two years in their current rank while at the University of Victoria, unless an exception is granted by the Dean. The candidate's record shall evidence:

- a) excellence in Teaching, including initiative in the development or delivery of the academic program of the candidate's Unit as described in s. 25.9;
- b) Scholarly Activity, as described in 25.19, that contributes to their disciplinary field or Scholarship of Teaching; and/or leadership in the improvement of teaching at the Department, Faculty or University level;
- c) Service that furthers the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline.

With these standards and criteria in mind, I ask that you offer your evaluation of the teaching performance and professional accomplishments of Dr. [Name]. To further assist you in your evaluation, a curriculum vitae, teaching dossier, and other supporting documents are included with this letter. Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the candidate's qualifications.

I will need to make your comments available to the Departmental Committee on Appointments, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and to the Dean of Science. Your letter will be considered confidential, unless you specify otherwise. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, if your response is designated confidential, and if Dr [Name] requests the information, I would be required to give Dr [Name] a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.

I would appreciate receiving your response by [Date]. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director Department/School of [DeptName]

encl: CV, teaching dossier, 3-page summary of teaching contributions, other supporting documents (if applicable)

14. Appendix F: Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor

Re: Promotion of Dr. [Name] to Teaching Professor

Thank you for agreeing to assist in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr [Name], Associate Teaching Professor in the Department/School of [DeptName], who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor. The criteria for promotion in the Faculty of Science at the University of Victoria are defined in Section 1 of its Faculty Evaluation Policy, which in turn is a reflection of the terms laid down in the Collective Agreement between the University and its faculty members.

<http://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/resources/Collective%20Agreement/index.php>

According to Article 29.7 of the Collective Agreement, to become a Tenured Teaching Professor, a Faculty Member must meet the requirements under s. 21.18 and have a record of performance in each of their Academic Responsibilities that meets or exceeds the criteria for Promotion as indicated in the Unit Standard. The record shall show positive performance for a minimum of two years while at the University of Victoria, unless an exception is granted by the Dean. The candidate's record shall evidence outstanding achievements, as defined in the Unit Standard, in either:

- a) Teaching; or
- b) Scholarly Activity, as described in 25.19, that contributes to their disciplinary field or the Scholarship of Teaching that has attained national or international recognition; and/or substantial leadership in the improvement of teaching in the candidate's Department, Faculty or in the University.

With these standards and criteria in mind, I ask that you offer your evaluation of the teaching performance and professional accomplishments of Dr. [Name]. To further assist you in your evaluation, a curriculum vitae, teaching dossier, and other supporting documents are included with this letter. Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the candidate's qualifications.

I will need to make your comments available to the Departmental Committee on Appointments, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and to the Dean of Science. Your letter will be considered confidential, unless you specify otherwise. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, if your response is designated confidential, and if Dr[Name] requests the information, I would be required to give Dr [Name] a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.

I would appreciate receiving your response by [Date]. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director Department/School of [DeptName]

encl: CV, teaching dossier, 3-page summary of teaching contributions, other supporting documents (if applicable)