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Preamble
This document is the response of the Faculty of Science to the requirement that each Faculty produce and maintain a "Faculty Evaluation Policy" consistent with section 19.5 of the University of Victoria and University of Victoria Faculty Association Collective Agreement (hereafter, “Agreement”) concluded in 2015 between the University of Victoria Faculty Association and the University of Victoria. The Agreement can be found at:


This document is consistent with the Agreement that took effect 5 June 2015.

The Faculty Evaluation Policy does not replace the Agreement, which takes precedence in all academic matters.

1. Criteria for evaluating performance
Evaluation of performance of Faculty Members takes place before promotion and the granting of tenure, the granting of continuing appointments, and also before the biennial awarding of Merit Increments. The criteria used at these different times are basically the same. The following section defines the criteria used in Members' evaluations in the Faculty of Science.

1.1 The criteria of evaluation
In accordance with section 19.5.1 of the Agreement, the criteria for evaluation of Members' performance are:

- Teaching performance, as described in sections 19.6 and 19.7 of the Agreement;
- Scholarly and professional achievement for Members other than Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, and Teaching Professors, which is defined in sections 19.8 and 19.9 of the Agreement;
- Other contributions, as described in section 19.11 of the Agreement;
- According to section 19.5.5 of the Agreement Teaching Professors at the Assistant and Associate ranks are evaluated on “Teaching performance” and “Other contributions”, but not on the basis of their “Scholarly and professional achievement”. However, there is an expectation that they will keep abreast of current developments in their respective fields, and they may be evaluated on the basis of contributions to scholarship related to teaching, which is included in the definition of teaching performance in this section. Teaching Professors will be expected to make contributions to scholarship related to teaching on an ongoing basis; and
- According to section 19.14 of the Agreement, Academic Administrators are evaluated on the basis of their administrative contributions and teaching performance, or scholarly and professional achievement, or both, where the appointment includes such duties.

1.2 Evaluation of "Teaching Performance"
Evaluation of a Member's "Teaching Performance" will be based on their Teaching Dossier and attachments to it.

As articulated in section 19.6 of the Agreement, Teaching Performance includes contributions to the Department’s or Faculty’s teaching program and to scholarship related to teaching as described in any relevant departmental policies. Scholarship related to teaching includes, but is not limited to, the following:
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Peer reviews are required for tenure and all promotion decisions, and for continuing appointment decisions for Assistant Teaching Professors (see 2.5) and, if current, may be used for salary evaluation. As articulated in section 19.7 of the Agreement, the criteria for the assessment of Teaching Performance, in addition to course experience surveys, may include such items as class visit reports, reviews of syllabi and examinations, evidence of innovative teaching, evidence of contribution to the Department’s or Faculty’s teaching program, teaching awards, and scholarship related to teaching. Teaching excellence may also be demonstrated through creation and communication of course- and/or program-specific learning outcomes that build on University-wide learning outcomes. There must be no obligation to include anecdotal or subjective student comments. Evaluation of teaching performance must not be based solely on Course Experience Survey scores and must consider all materials in the teaching dossier.

In applying the criteria for Teaching Performance, evaluators should be mindful of the distinction between achievement (quality of instruction) and activity (number of courses taught), with more emphasis placed on the former.

1.3 Evaluation of "Scholarly and Professional Achievement"

Evaluation of a Member’s Scholarly and Professional Achievement will be based on information contained in their Curriculum Vitae.

As articulated in section 19.8 of the Agreement, Scholarly and Professional Achievement 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, professional, and creative activity as described in the evaluation policy of the Faculty in which Faculty Member holds an appointment.

In the Faculty of Science, the criteria for the assessment of Scholarly and Professional Achievement will include, but is not limited to, the following:

- 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. Members are invited to explain their choice of journals. This may be done by making reference to journal impact factors (if so desired) or by explaining the importance of the journal to their discipline in their Research Statement;
- authorship of invited and contributed book chapters, monographs, and electronic media;
- the presentation of posters or contributed talks at conferences (regional, national, or international);
- the delivery of invited seminars or plenary lectures at scientific conferences or at other universities or institutions;
- awards and fellowships granted by institutions other than the University;
• membership on boards or councils devoted to research and professional affairs, and in certain fields the extent to which the Faculty Member’s professional services are in demand by academic and professional organizations outside the University;
• recognition by learned and professional societies;
• evidence of reputation for scholarship that the Faculty Member establishes among professional colleagues at the University and at other academic and professional institutions;
• community-based research activities;
• the securing of external, peer-reviewed research funding; the percent contribution to a Member's research from multi-applicant grants should be clearly explained;
• patents obtained; and
• other evidence, including external non-peer reviewed funding, patents applied for but not yet issued, and non-refereed publications.

In evaluating scholarship, proper weight should be given to the quality, as well as the amount of scholarship, for example, the number of papers. Thus, for example, a single groundbreaking research publication can 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 University and the Faculty of Science are committed to the principle that there is merit in collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship, and that there can be a uniquely synergistic character to such work, which must be explained by the Member in their Research Statement and be considered when making evaluations.

1.4 EVALUATION OF "OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS"
As articulated in section 19.11 of the Agreement, Other Contributions means contributions to the University, a profession or the community that are described in the evaluation policy of the Department or School in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment. Each policy will specify the factors that should be evaluated under other contributions.

In the Faculty of Science, the criteria for the assessment of “Other Contributions” may include, but are not limited to, the following:
• contributions through service to or development of the Faculty Member’s Academic Unit;
• service as the Chair of a Department, or the Director of a School, Centre or Institute;
• contributions through service to the University or the Association;
• mentoring colleagues in teaching and research;
• contributions to student life;
• attainment of extra-University recognition of a Faculty Member’s University related activities;
• contributions to the Faculty Member’s profession or community, including membership on boards or councils devoted to research and professional affairs, and, in certain fields, the extent to which the Faculty Member’s professional services are in demand by academic, professional and community organizations outside the University; and
• contributions to public awareness of the Member's discipline or research area, or to public debate of issues related to academic matters.
2. Documentation of Performance

2.1 The Official Performance File
All evaluations of performance relevant to reappointment, tenure, promotion, or salary are based on information contained in a Faculty Member’s Official Performance File. The OPF (see section 21.3 of the Agreement) contains the Member’s Curriculum Vitae, recommendations with regard to reappointment, tenure, or promotion decisions made by a departmental 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 departmental recommendation, 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, an annual review of a Faculty Member and any response to it, and reports with regard to the Member by a tribunal appointed under the Harassment Policy; the Policy on Scholarly Integrity; or 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.

2.2 Performance Evaluations
In accordance with section 20.4 of the Agreement, non-tenured Faculty Members, except Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors with continuing status, must by May 15 of each year, meet with his or her Chair/Director to discuss their performance during the past 12 months, as well as any performance expectations and concerns relevant to attaining tenure or continuing status. A detailed description of the annual review process, including the generation of a written report and the opportunity to respond is provided in sections 20.4 – 20.7 of the Agreement for non-tenured Assistant Professors and sections 20.17 – 20.22 of the Agreement for Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors without continuing status. All written material relevant to an annual review is to be contained in the Member’s OPF.

After the conclusion of the discussion, the Chair/Director of a unit will prepare a written annual review with regard to each non-tenured Faculty Member with eligibility for tenure that addresses each of the standards for achieving tenure (section 20.5). The written review will be sent to the Faculty Member by May 31 and a copy of the written review will be placed in the Faculty Member’s Official Performance File (section 20.6).

Information regarding responses and dispute resolution of the annual review are provided in sections 20.7 through 20.12 of the Agreement.

Section 20.13 of the Agreement states that upon the request of a Tenured Faculty Member, 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.

Section 20.14 of the Agreement states that in the case of an Assistant or Associate Teaching Professor the Chair/Director is responsible for providing the Faculty Member with a written statement of current performance expectations with regard to attaining reappointment in the Department. A copy of the statement will be sent to the Dean of the Faculty. The review will consider the topics listed in section 20.15. The Chair will provide a written review that addresses each of the performance expectations for attaining reappointment. Sections 20.6 – 20.12 inclusive also apply to performance reviews of Assistant or Associate Teaching Professors.
2.3 **THE CURRICULUM VITAE**

The standard CV and Teaching Dossier are available electronically (http://www.uvic.ca/science/assets/docs/CV-TD%20template%20Rev%20Sep02.docx). They are based on the UVic standard format. As articulated in section 19.19 of the Agreement the CV records a Member’s scholarly and professional achievements, and may include scholarship related to teaching, and other contributions. Members are asked to update their CVs biennially for their unit who will subsequently submit them to the Dean's Office by January 31st as electronic documents, without hardcopy, as a MS “Word” document, an rtf file, or a pdf file.

2.4 **THE TEACHING DOSSIER**

As stipulated in section 19.21 of the Agreement, each Member must biennially update a Teaching Dossier, which is deemed to be contained in the Member’s Official Performance File. Members are asked to submit their Teaching Dossiers to their unit who will subsequently submit them to the Dean's Office by January 31st as electronic documents, without hardcopy, as a MS “Word” document, an rtf file, or a pdf file. A standard form, with explanatory notes, for the Faculty of Science “core” Teaching Dossier is available on the Faculty of Science website.

In addition to the core Teaching Dossier, Members may attach, as appropriate, student comments on teaching, documentation of peer review of teaching, course outlines, and comments from former students. If student comments for a course are to be added to the Teaching Dossier then according to section 19.24 of the Agreement all comments must be included. Members may also attach a statement concerning learning outcomes for courses or programs to which they contribute.

The creation of a Teaching Dossier is not meant to be excessively burdensome; earlier teaching activities may not be as thoroughly documented as recent and future ones, and this is to be expected.

2.5 **PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

The Faculty of Science requires peer reviews of teaching in its evaluation processes because they perform two important functions: they provide a mechanism, particularly early in a Member’s career, for obtaining helpful advice, and they form an important component of the overall evaluation of teaching. At least two formal peer evaluations are required for tenure and all promotion decisions, and for continuing appointment decisions for Assistant Teaching Professors, consistent with Section 22.10. At least one of the courses should, if possible, be at the 100 or 200 level, if part of the Member's teaching record, and it is preferable for separate courses taught by the Member to be reviewed. The evaluations of each course are to be performed by different peers, who must be mutually acceptable as evaluators by both the Chair and the Member being evaluated. It is the responsibility of the candidate and the Chair/Director to ensure that the required peer evaluations are carried out on a timely basis.

The peer evaluators may choose to sit in on more than one lecture. They should also examine the course itself – its overall content, organization, supporting material (textbook, web-based material, handouts). The evaluation should be in the form of a signed document, giving the dates and courses at which the peer attended lectures and examined course materials. Peer evaluations are deemed to be current if they were carried out within three years of the time of submission of documents to the Departmental ARPT committee for a given promotion and / or tenure application.

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. Written peer evaluations of teaching are part of a Member’s Official Performance File. Informal peer evaluations are not.
2.6 RESEARCH STATEMENT
The Faculty of Science requires that at the time of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion a Member
provides a research statement no more than 3 pages in length to be part of their Official Performance File.
The objective of this document is to allow the Member to provide a brief descriptive narrative of their
research program that goes beyond the information 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. One suggestion
is to style the research statement on his or her “Most Significant Contributions to Research” section
prepared for NSERC grant proposals. This document will be included in the material sent to external
referees.

2.7 TEACHING STATEMENT
The Faculty of Science requires that at the time of evaluation for continuing status and / or promotion an
Assistant or Associate Teaching Professor provides a teaching statement of no more than 3 pages in length
to be part of their Official Performance File. The objective of this document is to allow the Member to
provide a brief descriptive narrative of their teaching contributions that goes beyond the information in their
Teaching Dossier and to provide their sense of the importance and impact of their work in the context of
their unit’s academic programs and elsewhere.

3. Salary Adjustment Evaluation: The awarding of Career Progress Increments (CPI) and
Merit Increments (MI)

3.1 OVERVIEW
Faculty Members are reviewed for Career Progress Increments (CPI) and Merit Increments (MI) every 2
years (section 19.30). According to section 19.32 of the Agreement the Faculty of Science is in Group B;
that is, salary reviews are undertaken in even numbered years. Academic Administrators within Science are
in Group A; that is, their salary reviews are undertaken in odd numbered years.

As a result of the salary review the faculty member will receive a salary adjustment effective July 1 in the
year of the review and the same adjustment is again applied on July 1 in the next year using the applicable
values for the increments in each year.

Following sections 19.38 to 19.41, for a new appointment “the first year of appointment” means the period
from the first day of appointment of a Faculty Member until June 30 of the next calendar year; the second,
third and fourth year of appointment means the next three July 1 – June 30 periods. On July 1 of each of
the second and third years of appointment, the Faculty Member’s salary will without review be adjusted by
the addition of a CPI plus two MI at the value set in this Agreement. If the Faculty Member is in a unit
being evaluated in the second year of his or her appointment, the Faculty Member or Librarian will be
evaluated with their colleagues in that year, but the resulting CPI and MI decision will only be applied in
the fourth year of appointment. Faculty Members whose units are evaluated in the third year of appointment
will be evaluated with their colleagues in that year and their salary for the fourth year of appointment will
be that awarded by that evaluation process. Thereafter, Faculty Members will be evaluated and receive
salary adjustments as per the schedule for their units.

In accordance with section 19.29.1 of the Agreement, Faculty Members are evaluated based on performance
over the four years of service preceding January 1 of the year in which the Member is evaluated. Where the
Faculty Member has been at the University for less than four years, the Member is evaluated on the basis
of the actual years of service, on the basis of performance expectations that are proportionate to the period
of review.
Faculty Members, other than Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors, are evaluated on the criteria listed in sections 19.6, 19.8, and 19.11 of the Agreement in the ratio of 40:40:20 respectively.

Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors are evaluated on the basis of the criteria listed in sections 19.6 and 19.11 of the Agreement in the ratio of 80:20 respectively.

Section 63.12 of the Agreement states: A CPI recognizes career progress of a Member whose performance is judged to have satisfied the expected standard of career progress in the period of review. MIs serve to recognize increasing levels of meritorious performance. The maximum number of MIs that may be awarded to a member in one year is four.

Section 63.18 of the Agreement states there are two pools of MIs available for award: the primary pool where the number of MIs is 2x the number of Members to be evaluated including Chairs; and a supplementary pool where the number of MIs shall be equal to the number of Chairs.

MIs are available only to Members who receive a CPI. All Members receiving a CPI will receive 0.0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0 MIs. Any score of 0.0 or 0.5 requires the Chair to write to the Member, explaining the reasons behind the decision.

According to section 63.17 of the Agreement MIs must be distributed among the Members in a unit, other than Chairs and those Members who receive an automatic 2 MI in accordance with section 19.39, such that at least 15% of Members in the unit, rounded down to the nearest whole number, fall within each of the following categories:

- 0.0, 0.5, or 1.0 MIs;
- 1.5, 2.0, or 2.5 MIs; or
- 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0 MIs.

These requirements are to be met on a faculty-wide basis, but should also be adhered to at the Department/School level. Sound arguments that justify deviation from the above distribution will be considered, in the context of the need to meet the formula across the Faculty as a whole.

### 3.2 DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT INCREMENTS TO UNITS

The number of MIs provided to units is determined by the following:

- The total number of Members is denoted X (every person counts as 1.0, whether full or part-time; Members are assigned to the academic unit in which the major part of their appointment exists);
- For the primary pool the Faculty is provided with 2 MIs for each Member including Chairs/Director but excluding Limited Term Appointments;
- For the supplemental pool the Faculty is allocated a number of MIs equal to the number of Departments and Schools in the Faculty. For Science this additional pool consists of 6 MIs;
- The Dean of Science will hold back 13% of the MIs provided to the Faculty of Science. The balance of the MIs will be distributed to the individual units on a pro-rata basis. The number determined will be rounded off to the nearest integer, with 0.5 being rounded up;
• The Dean is to allocate all assigned MIs as one pool; that is, the supplemental MIs do not have to go to the Chairs/Director; and
• The Dean’s holdback pool will be used to provide MIs for the Chairs/Director, to top up particularly outstanding cases, and/or to provide additional MIs in other cases (as argued by the Chairs/Director).

3.3 Distribution procedures

• The Dean will distribute the MIs provided to the Faculty to the units as specified above;
• The Chair/Director will assess the performance of each Faculty Member in that unit on the basis of the criteria described in this document, normally over a four year period preceding January 1 of the year in which the review is made, and will generate a list of all Members in order of merit; section 19.29.3 states that where a Faculty Member has been on leave, except leave without salary, for more than one teaching term during the period of review, the review period for purposes of evaluating teaching performance and other contributions is extended by one year;
• The Chair/Director will use this list to assign MIs, up to and including 4 MIs;
• The Chair/Director will present the list, in descending order of merit (strongest case at the top) with recommendations to the Dean for approval, as well as recommendations for other adjustments to be met from the Dean's pool of MIs. When the Chair/Director presents their list for the distribution of MIs to the Dean, they must provide a brief but detailed description of the factors that led to a particular placement of any individual on that list. Cases which are recommended for 4 MIs must be well supported, as they will be compared by the Dean across the Faculty. The Dean will use, to the best of their ability, evaluations that span the entire Faculty when they make assessments or changes; and
• The distribution rules outlined in section 63.17 will be applied by each Chair and Director for their unit. However, there may be subsequent adjustments by the Dean to ensure that the distribution is met for the entire Faculty. The final recommendations of the Dean will be forwarded to the Vice President Academic and Provost.

3.4 DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT INCREMENTS WITHIN UNITS

Chairs/Director will assess the performance of all Faculty Members in the unit, using the appropriate criteria. That is, for regular Faculty Members, considering Teaching Performance, Scholarly and Professional Achievements, and Other Contributions. For Teaching Professors at any rank, the appropriate criteria are Teaching Performance and Other Contributions.

3.5 JOB DESCRIPTIONS

The University takes seriously each of the three general categories – "Teaching Performance", "Scholarly and Professional Achievement" and "Other Contributions". In evaluating performance for the purpose of merit awards, the evaluation will be based on the actual distribution of responsibilities for the Member. All are important in supporting the scholarly mission of the institution, and expectations of the performance of each Member relate to all categories relevant to the position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of position</th>
<th>Teaching Performance</th>
<th>Scholarship and Professional Achievement</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard (the default)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Director</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Director</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally funded position</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy teaching</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Teaching Professor</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Teaching Professor</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These descriptions acknowledge that being a Chair/Director involves a heavy administrative burden, seen as "Other Contributions," which will be met by reducing the usual 40% “Teaching Performance” or “Scholarly and Professional Achievement” requirement. They also recognize that being the recipient of an externally funded position, such as an NSERC Industrial Research Chair or a Canada Research Chair, may carry with it a reduction in Teaching with attendant increased research expectations. Some Members may have a reduced involvement in Scholarship, with a concomitant increase in Teaching.

The distribution of responsibilities reflected in a Member’s job description must be clearly spelled out by the Chair/Director. For example, if a Member’s job description contains a 60% Teaching weight, a greater contribution to the teaching program is expected, in terms of amount and possibly quality, than the average for the unit. As in all cases, assessments must be based on documentation (curriculum vitae, teaching dossier, and any appended relevant material).

To achieve equity in the evaluation process both within a unit and between units, it is important that scores for each of the evaluation categories specified in this section be assigned on a 0 – 100 scale. Thus in accordance with section 19.28 of the Agreement before a Faculty Member’s scores are combined using the 40:40:20 or 80:20 rule, or using another agreed-upon ratio, the score in each category will be adjusted by subtracting a value equal to the average of the scores assigned across the unit for that category less 50.

Section 19.26 of the Agreement states that an alternative evaluation ratio may be agreed between the Member and the Chair/Director in advance for a fixed period, and approved by the Dean. For a Faculty Member, each figure in this alternative ratio must be at least 20. With regard to Chairs, such an agreement is made between the Dean and the Chair and should be made at the time of appointment as Chair/Director to cover the full term of the appointment.
3.6 Biennial Salary Adjustment Evaluation
The salary adjustment evaluation of individual Members of an academic unit will be made by the Chair/Director, either acting alone, or in consultation with others. The criteria for the evaluation of Faculty Members, other than Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, and Teaching Professors, are listed in sections 19.5.1.1, 19.5.1.2, and 19.5.1.3, and must be weighted in the ratio consistent with job descriptions (see FEP section 3.5). Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors must be evaluated on the basis of the criteria listed in sections 19.6 and 19.11 in the ratio of 80:20 respectively.

The period of review for awarding Career Progress Increments and Merit Increments is normally the four years preceding January 1 of the year in which the review is made. Where the Faculty Member has been at the University for less than four years, the Member is evaluated on the basis of the actual years of service, with performance expectations that are proportionate to the period of review. In accordance with section 19.29.5 the review period for a Member who has been on Leave Without Salary, the period of review for awarding a CPI and MIs will not be adjusted and will be the same as provided in section 19.29.1. Provisions for periods during which the Member was on Leave, except Leave Without Salary, are found in subsections of 19.29 of the Collective Agreement. Section 19.5.7 states that an assessment of achievement must take into account the effect on performance of maternity, parental and adoption leave, special leave, sick leave, compassionate care leave, compassionate leave without salary, and long term disability. A Faculty Member may submit information as to the effect of this leave or leaves on their performance.

Section 19.17 states that Faculty Members should be assessed taking into account their years of experience and section 19.18 states that expectations for a Member’s performance must be consistent with the Member’s FTE. Chairs/Director will consider these principles in making assessments. Satisfactory performance is expected for Faculty Members, in accordance with criteria appropriate to their position.

Since the number of merit increments available to the Faculty is fixed, the assessment of achievement is, in fact, an exercise in determining the relative order of merit; that is, in determining who in the Faculty is most deserving of merit increments, and who least. If, or as, the levels of performance in the Faculty increase, so will the effort and achievement required to attain a given Merit Increment.

Due to the nature of the comparative MI distribution, a Member who is given a specific number of MIs in a given year may not necessarily receive the same number of MIs in the next evaluation period, even though their performance is similar.

4. Policy for promotion and tenure

4.1 Introduction
This document is intended to provide guidance to a Member on the issues of promotion and tenure. It, together with the Agreement, is the basis for discussion between a Member and their Chair/Director about their responsibilities and evaluations of achievement. However, it should be noted that according to section 17.47 of the Agreement an Academic Administrator is not eligible for consideration for promotion or tenure and any sections dealing with those processes do not apply to Academic Administrators.

Section 20.1 of the Agreement indicates that the Chair/Director is responsible for providing the newly-appointed Member with a written statement of performance expectations with regard to attaining tenure. Thereafter, the Chair/Director shall meet with each non-tenured Member by May 15th of each year of their initial term of appointment and review performance, concerns, and expectations for the next year. Members and their Chair/Directors should read sections 20.4 – 20.12 of the Agreement to understand the mechanism and procedures regarding the annual review.
Although the Chair/Director and possibly colleague mentors are expected to provide guidance, the responsibility for successful performance rests with the Member.

Section 23.6 of the Agreement states: “A full-time Assistant Professor with eligibility for tenure must be considered for tenure not later than the sixth year in this rank at the University.”

Section 32.1 of the Agreement states: "By April 15 of the year preceding the academic year in which a Faculty Member must be considered for reappointment or tenure, the Chair of the Faculty Member's Department must notify the Faculty Member of the documentation that the Faculty Member will be expected to submit and in the case of tenure that the Faculty Member is required to nominate referees by May 15 in accordance with section 33.5.”

For Members who wish to be considered for tenure or promotion before the final year of their appointment, section 32.2 indicates that "By April 15 of the year preceding the academic year in which a Faculty Member intends to apply for tenure or promotion, a Faculty Member must so notify the Chair of the Department in writing."

4.2 REAPPOINTMENTS

As stated in Section 22.1, an Assistant 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 22.2 and 22.3 spell out the evaluation criteria and evaluation standards that must be applied by the unit of the Assistant Professor seeking reappointment. Specifically, an Assistant Professor is evaluated for reappointment on the basis of teaching effectiveness since being appointed to the University (22.2.1), scholarly achievements during their career (22.2.2), and service and professional activities since being appointed to the University (22.2.3). As stated in section 22.3, an Assistant Professor under consideration for reappointment must demonstrate that s/he is making reasonable progress toward meeting the written expectations of their Department or School with regard to the granting of tenure. In the Faculty of Science, reappointment recommendations of the unit’s ARPT Committee are submitted to the Dean who uses this input to make recommendations to the Provost.

Section 22.5 states that an Assistant Teaching Professor is eligible, after 3 years from their initial appointment, for reappointment for a term of four years. Sections 22.6 and 22.7 spell out the evaluation criteria and evaluation standards that must be applied by the unit of the Assistant Teaching Professor seeking reappointment. In the Faculty of Science, recommendations of the unit’s ARPT Committee are submitted to the Dean who uses this input to make recommendations to the Provost.

Section 22.6 states that an Assistant Teaching Professor is evaluated for reappointment on the basis of teaching effectiveness (22.6.1), and other contributions (22.6.2).

Consideration of teaching effectiveness will be based on, but not limited to good teaching performance as assessed from Course Experience Surveys from all courses taught, peer reviews of in-class teaching and of course content, good course administration and coordination, and good contributions to program and curriculum development.

Consideration of other contributions will be based on, but not limited to active participation and good performance on departmental, Faculty or University committees, Faculty Association responsibilities, and good community outreach where relevant to the teaching mission of the unit. Service activities cannot compensate for deficiencies in teaching.

Section 22.7 states that an Assistant Teaching Professor under consideration for reappointment must demonstrate that the candidate has met or exceeded the written expectations of their unit and continues to
demonstrate superior teaching effectiveness. Where this is achieved, there is an expectation of reappointment.

Section 22.24 of the Agreement states that Academic Administrators whose performance consistently meets or exceeds the expected standard may be reappointed for a second term of three years. Section 22.25 stipulates that where the Academic Administrator is appointed to an academic Department, the procedures of the Department respecting reappointment will apply. Where the Academic Administrator is not appointed to a Department, the designated Line Authority will appoint a committee with a majority of voting members being Faculty Members holding regular academic appointments with relevant expertise to consider the reappointment.

**4.3 TENURE**

- Section 23.6 states that a full-time Assistant Professor with eligibility for tenure must be considered for tenure not later than the sixth year in this rank at the University; and
- Section 23.8 states that an Associate Professor or a Professor with eligibility for tenure shall be considered for tenure not later than the fourth year in this rank at the University.

Standards to become a tenured Assistant Professor are outlined in section 23.15 of the Agreement.

Standards to become a tenured Associate Professor or Professor are found in Sections 23.17 and 23.18 of the Agreement respectively.

Section 23.5 of the Agreement states that a Faculty Member who has been denied tenure in their final year of eligibility shall be offered a terminal appointment for one year.

**4.4 PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

Section 25.1 of the Agreement states that an Assistant Professor who is promoted to Associate Professor is automatically granted tenure. However, the awarding of tenure does not automatically confer promotion.

Section 23.16 of the Agreement states that the departmental committee will determine whether a Faculty Member who is being considered for tenure has also attained the standards of a tenured Associate Professor, and, if so, the committee will recommend that the Faculty Member be granted tenure and be promoted to Associate Professor.

**4.5 “EARLY PROMOTION” TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

The Agreement does not speak to the concept of "early promotion". A member must meet the criteria set out by the Agreement regardless of when they apply for tenure and/or promotion. The critical question is always: Has the University had sufficient time to adequately assess the candidate's teaching performance and scholarly research conducted at the University of Victoria for the decision in question? A rapid rate of achievements for a short time, but which has not yet satisfied the question of assessment, is in itself not sufficient to merit promotion and/or tenure - the criteria as laid out in the Agreement must still be met in full by the evidence presented.

**4.6 ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

As for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate for promotion to Full Professor must also submit recent peer evaluations of teaching (see section 2.5). Also, it is normally expected that one or more students will have obtained graduate degrees under the Members' direct supervision, usually including one or more PhD students.
4.7 CONTINUING APPOINTMENT FOR ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE TEACHING PROFESSOR

4.7.1 ASSISTANT TEACHING PROFESSOR
According to section 22.9 at the time of the second reappointment an Assistant Teaching Professor must be considered for a continuing appointment. According to section 22.10 before a continuing appointment is granted, an Assistant Teaching Professor must be reviewed by the departmental committee that considers reappointments and be recommended by the Dean as having met the standard for evaluation as set out in section 22.7. Where this is achieved, there is an expectation of continuing appointment. The Assistant Teaching Professor must include in their teaching dossier evidence of two recent peer reviews of teaching. The provisions of section 41 of the Agreement apply.

The criteria for continuing appointment are the same as those outlined for reappointment of an Assistant Teaching Professor in Section 4.2 of this document.

Section 22.11 states that if a continuing appointment is not granted to the Assistant Teaching Professor who must be considered for a continuing appointment under section 22.9, the Assistant Teaching Professor will be granted a one-year terminal contract after which time the Assistant Teaching Professor's employment with the University will cease.

4.7.2 ASSOCIATE TEACHING PROFESSOR
Section 17.13 of the Agreement states that an appointment at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor is without tenure and is not a continuing appointment. Section 22.12 states that where a Faculty Member is appointed at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, they must be considered for a continuing appointment in the final year of their initial 4-year appointment (17.14).

Section 22.13 states that an Associate Teaching Professor is evaluated for continuing appointment on the basis of teaching effectiveness (22.13.1), and other contributions (22.13.2).

Consideration of excellence in teaching performance (22.14) will be based on, but not limited to very good teaching performance as assessed from Course Experience Surveys from all courses taught, peer reviews of in-class teaching and of course content, very good course administration and coordination, and very good proactive contributions to program and curriculum development. The candidate would be considered competitive if nominated for teaching awards.

Consideration of other contributions will be based on, but not limited to proactive participation and very good performance on departmental, Faculty or University committees, Faculty Association responsibilities, academic administrative appointments, and very good community outreach where relevant to the teaching mission of the unit, Faculty, or University. Service activities cannot compensate for deficiencies in teaching.

As outlined in section 22.14 an Associate Teaching Professor under consideration for a continuing appointment must demonstrate that the candidate has met or exceeded the written expectations of their Department and continues to demonstrate excellence in teaching performance. Where this is achieved, there is an expectation of continuing appointment. In the Faculty of Science, recommendations of the unit’s ARPT Committee are submitted to the Dean who uses this input to make recommendations to the Provost. The teaching dossier must include two recent peer reviews of teaching (22.15).

According to section 22.16 an Associate Teaching Professor who is being considered for a continuing appointment may also apply for promotion to Teaching Professor with tenure under section 25 of the Collective Agreement, but the Faculty Member will only be considered for promotion if the Faculty Member requests it. An Associate Teaching Professor may be awarded a continuing appointment even if
their application for Teaching Professor with tenure is unsuccessful and may apply again for promotion in a later year.

Where an application for a continuing appointment by an Associate Teaching Professor is unsuccessful, the Faculty Member will be offered a terminal appointment for one year (22.17).

4.8 **Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor**

As noted in Section 25.3 of the Agreement an Assistant Teaching Professor may apply for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at the time of second reappointment or in any year thereafter. An Assistant Teaching Professor may not apply for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor earlier than the date for second reappointment unless, in the letter of offer, the Assistant Teaching Professor has been granted years of credit toward promotion based upon previous teaching experience at another post-secondary institution. Section 25.4 states that Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor of an Assistant Teaching Professor who does not have a continuing appointment confers a continuing appointment, but an Assistant Teaching Professor may be granted a continuing appointment without promotion.

Standards to become an Associate Teaching Professor are outlined in section 25.5 of the Agreement. Section 25.5 states that to be promoted to Associate Teaching Professor, an Assistant Teaching Professor must have appropriate academic credentials or evidence of appropriate professional achievement and must demonstrate excellence in teaching (25.5.1), initiative in the development or delivery of the academic program of the Assistant Professor’s unit or the University (25.5.2), and service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Assistant Teaching Professor’s discipline (25.5.3).

Consideration of excellence in teaching will be based on, but not limited to very good teaching performance as assessed from Course Experience Surveys from all courses taught, and very good peer reviews of in-class teaching and of course content. The candidate would be considered competitive if nominated for teaching awards.

Consideration of initiative in the development or delivery of the academic program will be based on, but not limited to very good course administration and coordination, and very good proactive contributions to program and curriculum development.

Consideration of service and professional activities will be based on, but not limited to proactive participation and very good performance on departmental, Faculty or University committees, Faculty Association responsibilities, academic administrative appointments, and very good community outreach where relevant to the teaching mission of the unit, Faculty, or University. Service activities cannot compensate for deficiencies in teaching.

4.9 **Promotion to Teaching Professor**

Standards to become a Teaching Professor are outlined in section 25.7 of the Agreement which states that an Associate Teaching Professor must have the appropriate academic credentials or evidence of appropriate professional achievement and must demonstrate a sustained record of outstanding achievement in teaching (25.7.1), either scholarship related to teaching that has attained national or international recognition, or substantial improvement in teaching in the Associate Teaching Professor’s Department or in the University (25.7.2), and service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Associate Teaching Professor discipline (25.7.3).

Consideration of outstanding achievement in teaching will be based on, but not limited to outstanding teaching performance as assessed from Course Experience Surveys from all courses taught, exceptionally strong peer reviews of in-class teaching and of course content, and educational leadership and mentorship. The candidate will have won teaching awards or be considered competitive if nominated.
Consideration of scholarship related to teaching that has attained national or international recognition, or substantial improvement in teaching in his or her department/school, or University will be based on, but not limited to either publications and research about teaching and learning, or excellent and proactive contributions to program and curriculum development with impact beyond the classroom.

Consideration of service and professional activities will be based on, but not limited to proactive participation and leadership on departmental, Faculty or University committees, Faculty Association responsibilities, external professional service, and outstanding community outreach where relevant to the teaching mission of the unit, Faculty, or University. Service activities cannot compensate for deficiencies in teaching.

Note: As outlined in section 25.8 of the Agreement, an Assistant Teaching Professor who has, as of July 1, 2014, a continuing appointment as an Assistant Teaching Professor may apply directly for promotion to Teaching Professor with tenure without first being granted promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, provided:

- They do not apply for promotion to Teaching Professor before their eleventh year of service in the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor; and
- The application is made prior to June 30, 2019.

4.10 EVALUATION OF PRIOR SERVICE
In some cases, the evidence for the level of teaching performance and scholarly achievement may stem in part from prior service at another institution. In such cases, the ARPT Committee must be convinced that these contributions have been adequately documented, and that overall, the standards of the University of Victoria have been met.

4.11 EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE WHEN THERE HAS BEEN LESS TEACHING THAN NORMAL
Some Members may have contributed less to the teaching program than normal because they were supported by external agencies that have such requirements, for example, the NSERC Industrial Research Chair or Canada Research Chair programs. In evaluating teaching performance in such cases, the ARPT Committee may place greater weight on the supervision of undergraduate and graduate students in research at the University of Victoria and/or to teaching contributions at other institutions. Their contributions to the regular undergraduate teaching program may be less than average in quantity, but must meet the standards for quality normally expected for the granting of tenure or promotion.

4.12 GUIDELINES FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A NEW FACULTY MEMBER WITH TENURE
Sometimes appointments are made for which it is appropriate to consider awarding tenure at the time of appointment. This would be the case, for example, for senior NSERC Industrial Research Chairs, or for Canada Research Chairs who have held academic appointments elsewhere, or for more senior regular appointments. The letter of offer to such an individual will spell out the conditions of appointment, including rank and provision of tenure, so it behooves the academic unit, and the Dean, to determine beforehand, to the degree possible, that the appointment rank and/or suitability for tenure is appropriate. (Although letters of offer actually constitute only an agreement by the Dean to recommend appointment, the conditions of appointment, including suitability of tenure, should always be established before the letter is sent.) Ideally, the case (i.e. for appointment with tenure) will have been recommended by the ARPT Committee of the academic unit before the offer letter is sent out.

The following considerations will apply to cases of appointment with tenure:
the academic unit putting forward the recommendation for appointment with tenure should attempt to have the candidate submit as much relevant information as possible, including the expectations of the previous institutions, and records and evaluations of teaching and other service, as well as research achievements, in previous positions held;

the ARPT committee should attempt to translate the available documentation into terms that apply at UVic (e.g. interpreting letters of reference submitted in support of a job application into terms related to appointment with tenure);

when an appointment with tenure is essentially a lateral move, e.g. the recruitment of a Professor with tenure from a recognized academic institution to the same position at UVic, this would normally constitute a strong basis for the UVic appointment; and

normally, an appointment representing a de facto promotion from a regular full-time non-tenured Assistant Professor from another institution to an Associate Professor with tenure at UVic, or from a regular full-time Associate Professor with tenure from another institution to Professor with tenure at UVic, will not be considered. Under special circumstances where such promotions may be contemplated, the ARPT Committee must determine whether the standards for such a position at UVic have been met prior to making the appointment; this does not require that the exact documentation described for normal internal promotion or tenure cases need be provided, but the documentation available must enable these committees to determine that the candidate meets the standards in place at UVic. This includes arms-length external letters of reference.

4.13 Documentation to be Considered by ARPT Committees
In addition to the CV, Teaching Dossier, and Research Statement, 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 unit ARPT committee.

4.14 Referees
With the exception of promotion to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor, the Faculty of Science requires at least four external letters of reference solicited by the department ARPT Committee. For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor, the letters of reference may be internal and external and are solicited by the department ARPT Committee. To ensure that four letters are available in a timely fashion, at least six letters should be solicited. The procedure for determining the list of referees is outlined in sections 33.5 to 33.12. The responsibilities of the candidate in the development of the list of referees are outlined in Section 32.

For cases in which promotion may be granted along with tenure, the letter sent to referees should clearly state that promotion may be granted along with tenure, and an opinion should be requested on the appropriateness of both tenure and promotion. Letters to referees should follow closely the forms given in Appendices C and D of this document.

Reference letters are deemed to be current if they are less than one year old. Where medical problems, or maternity or parental leave necessitated delay of a tenure and/or promotion case for which letters had already been obtained, the candidate may request that: (a) those letters be used in a current submission to the Department ARPT even if they are more than 12 months old; or (b) updated letters based on an updated CV, teaching dossier, and a research statement be solicited from all referees prior to submission of the file to the ARPT. Under no circumstances can letters older than 24 months be considered.
Appendix A: Deadlines for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion  
(Appendix G from Agreement, with specific Faculty of Science requirements)

GENERAL

Departmental ARPT Committees – selection of - by April 30  
UAAC – selection of – by October 15

i) REAPPOINTMENT AND ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE TEACHING PROFESSOR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Chair to notify the Faculty Member of the documentation that the Faculty Member will be expected to submit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit the following documentation to the Chair: CV, teaching dossier, teaching statement, and copies of other documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days prior to committee meeting</td>
<td>Deadline for Chair to provide the candidate with a list of all documents other than those referred to in the candidate’s dossier that will be submitted to the committee for consideration. The list will include annual performance reviews and any responses to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after receiving the list</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit a written response to the complete list of documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after receiving the list</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days prior to committee meeting at which additional documents will be considered</td>
<td>Deadline for Chair to provide the candidate the addendum to the list of documents that will be considered by the committee, if this is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) days prior to the committee’s consideration of the candidate</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to deliver a written response to any additional documents considered by the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after delivery of additional documents</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Chair to send to the Dean the department’s written report and copies of all of the documents considered by the Departmental Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean with regard to ARPT recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Dean to send recommendation to Member and the President or the UAAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UAAC:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to notify UAAC of intent to make oral presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s recommendation to UAAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>Deadline for UAAC to send report to Member and to the President.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### President:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation if file does not go to UAAC</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s report to President if file does not go to UAAC.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to UAAC report to President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) 10 days after receipt of UAAC report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member on files not considered by UAAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member on files considered by UAAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty (60) days after receipt of President’s notice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for grievance of President’s decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ii) TENURE AND APPLICATIONS FOR PROMOTION THAT, IF GRANTED, WILL CONFER TENURE

### Chair:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Chair to notify the Faculty Member of the documentation that the Faculty Member will be expected to submit, and that the Faculty Member is required to nominate referees by May 15.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member who intends to apply for tenure to notify the Chair in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Deadline for departmental committee to nominate a minimum of six referees.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to nominate a minimum of six referees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to select a minimum of two nominees from the committee’s list and notify the Chair in writing of this selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Deadline for committee to select a minimum of two nominees from the candidate’s list of referees, and to notify the candidate in writing of this selection.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit copies of or citations to scholarly or creative works that they wish to be made available to the referees prior to the date for distribution of materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31</td>
<td>Deadline for referees to indicate their willingness to serve.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit the following documentation to the Chair:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV, teaching dossier, up to 5 publications (reprints/preprints), research statement and copies of other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Deadline for chair of the committee to send the information provided by the committee to the referees who have indicated their willingness to serve.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit the following documentation to the Chair:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV, teaching dossier, up to 5 publications (reprints/preprints), research statement and copies of other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>Deadline for chair to provide the candidate with a list of all documents other than those referred to in the candidate’s dossier that will be submitted to the committee for consideration. The list will include annual performance reviews and any responses to them.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit a written response to the complete list of documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days prior to</td>
<td>Deadline for chair to provide the candidate with a list of all documents other than those referred to in the candidate’s dossier that will be submitted to the committee for consideration. The list will include annual performance reviews and any responses to them.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receiving the list</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receiving the list</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days prior to</td>
<td>Deadline for chair to provide the candidate the addendum to the list of documents that will be considered by the committee, if this is required.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee meeting at which</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional documents will be considered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) days prior to the committee’s consideration of the candidate</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to deliver a written response to any additional documents considered by the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after delivery of additional documents</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Chair to send to the Dean department’s written report and copies of all of the documents considered by the Departmental Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean with regard to ARPT recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Dean to send recommendation to Member and the President or the UAAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UAAC:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to notify UAAC of intent to make oral presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s recommendation to UAAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30</td>
<td>Deadline for UAAC to send report to Member and to the President.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
President:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation if file does not go to UAAC*</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s report to President if file does not go to UAAC</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to UAAC report to President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after receipt of UAAC report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30</td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member on files not considered by UAAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member on files considered by UAAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty (60) days after receipt of President’s notice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for grievance of President’s decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**iii) PROMOTION**

Deadlines for Promotion that will confer tenure (i.e. promotion applications by an untenured Assistant or Associate Professor) adhere to the deadlines for Tenure above.

**Chair:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member who intends to apply for promotion to notify the Chair in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Deadline for the departmental committee to nominate a minimum of six referees.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to nominate a minimum of six referees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to select a minimum of two nominees from the committee’s list and notify the Chair in writing of this selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Deadline for the committee to select a minimum of two nominees from the candidate’s list of referees, and to notify the candidate in writing of this selection.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit copies of or citations to scholarly or creative works that they wish to be made available to the referees prior to the date for distribution of materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31</td>
<td>Deadline for referees to indicate their willingness to serve.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit the following documentation to the Chair: CV, teaching dossier, up to 5 publications (reprints/pre-prints), research or teaching statement and copies of other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Deadline for chair of the committee to send the information provided by the candidate to the referees who have indicated their willingness to serve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Deadline for chair to provide the candidate with a list of all documents other than those referred to in the candidate’s dossier that will be submitted to the committee for consideration. The list will include annual performance reviews and any responses to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days prior to committee meeting.</td>
<td>Deadline for chair to provide the candidate with a list of all documents other than those referred to in the candidate’s dossier that will be submitted to the committee for consideration. The list will include annual performance reviews and any responses to them.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit a written response to the complete list of documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after receiving the list.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days prior to committee meeting at which additional documents will be considered.</td>
<td>Deadline for to provide the candidate the addendum to the list of documents that will be considered by the committee, if this is required.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to deliver a written response to any additional documents considered by the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline</td>
<td>Committee/Administration</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after delivery of additional documents</td>
<td>Deadline for Chair to send to the Dean the department’s written report and copies of all of the documents considered by the Departmental Committee.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Chair to send to the Dean the department’s written report and copies of all of the documents considered by the Departmental Committee.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean with regard to ARPT recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Dean to send recommendation to Member and the President or the UAAC.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s recommendation to UAAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean:**

**UAAC:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to notify UAAC of intent to make oral presentation.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to notify UAAC of intent to make oral presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s recommendation to UAAC.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s recommendation to UAAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Deadline for UAAC to send report to Member and to the President.</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s recommendation to UAAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**President:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after receipt of Dean’s</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send recommendation if file does not</td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s report to President if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendation if file does not go to UAAC</td>
<td>go to UAAC.</td>
<td>file does not go to President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after receipt of UAAC report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to UAAC report to President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member</td>
<td>Deadline for President to send</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on files not considered by UAAC.</td>
<td>recommendation to the Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on files considered by UAAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member</td>
<td>Deadline for grievance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on files considered by UAAC.</td>
<td>President’s decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty (60) days after receipt of President’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Departmental Checklists

DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND CONTINUING APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE TEACHING PROFESSOR
Documentation to be submitted to the Dean of Science in the order of the checklist

Candidate: ____________________________ Department: ____________________________

__ ARPT Recommendation form signed by all members of the ARPT Committee including statements of evaluation by the ARPT Committee concerning teaching performance (section 22.6.1), and other contributions (section 22.6.2).

__ Curriculum Vitae

__ Teaching Dossier

__ Two or more peer evaluations of teaching (see FEP)

__ Annual Performance Reviews as applicable and any responses to them (section 20.14 to 20.16)

__ Position status change form

__ Statement from candidate (up to 3 pages—font no smaller than 12 pitch) concerning teaching and or research and or other contributions.

__ Other documents that the candidate wishes the Committee to consider (listed on reverse of this form)

______________________________  ________________________________
Chair of ARPT Committee                     Date

I have examined all the material listed above.

______________________________  ________________________________
Candidate                     Date
## DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

Documentation to be submitted to the Dean of Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and/or Promotion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARPT Recommendation form signed by all members of the ARPT Committee and the candidate (printed name below each signature) <strong>Note:</strong> If candidate is applying for tenure and promotion, please include two separate cover pages (one for tenure, one for promotion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Dossier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two peer or more evaluations of teaching (see FEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Performance Reviews and any responses to them (sections 20.1 to 20.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement from candidate of their relationship to each of the suggested referees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least four letters from referees (original copy; photocopy to remain in department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample of letter sent to referees soliciting reference, including list of appended material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position Status Change Form <strong>Note:</strong> If candidate is applying for tenure and promotion, please include two separate Position Status Change forms (one for tenure, one for promotion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter from candidate (section 32.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement from candidate (up to 3 pages—font no smaller than 12 pitch) concerning teaching and/or research and/or other contributions. (Material to be sent to referees.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other documents that the candidate wishes the Committee to consider (listed on reverse of this form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reprints/preprints of publications (up to 5, chosen by the candidate to best represent their scholarly contributions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chair of ARPT Committee**

I have examined all the material listed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE TEACHING PROFESSOR

Documentation to be submitted to the Dean of Science in the order of the checklist

Candidate: __________________________________________ Department: __________________________________________

___ ARPT Recommendation form signed by all members of the ARPT Committee including statements of evaluation by the ARPT Committee concerning the criteria for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor (section 25.7)

___ Curriculum Vitae

___ Teaching Dossier

___ Two or more peer evaluations of teaching (see FEP)

___ Statement from candidate of their relationship to each of the suggested referees

___ At least four letters from referees (original copy; photocopy to remain in department)

___ Sample of letter sent to referees soliciting reference, including list of appended material

___ Position Status Change Form

___ Letter from candidate (section 32.2)

___ Statement from candidate (up to 3 pages—font no smaller than 12 pitch) concerning teaching and or research and or other contributions.

___ Other documents that the candidate wishes the Committee to consider (listed on reverse of this form)

_________________________________________  _________________________________
Chair of ARPT Committee                               Date

I have examined all the material listed above.

_________________________________________  _________________________________
Candidate                               Date
## DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR PROMOTION TO TEACHING PROFESSOR

*With tenure* Documentation to be submitted to the Dean of Science in the order of the checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. ARPT Recommendation form signed by all members of the ARPT Committee including statements of evaluation by the ARPT Committee concerning the criteria for promotion to Teaching Professor (section 25.7)
2. Curriculum Vitae
3. Teaching Dossier
4. Two or more peer evaluations of teaching (see FEP)
5. Statement from candidate of their relationship to each of the suggested referees
6. At least four letters from referees (original copy; photocopy to remain in department)
7. Sample of letter sent to referees soliciting reference, including list of appended material
8. Position Status Change Form
9. Letter from candidate (section 32.2)
10. Statement from candidate (up to 3 pages—font no smaller than 12 pitch) concerning teaching and or research and or other contributions.
11. Other documents that the candidate wishes the Committee to consider (listed on reverse of this form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair of ARPT Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have examined all the material listed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix C – Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Re: Promotion of Dr. X to Associate Professor with Tenure

Thank you for agreeing to assist in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. _____, Assistant Professor in the Department/School of _____, 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 two possible positive outcomes: the first, required for the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and the second, for the granting of tenure to an Assistant Professor without promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The Collective Agreement is a public document that may be found on the web at


According to Article 23.17 of the Collective Agreement, to become a tenured Associate Professor, a Faculty Member must demonstrate:

(a) scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline;
(b) teaching effectiveness at or above a level of quality appropriate to the Faculty Member’s experience and with a commitment to excellence in teaching; and
(c) capacity for continuing development with regard to each of the following
   i) teaching; and
   ii) service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member’s academic discipline.

According to Article 23.15 of the Collective Agreement, an Assistant Professor with eligibility for tenure must demonstrate:

(a) a record of performance that meets or exceeds the written expectations of their Department that are in accord with the Evaluation Policy of the Faculty in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment; and

(b) continued development with regard to each of the following:
   i) teaching effectiveness at or above a level of quality appropriate to the Faculty Member’s experience and with a commitment to the importance of excellence in teaching;
   ii) scholarly or creative achievements of high quality that are normally but necessarily demonstrated by presentation or publication in a suitable academic or artistic forum; and
   iii) service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member’s academic discipline, where teaching effectiveness and scholarly achievements have paramount importance; and

(c) the capacity to attain the standards to become a tenured Associate Professor.

Candidates found to be qualified for promotion are automatically awarded tenure in accordance with
Article 25.1. However, since the awarding of tenure does not automatically confer promotion at the University of Victoria, you may wish to render separate opinions on the candidate’s qualifications for tenure and promotion under the two standards.

The Faculty Evaluation Policy (Section 1 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, referenced in Article 23.14 of the Collective Agreement, 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 scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. ------. To further assist you in your evaluation, a curriculum vitae and other supporting documents are included with this letter. It would be helpful if you could compare Dr. ------ to other individuals of similar experience with whom you are acquainted. I would also appreciate your comments on whether Dr. ------ would qualify for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in either your own institution or in another institution comparable to the University of Victoria.

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. ------ requests the information, I would be required to give Dr. ------ 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 ------

encl: CV, up to 5 research papers, 3-page summary of research achievements, other supporting documents (if applicable)
Appendix D – Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from tenured Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Re: Promotion of Dr. X to Associate Professor

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. ------, tenured Assistant Professor in the Department/School of ------, 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.


Article 23.17 of the Collective Agreement states that:

To become a tenured Associate Professor, a Faculty Member must demonstrate:

(a) scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline;
(b) teaching effectiveness at or above a level of quality appropriate to the Faculty Member’s experience and with a commitment to excellence in teaching; and
(c) capacity for continuing development with regard to each of the following:
   i) teaching; and
   ii) service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member’s academic discipline.

I would be grateful for your evaluation of the scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. ------. To help you do this, supporting documentation is included with this letter. It would be helpful if you could compare Dr. ------ to other individuals of similar experience with whom you are acquainted. I would also appreciate your comments on whether Dr. ------ would qualify for promotion in either your own institution or in another institution comparable to the University of Victoria. 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. ------ requests the information, I would be required to give Dr. ------ a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.

I would appreciate receiving your response by ------. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
Department/School of ------

encl: CV, up to 5 research papers, 3-page summary of research achievements, other supporting documents (if applicable)
Appendix E – Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
Re: Promotion of Dr. X to Professor

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. X, who is a tenured Associate Professor in the Department of ------, 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.


Article 23.18 of the Collective Agreement states that:

To become a tenured Professor, a Faculty Member must demonstrate:

(a) scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to the academic discipline;
(b) teaching effectiveness at or above a level of quality appropriate to the Faculty Member’s experience and with a continuing commitment to excellence in teaching;
(c) record of service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member’s academic discipline; and
   i) outstanding achievements with regard to either: teaching; or
   ii) scholarship that has attained recognition at a national or international level.

I would be grateful for your evaluation of the scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. ------. To help you do this, supporting documentation is included with this letter. It would be helpful if you could compare to other individuals of similar experience with whom you are acquainted. I would also appreciate your comments on whether Dr. ------ would qualify for promotion to the rank of Professor in either your own institution or in another institution comparable to the University of Victoria. 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. ------ requests the information, I would be required to give Dr. ------ a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.

I would appreciate receiving your response by -------. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
Department/School of ------

encl: CV, up to 5 research papers, 3-page summary of research achievements, other supporting documents (if applicable)