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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 the Framework Agreement concluded at the end of 2000 between the University of Victoria Faculty Association and the University of Victoria. The Agreement can be found at http://web.uvic.ca/vpac/framework/framework.htm


The Faculty Evaluation Policy does not replace the Framework 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, and also before the annual 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 the Framework Agreement, the criteria for evaluation of Members' performance are:

- Teaching Effectiveness
- Scholarship and professional achievement
- Other contributions

1.2 Evaluation in light of different workloads
The Faculty of Science and the University of Victoria consider a Member’s teaching and scholarship records to be equally important when being considered for promotion and tenure or for merit. While this is most often aligned with the normal workload distribution of 40% Teaching, 40% Research, and 20% Other Contributions, this sense of equal value also pertains to Members whose workload distributions have been altered; Canada Research Chair holders for example. In such cases, however, evidence for an enhanced research performance by a Member is expected when formalized teaching release is part of his/her workload when compared to disciplinary and departmental norms.

1.3 Assessment of "Teaching Effectiveness"
Evaluation of a Member’s "Teaching Effectiveness" will be based on his/her Teaching Dossier and attachments to it.

The criteria for the assessment of Teaching Effectiveness will include but not be limited to:

- A listing of the contributions to the teaching program in the form of undergraduate and graduate courses taught;
- student evaluations of teaching using Course Experience Surveys- statistical summaries of all teaching evaluation questionnaires administered during the period of review should be included in the Teaching Dossier; students' comments need not be included, but if they are, all comments for that section of the course taught by the Member must be submitted;
- peer reviews of teaching and, if available, assessments done by the Learning Teaching Center. Inclusion of the latter is voluntary. Inclusion of the former is required;
• a listing of undergraduate and graduate students, as well as postdoctoral trainees, supervised by the Member for research; having successfully graduated MSc or PhD students will be given particular weight; joint supervision should be clearly explained in the Teaching Dossier from the candidate;
• the development of new courses and the application of new approaches or methodologies in teaching;
• attendance at teaching workshops, and especially contributions to them
• honors won for teaching; and
• contributions to the scholarship of teaching which includes, but are not limited to, those items listed in Articles 13.1.2(a)(i-iii) of the Framework Agreement.

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

1.4 Assessment of "Scholarship and Professional Achievement" Evaluation of a Member’s Scholarship and Professional Achievement will be based on information contained in his/her Curriculum Vitae.

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. A Member must also articulate the nature of their specific contributions to collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship in their Research Statement.

The criteria for the assessment of "Scholarship and Professional Achievement" will include but not be limited to:

• 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;
• the securing of external, peer-reviewed research funding; the percent contribution to a Member’s research from multi-applicant grants should be clearly explained;
• the delivery of invited seminars or plenary lectures at scientific conferences or at other universities or institutions;
• authorship of invited and contributed book chapters, monographs, and electronic media
• the presentation of posters or contributed talks at conferences (regional, national, or international);
• patents obtained; and
• other evidence, including external non-peer reviewed funding, patents applied for but not yet issued, and non-refereed publications.
1.5 Assessment of "Other Contributions"
Evaluation of a Member’s "Other Contributions" will be based on his/her Curriculum Vitae. The criteria for the assessment of Other Contributions will include but not be limited to:

- contributions through service to or development of the Member's academic unit; service as the Chair of a Department, or Director of a School, Centre, or Institute;
- service to the University, the Faculty Association, or student life;
- mentoring colleagues in teaching and research;
- contributions to the Member's profession, including membership on research organization boards, professional society boards or journal editorial boards, councils and grant selection committees devoted to research and professional affairs, and on organizing committees for conferences;
- contributions to teaching including consultation on curriculum at the provincial level, instruction to high school teachers seeking upgrading, and contributions to programs at other post-secondary institutions; 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 achievements

2.1 The Official Performance File
All evaluations of achievement relevant to salary adjustments, promotion, or tenure are based on information contained in a Faculty Member’s Official Performance File. The OPF (see Article 41.1.3 of the Framework Agreement) contains the Member’s Curriculum Vitae, recommendations with regard to previous reappointment, tenure, promotion decisions, salary adjustments and annual reviews and any responses to them. The OPF in the Faculty of Science is deemed to include the Teaching Dossier and any attachments relevant for assessing teaching performance such as student comments.

2.2 Performance Evaluations
Non-tenured Faculty Members who are tenure-track must be provided with a written statement of performance expectations with regard to attaining tenure. By May 15 of each year, such members must meet with his or her unit head to discuss their performance during the past 12 months, as well as any performance expectations and concerns relevant to attaining tenure. A detailed description of the annual review, including the generation of a written report and the opportunity to respond is provided in Article 14.1.5 of the Framework Agreement. All written material relevant to an annual review is to be contained in the Member’s Official Performance File.

Upon the initiative of the Member or the unit head, there may also take place annual performance assessments of tenured Members.

2.3 The Curriculum Vitae
The standard CV and Teaching Dossier are available electronically on the website. They are based on the UVic standard format. Members are asked to update their CVs annually for their unit who will subsequently submit them to the Dean's Office by January 31st as electronic documents, without hardcopy, either as a MS “Word” document, an rtf file, or a pdf.

2.4 The Teaching Dossier
Each Member must maintain a Teaching Dossier, which is deemed to be contained in the Member’s Official Performance File. A standard form, with explanatory notes, for the Faculty of Science “core” Teaching Dossier is available electronically from the Dean’s office.

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 all comments must be included.

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. The Dean's office requests that Teaching Dossiers be submitted annually (January 31st) as electronic documents, without hardcopy, either as a MS Word document, an rtf file, or a pdf.

2.5 Peer Evaluation of Teaching
Peer evaluation of teaching performs two important functions: it provides a mechanism, particularly early in a Member's career, for obtaining helpful advice, and is an important component of the overall evaluation of teaching. 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. Tenure and all promotion decisions require a more formal documentation of peer evaluation. A formal peer evaluation should be comprised of at least two evaluations preferably of separate courses taught by the Member. More than two evaluations is preferred. At least one of the courses should, if possible, be at the 100 or 200 level, if part of the Member’s teaching record. The evaluations of each course are to be performed by different peers, who must be mutually acceptable as evaluators by both the academic unit head 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.

Written peer evaluations of teaching are part of a Member’s Official Performance File. Informal peer evaluations are not.

2.6 Research Statement
As permitted by Article 22.6 of the Framework Agreement the Faculty of Science requires that at the time of tenure and/or promotion a Member provide 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 “The Most Significant Contributions to Research” section of the NSERC Personal Data Form (Form 100). This document will be included in the material sent to external referees.

3. The awarding of merit increments

3.1 Overview
Effective May the Framework Agreement requires that MIs must be distributed to meet the following requirements:
• A member can receive 0.0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5 or 4.0 MIs.
• The “unit threshold” for a department or school is defined as 15% of Members in the unit other than Chairs, rounded down to the nearest whole number.
The distribution rules are:
  o The total number of Members receiving 0.0, 0.5, or 1.0 MIs is greater than or equal to the unit threshold.
  o The total number of Members receiving 1.5, 2.0, or 2.5 MIs is greater than or equal to the unit threshold.
  o The total number of Members receiving 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0 MIs is greater than or equal to the unit threshold.

Zeros are not forced by the distribution rule.

These requirements must be met on a faculty-wide basis, and should initially be adhered to at the Department/School level. The final unit distributions however may differ if the Dean makes subsequent adjustments from his or her pool based on Chairs/Director recommendations (Section 3.3).

### 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 X (every person counts as 1.0, whether full or part-time; Members and their MIs 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, less 3.0% which is held back by the Vice-President Academic & Provost;

- For the supplemental pool the Faculty is allocated a number of MIs equal to the number of Department 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 are allocated 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; and

- The Dean is to allocate all assigned MIs as one pool; that is, the supplemental MIs do not have to go Chairs.

- 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 award the MIs provided to the Faculty to the units as specified above;

- the individual unit heads will assess the performance of each Faculty Member in that unit on the basis of the criteria described in this document, normally over a three year period preceding January 1 of the year in which the review is made (see also Article 74.3.4.1), and will generate a list of all Members in ranked order of merit;

- the unit head will use this list to assign MIs, up to and including 4 MIs;

- the unit head 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 unit head presents his/her list for the distribution of MIs to the Dean, s/he must provide a brief 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 his/her ability, evaluations that span the entire Faculty when s/he makes assessments or changes; and

- The distribution rules 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
The maximum number of MIs that may be awarded to a Faculty Member in one year is four. MIs are awarded only in half-integer increments. Only those Faculty Members who have been awarded 0.5 or more MIs are automatically eligible for a career progress increment (CPI). Chairs/Director who assigned a Member an MI score of zero must provide a recommendation to the Dean for that Member to receive a CPI.

Unit heads will assess the performance of all Faculty Members in the unit, using the appropriate criteria. That is, for regular Faculty Members, considering Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship and Professional Achievements, and Other Contributions. For Assistant Teaching Professors, the appropriate criteria are Teaching Effectiveness and Other Contributions.

3.5 Job descriptions
The University takes seriously each of the three general categories—“Teaching”, “Scholarship 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 three. The Framework Agreement stipulates that no category (“Teaching Effectiveness”, “Scholarship and Professional Achievement” and “Other Contributions”) in the job description of a Faculty Member other than an Assistant Teaching Professor may carry less than 20% weight. Normally, one of the configurations in the following table would describe Members' jobs, although others are possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of position</th>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness</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>Unit head</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit head</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>
</tbody>
</table>

These descriptions acknowledge that being a unit head involves a heavy administrative burden, seen as "Other Contribution", which will be met by reducing the usual 40% “Teaching Effectiveness” or “Scholarship 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 unit head. 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).

One effect of having different weightings available for different contributions, is that Members whose contributions are primarily in the teaching realm (job description 60% Teaching Effectiveness) will see those contributions result in appropriate annual performance evaluations, relative to a policy in which all Members have 40% of their contributions assigned to Teaching Effectiveness.

The Framework Agreement stipulates that a Member’s job description can be changed by mutual agreement between the Member, the unit head, and the Dean, and that this change must be agreed upon before the beginning of the evaluation period to which it applies. Such changes will be for a period normally of two years and not to exceed five.

3.6 Assessment of achievement
The assessment of achievement of individual Members of an academic unit will be made by the unit head, either acting alone, or in consultation with others. The mechanism that will be used by each unit head will be described to the Members of his/her unit in advance of considering a given year’s annual assessment.

The period of review for awarding Career Progress Increments and Merit Increments is normally the three years preceding January 1 of the year in which the review is made, or less if the Member was appointed more recently. The review period for a Member who has been on Leave Without Salary is the same. Provisions for periods during which the Member was on Leave,
except Leave Without Salary, are found in Article 74.3.4.2 of the Framework Agreement. Any adverse effect of sick leave or of maternity or parental leave must be taken into account in the evaluation process.

The Framework Agreement speaks of the notion that higher standards of performance are expected with an increase in rank, and that within the Professorial rank, with number of years. Unit heads will consider this principle in making assessments. For regular Faculty Members, satisfactory performance is expected in Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Performance and Achievement, and Other Contributions. Exceptions to this expectation may be made for new regular Faculty Members, who are generally not expected to contribute as significantly to "Other Contributions".

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. Nevertheless, unit heads may wish to establish a rough guide for providing increments. In any such guide, the awarding of 4 MIs will represent an exceptional award, whatever the average performance.

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 year, even though his/her performance is similar.

3.7 Extraordinary Merit Increments
According to Article 74.6.7.1 of the Framework Agreement, the Vice-President Academic/Provost will retain 3% of the MIs available, to be awarded in recognition of:

- outstanding teaching effectiveness and scholarship and professional achievement; or

- substantial contributions to the functioning of the University in areas other than teaching effectiveness, or scholarly and professional achievement.

The Dean, upon presentation of a convincing case by the unit head, may petition the Vice-President Academic/Provost for extra merit increments to reward Members who have made relevant contributions.

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 Framework Agreement, is the basis for discussion between a Member and his/her unit head about their responsibilities and evaluations of achievement. Article 14.1.1 of the Framework Agreement indicates that the unit head is responsible for providing the newly-appointed Member with a written statement of performance expectations with regard to attaining tenure. Thereafter, the unit head shall meet with each non-tenured Member by May 15th each year and review performance, concerns, and expectations for the next year. Members and their unit heads should read Article 14.1.2 of the Framework Agreement to understand the mechanism and procedures regarding the annual review.

Although the unit head and possibly colleague mentors are expected to provide guidance, the responsibility for good performance rests with the Member.

Article 22.1 of the Framework 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..."

For Members who wish to be considered for tenure or promotion before the final year of their appointment, Article 22.2 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 her or his Department in writing."

4.2 Reappointments
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. Article 15.1.2 and Article 15.1.3 of the Framework Agreement spell out the evaluation criteria and evaluation standards that must be applied by the unit of the Assistant Professor seeking reappointment. 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.

An Assistant Teaching Professor is eligible for reappointment for a term of four years. Article 15.2.2 and Article 15.2.3 of the Framework Agreement spell out the appropriate 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.

4.3 Tenure
Regarding tenure, Article 16.2 of the Framework Agreement spells out the following:

- 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
- 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 Article 16.3.1 of the Framework Agreement.

Standards to become a tenured Associate Professor or Professor are found in Articles 16.3.3 and 16.3.4 of the Framework Agreement, respectively.

4.4 Promotion
Regarding promotion, Article 18.2 of the Framework 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.

Article 16.4 of the Framework Agreement states that a Member who has been denied tenure in their final year of eligibility shall be offered a terminal appointment for one year.

Unit heads are urged to look carefully at cases of Members who are going forward for tenure, to determine whether they should simultaneously be requesting promotion to Associate Professor. This consideration should be made before any letters of reference are requested, to ensure that the appropriate request for evaluation is made to referees. A recommendation that tenure be granted may also include a recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor, notwithstanding the absence of a formal application for promotion.
4.5 “Early Promotion” to Associate Professor
The Framework Agreement does not speak to the concept of "early promotion". A member must meet the criteria set out by the Framework Agreement regardless of when s/he applies for tenure and/or promotion. The critical question is always: Has the university had sufficient time to adequately assess the candidate's teaching effectiveness and scholarly research 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 Framework 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 a recent peer evaluation of teaching (which should comprise two evaluations preferably of separate courses taught by the Member). 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 PhDs.

4.7 Continuing Appointment for Assistant Teaching Professors
At the time of the second reappointment and normally in the seventh year of service at the University, an Assistant Teaching Professor must be considered for a continuing appointment. According to Article 15.2.4.4 of the Framework Agreement an Assistant Teaching Professor who has served, as of July 1, 2008, fifteen years as an Assistant Teaching Professor, may request the Dean to recommend to the Vice President Academic and Provost that s/he be granted a continuing appointment. The Dean will make an evaluation based on the past three years teaching evaluations, activity reports and any other relevant information from the Assistant Teaching Professor.

Otherwise, according to Article 15.2.4.5 of the Framework Agreement, an Assistant Teaching Professor must be evaluated by the Departmental Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee.

4.8 Teaching Professor
An Assistant Teaching Professor may apply for promotion to Teaching Professor in the year which the Assistant Teaching Professor will have completed eleven years' service as an Assistant Teaching Professor or during the fourth year of holding a continuing appointment, whichever is earlier.

Standards for promotion to Teaching Professor are found in Article 18.3.2 of the Framework Agreement.

4.9 Evaluation of prior service
In some cases, the evidence for the level of teaching effectiveness and scholarly achievement may stem in part from prior service at another institution. In such cases, the ARPT and FAC must be convinced that these contributions have been adequately documented, and that overall, the standards of the University of Victoria have been met.

4.10 Evaluation of teaching effectiveness 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 effectiveness in such cases, the ARPT and FAC may place greater weight on teaching contributions at other institutions and/or to the supervision of undergraduate and graduate students in research at the University of Victoria. Such contributions, which must be provided in the documentation by the Member, together with the expected contributions to the regular
undergraduate teaching program, may be less than average in quantity, but must meet the
qualitative standards normally expected for the granting of tenure or promotion.

4.11 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 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 (and subsequently the
FAC) 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.

5. Faculty Advisory Committee

5.1 Some general considerations
The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) of the Faculty of Science is charged with the
responsibility of ensuring that the awarding of tenure and/or promotion is carried out in a
manner fully consistent with the Framework Agreement and with academic standards of the
Faculty.

Recommendations for promotion and tenure are made by the ARPT committees of the units in
the Faculty to the FAC. The FAC then provides a non-binding recommendation to the Dean,
who in turn makes a recommendation to the President. The operations of ARPT committees
are described in Articles 21 to 31 in the Framework Agreement, and for the FACs, in Articles 32 to 36.

All discussions by members at meetings of the FAC are confidential. Members must not disclose or discuss opinions expressed during the Committee’s proceedings or the Committee’s recommendations outside the meetings, except as otherwise provided in the Framework Agreement.

The University policy on conflict of interest in effect at the beginning of the current academic year shall apply to the proceedings of the Committee. In cases of conflict of interest between a member of the Committee and a candidate, the member shall declare such a conflict and withdraw from considerations of the case.

The Framework Agreement speaks to a number of considerations of tenure and promotion cases before FAC, including appeals and other matters, and candidates whose cases are to come forward should familiarize themselves with these considerations. The following description focuses on the operation of the FAC in the Faculty of Science.

5.2 Composition of the FAC
Each unit of the Faculty (Departments, School) will at all times appoint one tenured regular faculty member and one tenured alternate member to sit on the FAC. Members serve for three years. In choosing members of the FAC, the unit should make every effort to represent the range of diversity and seniority of its Members. When the term of the current regular member ends, the alternate member takes his/her place, and a new alternate member joins.

The membership of the FAC (the Dean, six internal, two external) will be approved by the Faculty no later than April 30th in accordance with Article 32.1 of the Framework Agreement. If for any reason both the regular and the alternate members representing a unit must leave the FAC in the same year, that unit will find replacements for both positions. Chairs and Acting Chairs of Departments are ineligible for membership on the Committee. Persons to be considered for promotion in a given year may not serve on the Committee in that year.

When a given case is being considered by the FAC, the member from the unit in which the candidate has his/her major appointment may be present during the proceedings. However, s/he will not participate in the discussion unless specifically asked a question by the other members. Even then the unit FAC member may only answer questions related to the culture of the candidate’s discipline, for example, the quality of a specific journal, and not on the candidate or the candidate’s record. The unit FAC member may not vote on the outcome regarding tenure and/or promotion.

If a member is unable to be present for the projected course of FAC meetings for a particular candidate, the alternate member from the same unit takes his/her place for the duration of that case or cases. If a member is on academic leave and is therefore unable to serve in a given year, the alternate member will take his/her place for that year.

Two tenured faculty members from Faculties other than Science are also chosen for the FAC by the Dean. Such members also serve for three years. They should be chosen to have overlapping terms.

The candidate may also request that an additional, voting Member from another Faculty, who is likely to have an understanding of the case, be added to the Committee while hearing his or her case. The conditions for such an addition are described in the Framework Agreement, Article 32.3(d).
A quorum will comprise five (5) members of the FAC, plus the Dean or Dean’s designate. No formal business of the Committee shall be conducted without the Dean or the Dean’s representative being present.

5.3 Procedures of the FAC
A list of deadline dates regarding tenure and promotion procedures is provided in Appendix A. The Committee first considers all applications for tenure and then applications for promotion. Before considering any cases to come before it in a given year, the FAC will first meet to select a Chair (to assign case managers and to oversee the FAC meetings), a vice-Chair (to substitute for the Chair in his or her absence), and a Secretary, from its members. The Secretary will submit a brief record of the meeting to the Dean as soon as possible after each meeting. Case managers will be selected for each case to be brought before the FAC in that year. The case managers may not be from the same unit in which the candidate has his/her major appointment.

The process of considering the cases before the Faculty of Science FAC will comprise the following steps:

i. The appropriately-constituted FAC will meet and the Committee will undertake a non-binding straw vote by secret ballot to gauge the strength of the case. The case manager will then present the case. Following discussion, questions may be formulated for the candidate. Such questions will be forwarded to the candidate in writing.

ii. As stated in the Framework Agreement, the candidate is entitled to make an oral presentation in response to the ARPT committee’s reasons to the Committee if he/she gives written notice to the Dean not later than five working days after receiving the Department’s statement of reasons resulting from the ARPT committee’s decision. A candidate may be assisted in making an oral presentation by another Member chosen by the candidate.

iii. After presentation of the case by the case manager, and discussion, and provided there are no questions or concerns which need to be conveyed to the candidate, it may choose to vote for approval of the case at the same meeting. The vote will be held as usual (see section vi below). If the vote is unanimously in favor, this will be considered to be the final vote and the case will be considered to be completed. If the vote is not unanimously in favor or if the vote is not in favor of tenure and/or promotion, the FAC may opt to reschedule an additional meeting with the candidate to address any questions and concerns. If the FAC elects not to do so, the case will be considered to be completed.

iv. If the FAC determines that it has questions and concerns that should be addressed by the candidate, the FAC Chair may invite the candidate to meet with the FAC, to hear the candidate’s answers to the questions or concerns of the Committee, and to discuss other points related to the candidate’s case. The candidate may elect to meet with the FAC accompanied by his or her unit head or by an academic colleague. The FAC may ask questions of either party, and either party may make a brief presentation. The candidate may elect to meet more than once if a written request for the meeting has been tendered as per (ii) above, or in response to the committee’s invitation. The unit head or academic colleague may not meet with the FAC without the candidate.

v. After the candidate has met with the committee, the FAC may either hold a vote on the case immediately, or it may choose to hold further meetings before voting.

vi. All voting by the FAC is by secret ballot, with the choice of “yes” or “no” as to the case. The vote is to be based on the global considerations of the “Standards to be Applied in Review” described in Article 32.4.8(d) of the Framework Agreement. The Secretary shall record the number of those in favor and those opposed to the promotion and/or tenure, and all ballots
(straw vote and final) shall be retained until the case and any challenges to it are resolved. All FAC members who are eligible to vote on a given case must vote. To be eligible, an FAC member must have been present for all of the presentations relevant to that case, and all of the Committee's deliberations on it.

vii. The case manager will prepare a case report that will include the results of the final vote and the reasons for this recommendation. All Committee members who voted on a case will sign the case report.

viii. The Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee must forward the Committee’s case report to the Dean and to the candidate. This must occur no later than November 15th for Assistant Teaching Professors, Continuing, December 5th for tenure and promotion cases to Associate Professor and March 15th for promotion cases to Professor. The candidate may make a written submission to the Dean with regard to these recommendations, as described in Article 36.0 of the Framework Agreement. Finally, the Dean must transmit his or her written recommendation on each case, with a copy of the Faculty Advisory Committee's recommendation, to the President via the Provost and to the candidate. Where the recommendation of the Dean is negative, the candidate may appeal to the University Review Committee as described in Article 37.3.1 of the Framework Agreement.

According to Article 32.4.8 of the Framework Agreement the FAC may refer a case back to the Department for reconsideration where significant errors in procedure or bias have been identified.

5.4 Documentation to be considered by the FAC
A checklist of the documentation that makes up a complete dossier is presented in Appendix B.

In addition to the CV and Teaching Dossier, up to five publications, chosen by the candidate to best represent his or her scholarly contributions, are to be included in the candidate’s original submission to the unit ARPT committee. In addition, the candidate is required to provide a research statement, of no more than three pages, outlining the significance of these contributions similar, if chosen, to the outline of research highlights found in an NSERC Form 100.

Unit heads will include with each departmental recommendation for tenure or promotion at least four external letters of reference solicited by the department ARPT Committee from a list of persons mutually agreed to by the candidate and the ARPT Committee, and a copy of the letter sent to the referees, together with a list of enclosures. There should be at least two letters from referees suggested by the ARPT Committee. To ensure that four letters are available in a timely fashion, at least six letters should be solicited. In all cases, all letters of reference received in response to requests must be submitted to both the ARPT committee and, in turn, to the FAC. Indeed, the FAC must receive all of the documents that were put before the ARPT committee, and no supporting documentation may be added to the case file by the candidate after the ARPT decision is reached.

For cases in which tenure may be granted along with promotion, the letter sent to referees should clearly state that tenure will be granted along with promotion, 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. Letters are deemed to be current if they are less than one year old. Where medical problems, 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 and FAC even if they are more than 12 months old; or (b) updated letters based on an updated CV, TD, and a research statement be solicited from all referees prior to
submission of the file to the ARPT and FAC. Under no circumstances can letters older than 24 months be submitted with the file for consideration by the FAC.

Unsolicited information directed to the Faculty Advisory Committee, except as allowed by the Framework Agreement, will not be considered.

The FAC comprises a broad cross-section of faculty and should be seen as being a non-expert committee. The role of the FAC is not to reevaluate the file after the deliberations of the ARPT Committee. As stated in Article 32.4.8 (c) of the Framework Agreement, its role is to advise the Dean that the ARPT Committee has provided a sound and unbiased recommendation for tenure or promotion based on the criteria outlined in the Framework Agreement, the Faculty Evaluation Policy, and in the case of reappointment or tenure the performance expectations of the unit as provided to the Member in accordance with Articles 14.1.1 and 14.3.1 of the Framework Agreement. It is therefore important that the ARPT take its reporting role very seriously and provide sufficient information and detail in its report that will allow the FAC to make an informed judgment of the file.

Article 25.3 of the Framework Agreement stipulates that if requested by the candidate, the Chair of the Department must provide the candidate with a copy of any documents in the case file, with some exceptions. If the request is for letters of reference, and the referees have indicated that the letters are confidential, then these shall normally be provided in a form that does not identify the author. If this is not possible, a summary should be prepared in a manner to protect the identity of the author.

The files for tenure and promotion cases must be accompanied by completed and annotated check-lists, signed by the Chair of the unit’s ARPT Committee and the candidate.

5.5 Candidate’s relationship to the referees
Under the Framework Agreement, unless approval is given by the Dean, a referee must not
(a) hold an academic appointment at the University; or
(b) have been the supervisor of the candidate’s PhD or equivalent academic degree or the supervisor of the candidate’s post-doctorate program; or
(c) be a co-author of any of the candidate’s publications or a co-investigator on any of the candidate’s research projects.

While in principle there is no restriction on their rank, the referee should be sufficiently senior and have the expertise to be credible. Because it is not always possible to fulfill these criteria above in Science, the ARPT Committee should be considerate of cases where there may be an infringement of them, particularly of item (c) above. To minimize any conflict of interest in such cases, it is useful to apply the description of an appropriate referee adopted by NSERC guidelines: a referee should not have co-published or collaborated with the candidate under review for the past six years. Even this definition may be too restrictive in some cases, for example, where the candidate is a participant in very large research groupings that include many or most of the world’s experts in his or her area of research. Judgment and discretion are called for in such cases. In such cases the ARPT Committee may consult with the Dean. The decisions based on such consultations should be included in the documentation presented to the FAC.

A useful statement of the “arm’s length” issue regarding referees was made by the Faculty Advisory Committee of the then Faculty of Arts and Science in 1985:

If the former supervisor of the dissertation, or colleagues with whom the candidate has worked or is collaborating on research activities are referees, the value of the external
letters can be diminished...candidates for promotion are best advised to observe the arm's length principle to the greatest degree possible... Candidates for tenure or promotion who work in highly specialized research fields may have a very small pool of potential referees on which to draw. The Committee recognizes and appreciates the difficulties that may arise in individual cases. Nevertheless, our advice to our colleagues is that wherever, and to the greatest degree possible, candidates nominate external referees at arm's length from their own work.

In every case, the candidate must identify, in the “Recommendation Form Relating to Promotion and Tenure” submitted by the academic unit, his/her relationship, which may be "none", to each of the referees.
Appendix A - List of deadlines

Apr 15  unit heads must notify Members who are to be considered for reappointment or tenure of the documentation the Member is expected to submit. (see Article 22.1 of the Framework Agreement)

Apr 15  Member must notify their unit head of their intention to apply for tenure or promotion in the next academic year. (see Article 22.2 of the Framework Agreement)

Apr 30  appointments of unit ARPT committees for the upcoming period July 1 to June 30 (see Article 21.1 of the Framework Agreement)

May 15  both the Member who is to be considered for tenure in the next academic year or who intend to apply for tenure or promotion, and his or her ARPT Committee must prepare and simultaneously exchange lists of at least 6 referees. (see Article 23.3 of the Framework Agreement)

June 1  Member must select a minimum of 3 referees from the list which was prepared by the ARPT according to Article 23.3 of the Framework Agreement, and notify the unit head of this selection. (see Article 22.4 of the Framework Agreement)

Sep 1  a Member to be considered for reappointment, tenure or promotion conferring tenure must submit the required documentation to their unit head. The submission date is Oct 1\textsuperscript{st} for the case of promotion only. (see Article 22.5 of the Framework Agreement)

Sep 15  unit heads inform the Dean of members expected to seek tenure or promotion

Oct 15  unit heads submit recommendations on reappointments and Assistant Teaching Professor, continuing appointments to the Dean's office (see Article 29.0 of the Framework Agreement)

Nov 15  unit heads send to the Dean the written report of the departmental ARPT committee, and all relevant documentation, for tenure cases (see Article 29.0 of the Framework Agreement)

Nov 15  the FAC submits its recommendations for all Assistant Teaching Professor, continuing cases to the Dean and the Faculty Members (see Article 35.0 of the Framework Agreement)

Dec 1  Dean must submit his/her recommendations for reappointments and Assistant Teaching Professor, continuing appointments to the President and the Faculty Member (see Article 37.2 of the Framework Agreement)

Dec 15  the FAC submits its recommendations for all tenure cases and those for promotions which also confer tenure to the Dean and the Faculty Members (see Article 35.0 of the Framework Agreement) to the President and the Faculty Member (see Article 37.2 of the Framework Agreement)

Jan 15  Dean must submit his/her recommendations for all tenure cases and those for promotions which also confer tenure to the President and the Faculty Member (see Article 37.2 of the Framework Agreement)

Jan 15  unit heads send to the Dean the Department's written report, and all relevant documentation, for promotion cases (see Article 29.0 of the Framework Agreement)

Mar 15  the FAC submits its recommendations for all promotion cases to the Dean and the Faculty Members (see Article 35.0 of the Framework Agreement)

Apr 1  Dean must submit his/her recommendations for all promotion cases to the President and the Faculty Member (see Article 37.2 of the Framework Agreement)

Last revision: September 24, 2013
Appendix B

DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT 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 effectiveness (FA 15.2.2a), and other contributions (FA 15.2.2b).

__ Curriculum Vitae

__ Teaching Dossier

__ Two peer evaluations of teaching (see FEP)

__ Annual Performance Reviews as applicable and any responses to them (see FA 14.3)

__ 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

Rev: September 24, 2013
DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT 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 effectiveness (FA 15.1.2a), scholarship (FA 15.1.2b), service and professional activities (FA 15.1.2c).

___ Curriculum Vitae

___ Teaching Dossier

___ Two peer evaluations of teaching (see FEP)

___ Annual Performance Reviews and any responses to them (FA 14 and 25.1)

___ 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

Rev. September 24, 2013
DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT 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 effectiveness (FA 15.2.2a), and other contributions (FA 15.2.2b).

___ Curriculum Vitae

___ Teaching Dossier

___ Two peer evaluations of teaching (see FEP)

___ Annual Performance Reviews as applicable and any responses to them (see FA 14.3)

___ 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

Rev. September 24, 2013
DEPARTMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION CASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation to be submitted to the Dean for consideration by the Faculty Advisory Committee in the order of the checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and/or Promotion: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ARPT Recommendation form signed by all members of the ARPT Committee and the candidate (printed name below each signature) **Note:** If candidate is applying for tenure and promotion, please include two separate cover pages (one for tenure, one for promotion)

- Curriculum Vitae

- Teaching Dossier

- Two peer evaluations of teaching (see FEP)

- Annual Performance Reviews and any responses to them (FA 14 and 25.1)

- Statement from candidate of his/her 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 **Note:** If candidate is applying for tenure and promotion, please include two separate Position Status Change forms (one for tenure, one for promotion)

- Letter from candidate (for promotion cases and early consideration of tenure, see FA Sec. 22.2)

- 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.)

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

- Reprints/preprints of publications (up to 5, chosen by the candidate to best represent his/her scholarly contributions)

---

**Chair of ARPT Committee** ________________ **Date** ________________

I have examined all the material listed above.

---

**Candidate** ________________ **Date** ________________

Rev. September 24, 2013
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’s Framework 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 Framework Agreement is a public document that may be found on the web at:

http://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/resources/framework/index.php

According to Article 16.3.3 of the Framework Agreement to become a tenured Associate 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) capacity for continuing development with regard to each of the following
   i) teaching
   ii) service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline.

According to Article 16.3.1 of the Framework Agreement an Assistant Professor with eligibility for tenure must demonstrate:

(a) a record of performance that meets or exceeds the written expectations of her or his Department (Faculty in the case of a non-departmentalized Faculty) that are in accord with the Evaluation Policy in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment;
(b) continued development with regard to each of the following
   i) teaching effectiveness at or above the 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 18.1. 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 16.3.1 a) of the Framework 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, teaching dossier 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 Promotion and Tenure, and to the Faculty Advisory Committee and administrative officers responsible for consideration of promotion cases. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. ------ may be granted access to your letter unless you specifically state that you wish the contents to remain confidential. If your response is designated confidential, and if Dr. ------ requests the information, I would be required to give him 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 ------

enclosures: CV, Teaching Dossier, up to 5 research papers, 3-page summary of research achievements
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 Framework Agreement between the University and its faculty members (http://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/resources/framework/index.php). Article 16.3.3 of the Faculty Evaluation Policy states that

To become a tenured Associate 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) capacity for continuing development with regard to each of the following
   i) teaching
   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 Faculty Advisory Committee and administrative officers responsible for consideration of promotion cases. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. ------ may be granted access to your letter unless you specifically state that you wish the contents to remain confidential. 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 ------

enclosures: CV, Teaching Dossier, up to 5 research papers, 3-page summary of research achievements
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 -----, 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 Framework Agreement between the University and its faculty members (http://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/resources/framework/index.php). Article 16.3.3 of the Framework 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) A record of service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member’s academic discipline; and
(d) Outstanding achievements 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 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 Faculty Advisory Committee and administrative officers responsible for consideration of promotion cases. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. ---- may be granted access to your letter unless you specifically state that you wish the contents to remain confidential. If your response is designated confidential, and if requests the information, I would be required to give 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 -----

enclosures: CV, Teaching Dossier, up to 5 research papers, 3-page summary of research achievements