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1. PREFACE

1.1 Introduction

This Faculty Evaluation Policy (FEP) for the Faculty of Human and Social Development (HSD) arises from the June 2015 Collective Agreement (CA) between the University of Victoria Faculty Association and the University of Victoria (see the CA at https://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/assets/docs/Collective%20Agreement.pdf). All faculty members should familiarize themselves with the Collective Agreement (CA) in its entirety. Where there is a conflict between this Faculty Evaluation Policy and the June 2015 CA between the University of Victoria Faculty Association and the University of Victoria, the CA supersedes this document.

The Faculty of Human and Social Development is distinguished by the fact that its constituent Schools and Programs were established to provide professional as well as academic education. We value the work of educating our students for their academic and professional advancement because of its impact in making uniquely important contributions to health and society. Increasingly, our graduates are called upon to work in teams for the interests of our communities and therefore the culture of the Faculty is one where multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary work is highly valued, Indigenous scholarship is recognized for its distinct contributions, and community linkages are critical. We aspire to be a Faculty that best integrates outstanding scholarship, inspired teaching and social change.

The Faculty is responsive to community needs and considers social responsibility for action and change in the human services to be important. We are actively engaged in influencing policy and practice. As a result, many faculty members work in partnerships in their teaching and research programs and are community engaged scholars, contributing to the betterment of a rapidly changing global society. There is no universally adopted definition of community engaged scholarship (CES). For purposes of this document, we will use the definition of CES adopted by the UVic UNESCO Chair, which is “teaching, discovery, integration, application and engagement that involve the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community. It has the following characteristics: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique, rigor and peer-review”. This description of CES comes from a draft 2015 document provided by the University of Victoria’s Institute for Studies and Innovation in Community University Engagement (ISICUE); see Appendix A. In order to fulfill our mandate of professional education, the professional and academic values of our Faculty and the important range of activities that faculty members engage in need to be considered in the process of evaluating faculty members.

Section 19 of the CA: Evaluation of Members requires that each Faculty establish a Faculty Evaluation Policy which must be reviewed by December 31 of the year in which a new CA comes into effect. The Evaluation Policy and any amendment thereto must be consistent with the CA and be submitted to the Faculty and the Vice-President Academic and Provost for approval. This policy outlines the principles and procedures in the Faculty of Human and Social Development for the purposes of evaluating faculty members’ applications for reappointment, tenure, continuing status, and/or promotion, and for any salary adjustments on the basis of demonstrated achievement.
Section 19.5 of the CA further states that the Faculty Evaluation Policy must include:

19.5.1 a description of the components to be evaluated within each of the following evaluation criteria:
   19.5.1.1 teaching performance, which is defined at sections 19.6 - 19.7 (Part 2.1 of the FEP);
   19.5.1.2 scholarly and professional achievement, for Faculty Members other than Assistant Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors, which is defined at section 19.8 (Part 2.2 of the FEP); and
   19.5.1.3 other contributions, which is defined at section 19.11 (Part 2.3 of the FEP);

19.5.2 a description of the assessment techniques to be used in making evaluations (Part 3 of the FEP);

19.5.3 a description of the format and essential content to be used by a Faculty Member in preparing the teaching dossier for evaluation of teaching performance;

19.5.4 a description of the mechanism or process by which recommendations will be made with regard to MIs for Members of the Departments, including any system of allocating MIs among Departments and the rules relating to salary evaluation procedures set out in this section (Part 5 of the FEP);

19.5.5 provision that while Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors are not evaluated on the basis of their research and scholarship, 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 (Part 2.2.2 of the FEP);

19.5.6 provision that Academic Administrators be evaluated on the basis of the criteria listed in section 19.14 (Part 2.4 of FEP); and

19.5.7 provision for taking 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 (Part 3.4 of FEP).

Faculty members are responsible for reviewing the performance expectations outlined in their initial appointment letters, the annual reviews provided by their Director, the relevant School/Program Standard for attaining reappointment or tenure document, this Faculty Evaluation Policy, and relevant sections of the CA. Faculty should also familiarize themselves with the format of the student evaluations of their teaching. Information about any changes to the teaching evaluation form will be communicated to all faculty members by their School/Program Director in a timely manner.

1.2 Expectations with Regard to Standards (CA – Sections 19.17 & 19.18)

As stipulated in Section 19.17 of the CA, it is anticipated that faculty members will be assessed taking into account their years of experience. In the Faculty of Human and Social Development, this means that expectations of faculty members rise over time and with higher rank. Professors and Teaching Professors are expected to have greater experience and expertise in all areas of their work than Associate or Assistant Professors/Teaching Professors. Further, as outlined in Section 19.18 of the CA, this faculty evaluation policy reinforces that “expectations for a Member’s performance must be consistent with the Member’s FTE”.

Section 19.7 also outlines that performance standards may be further defined by the Faculty Evaluation Policy or by other Departmental policies as described in Section 19.5. Faculty-wide criteria and examples for meritorious, satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance in each of
teaching, scholarship, and other contributions are provided in this document in Part 2. Each school provides further information in its statement of performance expectations as reviewed and approved by the Dean. As with this FEP, in their statements, units must specify that expectations for a faculty member’s performance must be consistent with their years of experience and FTE (CA 19.17 and 19.18).

1.3 Curriculum Vitae (CA – Sections 19.19 & 19.20)

Sections 19.19 and 19.20 of the CA state that:

19.19 Members are expected to maintain a curriculum vitae, which is updated biennially, that records their scholarly and professional achievements, that may include scholarship related to teaching, and other contributions; and provide a copy of their curriculum vitae to the Chair of each Department and Dean of each Faculty of which the Faculty Member is a member or, in the case of Librarians, to the University Librarian.

19.20 A curriculum vitae will be in the form described in the evaluation policy of the Faculty or Department or Libraries. A Member’s curriculum vitae is a public document that is to be kept on file in the office of the Faculty Member’s Department or the University Librarian’s office in the case of a Librarian.

HSD faculty members should submit their updated CVs in the University of Victoria template format outlined at www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/resources/templates

1.4 Format and Content of a Teaching Dossier (CA – Section 19.21 – 19.24))

19.21 Faculty Members are expected to maintain a teaching dossier, which is updated biennially, that documents their teaching performance, and provide a copy of her or his teaching dossier to the Chair of the Department.

Section 19.7 states that the evaluation of teaching performance will be conducted on the basis of a Faculty Member’s teaching dossier that, in addition to course experience surveys, may include such items as peer reviews, 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. There must be no obligation to include anecdotal or subjective student comments. Evaluation of teaching performance must not be based solely on student evaluation scores and must consider all materials in the teaching dossier.

Faculty members should note that Section 19.22 of the CA indicates mandatory components to be provided in the teaching dossier for evaluation as follows:

19.22 Evidence of teaching performance will include complete aggregated statistical results of all course experience surveys administered during the period of review, in accordance with the evaluation policy of the Faculty in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment, or the Faculty in which the course is offered, and any relevant Department policies; however, anecdotal or subjective student comments will be included only if the Faculty Member chooses to include them.

Sections 19.23 & 19.24 outline additional, optional components that may be included as follows:
In addition to the data specified in section 19.22, evidence of teaching performance may include complete aggregated statistical results of all teaching evaluation questionnaires administered by the Faculty Member in a course during the period of review; however, the Faculty Member is not obliged to submit or include anecdotal or subjective student comments.

A Faculty Member may choose to include anecdotal or subjective comments by students or former students in her or his teaching dossier. Where such comments are included that have been collected as part of a survey of students in a course, all the comments from that course must be included in the Faculty Member’s teaching dossier.

The core of the teaching dossier in HSD should consist of a completed HSD Short-Form Teaching Dossier. The required elements to be included in the dossier are outlined below.

**Required Elements**

- **Statement of Teaching Philosophy**: written narrative prepared by the faculty member. It distinguishes the faculty member’s approaches to learning and teaching and provides a conceptual framework that explains the values, principles and goals that underpin the faculty member’s teaching decisions and actions. (1 page single space maximum)

- **Statement of Effective Teaching Strategies**: written narrative that illustrates how the faculty member’s philosophy is enacted in the teaching process. The intent is to describe teaching goals and teaching strategies with a brief rationale. The emphasis is on providing examples of creativity/change/innovation/development in course materials including course syllabi, assignments, methods of assessment, class/learning activities, and reflections on the teaching improvement. It is advisable to link teaching strategies to learning outcomes. (3 page single space maximum) There may be references to documents attached in appendices including evidence of impact of teaching activities.

- **Teaching Responsibilities**: A listing of teaching responsibilities for the relevant period of review; courses taught, listed by course number, title, delivery method, contact hours and number of students taught. A listing of directed studies taught and graduate student supervision should be included.

- **Evidence of Teaching Performance**:
  - Aggregated results from the course experience surveys administered during the period of review including response rate for each course are required. Note: evaluation of teaching performance must not be based solely on student evaluation scores and must consider all materials in the teaching dossier.
  - Anecdotal or subjective student comments are optional and will be included only if the faculty member chooses to include them. Where such comments are included that have been collected as part of a survey of students in a course, all the comments from that course must be included in the faculty member’s teaching dossier.
  - Faculty Members may include a statement of interpretation to address the course experience survey results (1 page single space maximum).
  - Additional supplementary evidence of teaching performance may include but are not limited to: formative (i.e. content, process and design aspects of instruction) and summative (outcomes of instruction) evaluations, reviews of syllabi, evidence of quality graduate student supervision, evaluation of graduates/alumni, self-evaluations of teaching and learning, feedback from co-teachers, coordination of practicums, courses, co-op, etc.)
Peer Teaching Reviews. Peer teaching reviews are optional for Research Stream Faculty; two recent peer reviews of teaching are required for Teaching Stream Faculty being considered for continuing appointment (CA 22.10 and 22.15), tenure and promotion. Peer reviews are to be conducted by an experienced senior faculty colleague in the year preceding application for continuing appointment, tenure and promotion. Faculty should consult with their director on the choice of any potential peer reviewer. Faculty members may request additional peer reviews at any time.

Peer teaching reviews provide further evidence of teaching performance and are gathered through an intentional process whereby a peer reviews, observes and provides written feedback on a faculty member’s teaching (e.g. course design, syllabus, learning activities, assignments, observations of teaching, learning outcomes) with the intent of providing comment for the improvement of teaching.

Evidence of Contributions to the School or Faculty’s Teaching Program and to the Scholarship of Teaching.

- Contributions relating to educational leadership, curriculum design, course development or the advancement of knowledge of teaching and learning
- Scholarly publications related to teaching and learning
- Grants and awards related to the scholarship of teaching
- Other supplementary material as relevant

Optional Supplementary Materials for Continuing Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Applications

For Continuing Appointment, Tenure and Promotion purposes, supplementary materials (CA 19.7) may provide evidence of teaching performance, using multiple methods of evaluation. These materials may include, but are not limited to:

- peer reviews of teaching,
- class visit reports,
- reviews of syllabi and examinations,
- evidence of innovative teaching,
- evidence of the quality of student supervision,
- evaluation by graduates/alumni,
- evidence of efforts undertaken to improve teaching effectiveness,
- teaching awards,
- self-evaluations of teaching and learning,
- a statement regarding one’s approach to teaching and learning,
- expected learning outcomes (by course),
- contributions to the Department’s or Faculty’s teaching program,
- contributions to course design and curriculum development,
- scholarship related to teaching, and
- evidence of the impact of teaching activities.

The Learning and Teaching Centre (http://www.ltc.uvic.ca), is a valuable resource that may be used by faculty members preparing dossiers.
1.5 Transitional Issues for Assistant Teaching Professors

Appendix L of the CA provides a Memorandum of Understanding on transitional issues for Assistant Teaching Professors.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA (CA – Section 19.5.1)

In the Faculty of Human and Social Development, teaching, research, scholarship, professional achievement, and other community and University contributions are often closely linked, and it may be difficult, if not counterproductive, to categorize a contribution in only one area. We value this integration. At the same time, the evidence of achievement, in total, must describe contributions that reflect a satisfactory quantity as well as quality of those contributions in accordance with the CA.

2.1 Evaluation of Teaching Performance (CA - Sections 19.6 & 19.7)

Section 19.6 outlines the evaluation of teaching performance for all categories of faculty as follows:

19.6 Teaching performance requires the evaluation of all of a Faculty Member's methods and forms of teaching and student supervision that are described and evaluated in accordance with the evaluation policy of the Faculty and of the Department in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment. Teaching performance includes contributions to the Department’s or Faculty’s teaching program and to scholarship related to teaching as described in the evaluation policy of each Faculty and in any relevant departmental policies. Scholarship related to teaching includes, but is not limited to, the following:

19.6.1 scholarly works relating to teaching, curriculum development or learning in a discipline in which such works would not normally form part of the Member’s scholarly and professional achievements;
19.6.2 presentations and addresses related to teaching, curriculum development or learning in a discipline in which such activities would not normally form part of the Member’s scholarly and professional achievement; and
19.6.3 contributions related to the unit’s teaching program in the form of curriculum development, course design or other contributions that advance the Unit’s ability to meet its teaching responsibilities.

The Faculty of Human and Social Development values community-engaged teaching which includes transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge within and beyond the classroom setting through teaching, mentoring and other curricular activities that service communities within or outside of the university. One of the important teaching objectives in the Faculty of Human and Social Development is to develop in students a sense of professional responsibility to the public at large, and to relevant professional bodies. Because faculty members are responsible for the quality of the professional preparation achieved by graduates, the evaluation of their teaching may include an assessment of the ability to teach professional work in community settings.
and/or their ability to teach in the classroom and by online education where these form part of their teaching responsibilities.

Activities that are included in teaching encompass both direct contact with students as well as indirect contact that occurs through the development of curriculum and community-engaged mentorship. Direct teaching contacts in classes, courses, seminars, on-line instruction and graduate supervision are of paramount importance in the evaluation process and will be weighted more heavily than other activities that are considered under the category of teaching. The follow lists include examples of activities that may be considered in the evaluation of teaching. The lists are not intended to be prescriptive. It is not expected that each faculty member will engage in all of these activities. Rather, the lists are intended to provide examples of the types of activities that might be considered under the category of teaching.

Teaching activities include, but are not limited to:

- Course-based teaching (related primarily to direct student contact)
  - a. Classroom teaching (may include the use of technology)
  - b. Online teaching
  - c. Blended teaching (combination of classroom & online)
  - d. Experiential teaching
  - e. Land-based teaching and learning
  - f. Directed studies courses

- Mentoring and research training
  - a. Graduate student supervision
  - b. Service learning (practicum, internship) supervision
  - c. Supervision of student research or other scholarly or creative activities
  - d. Student advising, career mentorship and other supports to students' academic lives
  - e. Mentoring of colleagues to improve the quality of teaching
  - f. Conducting peer-reviews of colleagues' teaching
  - g. Research training and mentoring of community members/research partners

- Capacity building
  - a. Policy development in relation to teaching
  - b. Scholarship that enhances teaching
  - c. Involvement in the scholarship of teaching
  - d. Developing infrastructure to support students and teachers for practice and/or other teaching

- Knowledge transfer
  - a. Public workshops and presentations
  - b. Participation in expert panels, government/community committees

- Development of curriculum
  - a. Course syllabi development
  - b. Distance education/blended learning course development
  - c. Development of auxiliary course or curriculum materials
  - d. Development of software, media methods
  - e. Involvement in international student and/or professor exchanges
  - f. De-colonization of the curriculum
  - g. Integration of technology into teaching
h. Community engagement in teaching (community field visits, workshops, involvement of guest speakers and knowledge holders such as Elders, etc.)

i. Statement of learning outcomes directly related to the material for each course and unit of a course, including how syllabi embed strategies to achieve and evaluate students according to those learning outcomes. Peer reviews of teaching can reflect assessment of a faculty member’s use and achievement of learning outcomes in the teaching under review. In such instances, the peer reviewers should meet with the faculty member ahead of the review time to clarify the learning outcome goals for the course and class to facilitate the inclusion of clear assessment of these for the written review process.

- Provision of Professional development
  a. Leading, co-leading or contributing to teaching of workshops, courses, conferences

2.1.1 Indicators for Assessment of Teaching

Indicators of Meritorious Teaching

For the purposes of allocating Merit Increments for teaching and assessing teaching for reappointment, tenure or continuing status, and promotion processes, evidence relating to the excellence and impact of teaching activities will be considered. Illustrations of such evidence include, but are not limited to:

- Receiving excellent quantitative and/or qualitative teaching evaluations;
- Demonstrating illustrations of innovation/creativity/change/ development of course materials, including course outlines, assignments, methods of assessment, class exercises, or case studies;
- teaching in locations and modalities beyond the traditional face-to-face campus boundaries;
- employing effective development and use of strategies that support student learning in community and/or practice settings;
- receiving a teaching/educational leadership award;
- showing high quality graduate student supervision and committee membership (where appropriate) See the University of Victoria Faculty of Graduate Studies Responsibilities in the Supervisory Relationship Policy available at http://www.uvic.ca/graduatestudies/assets/docs/docs/policies/Supervisory%20Relationship%2007.pdf and see further resources at http://www.uvic.ca/graduatestudies/resourcesfor/faculty/advising/index.php
- having significant involvement in co-op work term assessments where appropriate;
- creating an inclusive respectful environment for all students;
- receiving positive peer reviews of teaching;
- creating a new course to the curriculum or significant and substantial revision of an existing course;
- balancing support of students with providing a challenging learning environment;
- demonstrating commitment to community-engaged teaching;
- taking leadership or being involved in international student and/or professor exchanges;
- committing to mentoring, collaborating, and team teaching relating to improve student experience and learning outcomes;
- mentoring of colleagues to improve quality of teaching;
- participating in teaching development activities;
• committing to improving the learning and teaching and learning climate;
• contributing leadership to program and curriculum development;
• proving scholarship that supports teaching, educational leadership and innovation; and
• employing the use of technologies to improve learning and teaching.

**Indicators of Satisfactory Teaching**
Acceptable teaching may include, but not be limited to, a continuing pattern of some of the following:
• receiving favourable student and/or peer evaluation as well as the absence of unsatisfactory performance;
• taking responsibility for addressing issues raised through student and/or peer feedback;
• preparing for class or other teaching activity (e.g., online discussion);
• providing respectful treatment of students;
• providing balanced constructive feedback to students;
• contributing to program and curriculum development; and
• showing willingness to take on graduate committee work (where appropriate).

**Indicators of Unsatisfactory Teaching**
Unsatisfactory teaching may include, but not be limited to, a continuing pattern of some of the following:
• showing a lack of preparation for class or other teaching activities;
• cancelling of classes or other teaching activities without giving notice or providing acceptable reasons; not providing availability for class or consultation;
• receiving negative evaluation of teaching performance (from students, peers, or both);
• demonstrating prejudicial or discriminatory treatment of students; and,
• refusing to participate in graduate student committees.

### 2.2 Evaluation of Scholarly and Professional Achievement for Faculty Members other than Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor (CA – Sections 19.8 – 19.10)

Sections 19.8, 19.9 and 19.10 outline the criteria for scholarly and professional achievement on which tenured or tenure-track faculty members holding an appointment as Assistant, Associate or Full Professor are evaluated as follows:

**19.8** 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 and Department in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment.

**19.9** Scholarly and professional achievement will be evaluated in all possible manifestations and may include, but is not limited to, the following, as specified in each Faculty’s evaluation policy and any relevant departmental policies:

- **19.9.1** publications and scholarly papers, especially insofar as they reveal the quality of research, including alternate and emerging forms of scholarship;
- **19.9.2** other forms of creative achievement in areas that are directly relevant to a Faculty Member’s discipline;
- **19.9.3** awards and fellowships granted by institutions other than the University;
19.9.4 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;

19.9.5 recognition by learned and professional societies; and

19.9.6 evidence of reputation for scholarship that the Faculty Member establishes among professional colleagues at the University and at other academic and professional institutions.

19.10 The evaluation of scholarly and professional achievement will be conducted on the basis of a Faculty Member’s curriculum vitae.

Scholarship is broadly defined and highly valued in this Faculty. The scholarship of teaching, integration, and application are valued as well as the scholarship of discovery (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997). In addition to the traditional controlled experimentation typical of the sciences, research may include, but is not limited to, studies using qualitative or interpretive methods, descriptive surveys, needs assessment studies, applied evaluation projects, action research, theoretical work integrating the empirical work and hypotheses of others, ethical or philosophical work, model building, creative arts-based projects, and literature surveys. As this Faculty values community-engaged scholarship, it would not be considered unusual for a faculty member to have a research portfolio that balances publications directed at academic audiences with other professional or creative activities. The differing time lines that may be appropriate for the variety in methodologies of community engaged scholarship are recognized. Scholarship of teaching can be considered in either the category of teaching effectiveness OR research and scholarship.

Collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship is encouraged and valued in the Faculty. As with single-authored work, faculty members will receive credit for multi-authored publications and research grants. The specific nature of the contribution to the project must be noted in the documentation. Similarly, with community-based or participatory action research (both of which involve partnerships with community members) the specific nature of the faculty member’s contribution to the project must be made explicit.

Indigenous knowledge and scholarship are integral to the Faculty of HSD. Indigenous scholarship is highly diverse but it invariably places the specific needs and experiences of Indigenous peoples, communities and territories at the centre. Specifically, Indigenous scholarship seeks to transform the social, historical and political conditions impacting Indigenous children, youth, families, communities, nations and homelands. It is a form of scholarly engagement that is closely attuned to Indigenous cultural, environmental, political, economic and spiritual wellbeing. Although what constitutes Indigenous research is not limited to Indigenous methodologies, it is recognized that in Indigenous research paradigms, a strong ethic of relational accountability to human and non-human relations (including the earth, plants, animals, water, cosmos, etc.) permeates all research endeavors. In other words, Indigenous research is “answerable to all relations” (Wilson, 2001, p. 177).

The evaluation of Indigenous research may include attention to family-, community- and land-based partnerships, ethics and methodologies. Indigenous research paradigms recognize that central to Indigenous well-being is a connection to land, “where ceremonies are properly held, stories properly recited, medicines properly gathered, and transfers of knowledge properly authenticated” (Battiste, 2002, p. 13). HSD values Indigenous scholarship and knowledge translation. It would not be considered unusual for a faculty member to have a research portfolio that balances publications directed at academic audiences with other
professional or creative activities aimed at supporting the meaningful engagement of Indigenous protocols, partners and communities. The differing time lines that may be appropriate for the variety of Indigenous scholarship, and research methodologies are recognized. Scholarship of Indigenous teaching can be considered in either the category of teaching effectiveness OR research and scholarship.

Peer review is generally considered to be an indicator of quality of the work. Hence, publications that are refereed are generally considered to be of higher value in the evaluation process. However, it is recognized that non-refereed publications make important contributions to disseminating knowledge and they, too, are encouraged. For non-refereed publications that make a significant impact on the field or discipline, evidence of the contribution (e.g. book reviews, citations, letters to the editor, etc.) and the intended or actual impact may be provided to demonstrate the quality of the work.

It should be emphasized that it is the quality, significance and impact of any contribution that is of paramount importance. Size of a research grant or payment for a professional or scholarly activity, e.g. honorarium for a workshop, royalties for a book, presentation, film, etc., do not, in themselves, constitute either positive or negative support for the merit of the activity. Faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of the quality, significance and impact of their scholarship (refereed and non-refereed, written and oral) and so may include assessments from a range of users (e.g. academic peers, government officials, NGOs officers, Aboriginal community leaders, conference participants, academic and community awards, community members, patients, youth).

Publications will be given credit at the time that a letter of total acceptance has been obtained. Acceptance subject to revisions will be treated as material “in preparation”. Materials that are “in preparation” will not be considered in the evaluation until they have been accepted for publication or presentation.

The lists below provide examples. It is emphasized that not all possible contributions of a faculty member are captured by these examples; there is no expectation that a faculty member will have publications or other types of scholarly achievements in each category.

**Scholarship and Professional Achievement**

Examples of scholarship include, but are not limited to, the following:

- peer-reviewed publications (see below);
- non-peer-reviewed material (see below);
- films, videos, computer software, web-sites, pod-casts;
- tests, questionnaires, or assessment instruments;
- research grants and contracts (see below);
- research proposals;
- conference presentations;
- invited addresses to professional associations/societies/community groups;
- editing a research or professional journal;
- developing a new practice technique;
- building university-community partnerships;
- developing research protocols;
- distance education, distributed or blended learning course development; and
- artistic creations and productions.
Peer-reviewed publications
These have been reviewed by peers prior to publication and are considered substantial evidence of scholarship. They can be in either paper or electronic format. Examples are listed as follows:
- papers in refereed journals;
- books published by university or other publishing houses using referees in the publishing process;
- refereed chapters in edited books; and
- abstracts and papers in published conference proceedings (not conference program) where a peer review process can be documented; films, videos or computer software where a peer review process can be documented.

Non-peer-reviewed material
These are publications, papers and other materials that have not been peer-reviewed prior to publication. Examples are listed as follows:
- non-peer-reviewed examples of those above;
- articles in association newsletters or journals;
- publications for clients;
- papers presented at scholarly or professional meetings;
- occasional papers;
- educational pamphlets;
- technical reports;
- program manuals;
- briefs to governments, Aboriginal communities or other bodies; and
- reviews of scholarly articles and research grant applications.

Research grants and contracts
It is recognized that the process of application for funding is time consuming and is not always successful. For faculty members at the lower ranks in particular, or those who are beginning new research programs, consideration should be given to rewarding research grant/contract applications. It is also recognized that some research (e.g. philosophical or theoretical research, as well as some types of empirical research) may not require funding.

It should be noted that peer review is important in assessing the merit of research grant/contract applications. The amount or size of the grant/contract is not as important as the fact that the contract/grant has been refereed and deemed worthy of funding. Credit for research grants and contracts will be given at the time that written confirmation of funding has been provided.

2.2.1 Indicators for Assessment of Scholarship
Indicators of Meritorious Scholarship and Professional Achievement
For the purposes of allocating Merit Increments for scholarship and of assessing scholarship as part of reappointment, tenure/continuing status and promotion processes, evidence relating to, but not limited to, the following types of contributions will be considered:
- refereed publications;
- development of new research programs and grant applications;
- presentations at scholarly or professional meetings;
- media work; and
Indicators of Satisfactory Scholarship and Professional Achievement
- an ongoing program of research and scholarship;
- evidence of dissemination of research and scholarship;

Indicators of Unsatisfactory Scholarship and Professional Achievement
Unsatisfactory research and scholarship may include, but is not limited to, the following:
- lack of publications or other scholarly activity; and
- proven lack of scholarly integrity.

2.2.2 Provision for Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors (CA Sections 19.5.5)
Section 19.5.5 indicates that “while Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors are not evaluated on the basis of their research and scholarship, 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”. Continuing Status and Promotion for Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors is outlined in Part 3 of this policy.

2.3 Evaluation of Other Contributions (CA – Section 19.11)
Section 19.11 of the CA outlines the other contributions to the university on which all faculty may be evaluated as follows:

19.11 Other contributions means contributions to the University, a profession or the community that are described in the evaluation policy of the Faculty and the Department in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment. Each policy will specify the factors that should be evaluated under other contributions and may include, but are not limited to, the following:
19.11.1 contributions through service to or development of the Faculty Member’s Academic Unit;
19.11.2 service as the Chair of a Department, or the Director of a School, centre or institute;
19.11.3 contributions through service to the University or the Association;
19.11.4 contributions to student life;
19.11.5 attainment of extra-University recognition of a Faculty Member’s University related activities; and
19.11.6 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.

The Faculty values engaged citizenship and therefore recognizes professionally-related service and community-engaged outreach as integral to the activities of faculty members. There are a wide variety of ways that individuals contribute to the University, their profession, and the community and every effort shall be made to consider contributions such as those listed below. Professional experience and activity are considered particularly
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important to members of a professional school, especially insofar as they provide evidence of leadership and innovative contributions, and should be rewarded. Examples of "Other Contributions" are as follows:

• contributions to the development of the faculty member's Program, School or Faculty;
• contributions to student life;
• student advising/mentoring;
• outreach and role-modeling for prospective students;
• challenging the prevailing hegemony;
• community-based education, development, action or advocacy;
• contributions to University governance, committees and other activities that are a part of the operations of the University;
• advocacy for students, faculty members or community members;
• attainment of positive extra-university recognition;
• activities that work to resolve relevant social problems and issues (locally, nationally or internationally);
• the organization of literary, aesthetic or celebratory activities that promote university and community collaborations and connections; and
• activities that promote the use of research-based knowledge outside of the university.

The following are some examples of the many kinds of professional contributions that will be considered in the process of evaluating “other contributions”:

• distinctive and important contributions to one's profession, learned societies or commissions of inquiry;
• awards and fellowships from professional societies;
• workshops which have had a demonstrated impact on professional practice;
• program development, implementation and evaluation activities which have contributed to the profession or community;
• invited addresses to professional associations, societies and community groups;
• mentorship and role-modeling activities;
• contributions to School/Program, Faculty, or University development, where the assignment is clearly related to one's professional competencies and standing;
• serving as a reviewer for accreditation, tenure and promotion files, external reviews, etc.;
• policy development; and
• organizing a major conference.

2.3.1 **Indicators to Assess Other Contributions**

**Indicators of Meritorious Contributions**

For the purposes of allocating Merit Increments for professional achievement and other contributions, evidence related, but not limited, to the following contributions will be considered:

• active participation in several University, Faculty or School/Program committees;
• leadership in a professional association/society;
• leadership in promoting a critical and productive academic culture;
• leadership in fostering an inclusive environment or curriculum;
• recognition/awards by community agencies or groups;
• community linkages that build on scholarly activity; and
• demonstrations of community-engaged outreach.
Indicators of Satisfactory Contributions

- participation in one or more University, Faculty or School/Program committee;
- participation in activities that support the University, Faculty or School/Program; and
- participation in community outreach or professional activities.

Indicators of Unsatisfactory Contributions

- lack of participation in other activities such as University, Faculty or School/Program governance structures; or profession/community/societal contributions.

2.4 Provision for Academic Administrators (CA – Sections 19.14 – 19.16)

19.14 Academic Administrators are evaluated on the basis of their:
19.14.1 administrative contributions; and
19.14.2 teaching performance, or scholarly and professional achievement, or both, where the appointment includes such duties.

19.15 The criteria are defined as follows:
19.15.1 administrative contributions will be determined by the nature of the position description for the particular role; and
19.15.2 teaching performance and scholarly and professional achievement will have the meanings set out in Sections 19.6 and 19.8.

19.16 It will be expected that an Academic Administrator will be assigned some duties relating to teaching, research or both. The Line Authority will provide an Academic Administrator at the time of his or her appointment with a written description of the criteria according to which his or her performance will be evaluated.

3. ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES TO BE USED IN MAKING EVALUATIONS (CA-Section 19.5.2)

As outlined in 2.1 of this FEP, in alignment with CA 19.17 and 19.18, all assessments of a faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and other contributions must take into account their years of experience and must be consistent with the Member’s FTE. In addition, Section 19.28 of the CA states that:

19.28 To achieve equity in the evaluation process both within a unit and between units, it is important that the evaluation categories be assessed in a comparable manner. For that purpose, the scores for each of the evaluation categories specified in this section will be assigned on a 0–100 scale. 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.

3.1 Assessment Techniques: Teaching

As outlined in CA 19.7 and 19.21, faculty members are expected to maintain a teaching dossier. Teaching performance is assessed against the evidence in the dossier. Evaluation of teaching performance must not be based solely on student evaluation scores and must consider all materials in the teaching dossier including appendices (CA 19.7).
When interpreting CES scores, consideration is given to different factors that may influence such scores. Individual faculty members may highlight any factors that they believe adversely influence their student evaluation scores, and provide the necessary materials to document such factors.

Teaching performance will be assessed based on a 0-100 scale outlined by the faculty as prescribed by the CA. After the scoring, the scores will be normalized as per section 19.28 of the CA.

3.1.1 Assessment of Teaching Performance for Merit Review
An overall rating for teaching performance is calculated as part of the biennial merit review process by combining the separate assessments of course teaching performance and other teaching contributions. Efforts made to improve teaching, such as participating in teaching seminars, may also be considered for merit review purposes. A faculty member’s teaching performance rating, based on performance over the period of review (CA 19.29), is evaluated in the biennial review process. The teaching performance rating comprises 40% of overall performance (80% for teaching faculty), unless agreed otherwise between the faculty member and the director and approved by the Dean.

3.1.2 Assessment of Teaching Performance for Tenure and Promotion
To achieve tenure or promotion, a faculty member must meet or exceed the expected standards for teaching, scholarship and other contributions set out in the CA and as elaborated by Faculty and departmental policies in each area of evaluation. The onus is on the applicant to provide such demonstration. In doing so, primary emphasis is placed on results achieved as opposed to efforts expended. Per Sections 23.15, 23.17 and 23.18, it is expected that candidates for tenure and promotion as well as for continuing appointments in HSD should demonstrate that they have achieved “teaching effectiveness at or above a level of quality appropriate to the Faculty member’s experience and with a commitment to excellence in teaching”. Efforts made to improve teaching will be considered in tenure and promotion and continuing appointment decisions.

3.1.2.1 Research Stream Faculty
23.14 Applicants for tenure must demonstrate that their teaching effectiveness and their scholarly and professional achievements meet or exceed the standards for the rank established by the Department in which the applicant holds an appointment.

23.15 To become tenured, an Assistant Professor with eligibility for tenure must demonstrate 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 continued development with regard to each of:

23.15.1 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; scholarly or creative achievements of high quality that are normally but not necessarily demonstrated by presentation or publication in a suitable academic or artistic forum; and 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

23.15.2 the capacity to attain the standards to become a tenured Associate Professor.

23.16 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.

23.17 To become a tenured Associate Professor, a Faculty Member must demonstrate scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline; 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 capacity for continuing development with regard to each of the following:

23.17.1 teaching; and

23.17.2 service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline.

23.18 To become a tenured Professor, a Faculty Member must demonstrate scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to the academic discipline; 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; a record of service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Faculty Member's academic discipline; and outstanding achievements with regard to either

23.18.1 teaching; or

23.18.2 scholarship that has attained recognition at a national or international level.

3.1.2.2 Teaching Stream Faculty

25.3 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 postsecondary institution.

25.4 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.

25.5 To become an Associate Teaching Professor, the Assistant Teaching Professor must have the appropriate academic credentials or evidence of appropriate professional achievement and must demonstrate:

25.5.1 excellence in teaching;

25.5.2 initiative in the development or delivery of the academic program of the Assistant Teaching Professor's unit or the University; and
25.5.3 service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Assistant Teaching Professor’s discipline.

25.6 An Associate Teaching Professor may apply for promotion to Teaching Professor during the fourth year of holding the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or in any year thereafter. The workload assignment and study leave of a Teaching Professor with tenure are the same as those of an Assistant or Associate Teaching Professor with a continuing appointment. The title of Teaching Professor with tenure does not entitle a Member to a term free of teaching. An Associate Teaching Professor who is promoted to Teaching Professor is granted tenure.

25.7 To become a Teaching Professor, an Associate Teaching Professor must have the appropriate academic credentials or evidence of appropriate professional achievement and must demonstrate:

25.7.1 a record of outstanding achievement in teaching; and

25.7.2 either scholarship related to teaching that has attained national or international recognition, or substantial leadership in the improvement of teaching in the Associate Teaching Professor’s Department or in the University; and

25.7.3 service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Associate Teaching Professor’s discipline.

25.8 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:

25.8.1 they do not apply for promotion to Teaching Professor before their eleventh year of service in the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor; and

25.8.2 the application is made prior to June 30, 2019.

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 set out in section 22.7. The Assistant Teaching Professor must include in their teaching dossier evidence of two recent peer reviews of teaching. The provisions of section 41 apply.

22.15 Before a continuing appointment is granted, the Associate Teaching Professor must be reviewed by the departmental committee that considers reappointments and be recommended by the Dean as having met the standard for continuing appointment for their Department. The Associate Teaching Professor must include in their teaching dossier evidence of two recent peer reviews of teaching.

In applications for tenure, promotion and continuing appointment for Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors, two recent formal peer reviews of teaching are required to assist in interpreting CES scores as a measure of teaching performance. Each peer review will be conducted by an experienced senior faculty colleague who observes teaching performance in the classroom or online on one occasion in the year preceding application for tenure, promotion, or continuing appointments. Junior faculty members will not
review senior ones. Faculty members should consult with their director on the choice of any potential peer reviewer. Faculty members may request additional peer reviews at any time and may include such reviews in their biennial performance submissions.

3.2 Assessment Techniques: Scholarship and Professional Achievement

Individual schools or units determine the importance of the items listed under scholarship and professional achievement. Refer to: 2.2 Evaluation of Scholarly and Professional Achievement for Faculty Members other than Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors (CA – Sections 19.8 – 19.10)

Scholarship and professional achievement will be assessed biennially for merit based on a 0-100 scale as prescribed by the CA. After the scoring, the scores will be normalized as per section 19.28 of the CA.

3.3 Assessment Techniques: Other Contributions

Individual schools and units determine the importance of the items listed as other contributions.

Other contributions will be assessed biennially for merit based on a 0-100 scale as prescribed by the CA. After the scoring, the scores will be subjected to the normalization process described in section 19.28 of the CA.

3.4 Provision for taking 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 (CA – Section 19.5.7)

Any maternity, parental and adoption leave, special leave, sick leave, compassionate care leave, compassionate leave without salary, and long-term care leave incurred during a period under review according to this policy will be taken into account when evaluating performance.

Provisions for “stopping the clock” with respect to reappointment or tenure are found in Section 48. Section 48.1 provides specific rules that automatically stop the clock where a faculty member has been on maternity, parental or adoption leave, special leave, sick leave, or long-term disability (LTD). Section 48.2 provides for any member who has been affected by illness, injury, disability, family responsibilities, or personal circumstances to apply in writing to the Dean to defer consideration for reappointment or tenure, which may be granted (Section 48.2) by the Vice-President Academic and Provost in consultation with the Dean. Section 48.5 provides that time on LTD is not counted in regard to reappointment or tenure. As well, in any evaluation process, faculty members may submit a statement with respect to the impact of leave on their performance to the body responsible for reviewing their work (section 19.5.7).
4. PROCESSES AND DOCUMENTATION TO SUBMIT FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, OR PROMOTION

Processes within the Faculty pertaining to reappointment, the granting of tenure or continuing status, and promotion for faculty members are governed by the relevant Sections in the CA. Reappointment for all categories of faculty is discussed in Section 22. Standards for tenure are outlined in Section 23. The standard for securing Continuing Status for Assistant Teaching Professors or Associate Teaching Professors is outlined in Sections 22.9 – 22.11 and Sections 22.12 – 22.17. Standards for promotion are addressed in Section 25, which should be read in conjunction with Section 17 regarding terms of initial appointments. Processes pertaining to reappointment, tenure and promotion are addressed in Sections 31 – 41.

A summary of the major steps in the processes regarding reappointment, the granting of tenure or continuing status, and promotion, including the deadlines associated with them, are outlined in Appendix G of the CA. Note that deadlines for promotion that will confer tenure adhere to the deadlines for Tenure.

Documentation submitted for consideration for reappointment, the granting of tenure or continuing status, and/or promotion covers the faculty member’s entire academic career. This documentation consists of a binder that includes:

- an updated curriculum vitae (required of all faculty members)
- an updated teaching dossier (required of all faculty members);
- a section that outlines the faculty member’s scholarly and professional achievements to date as appropriate to the type of appointment held and sought (required of all Assistant and Associate Professors); and
- a section that outlines the faculty member’s other contributions to date as appropriate to the type of appointment held and sought (required of all faculty members).

Faculty members are encouraged to keep the documentation they submit reasonable in size (i.e., one 4” binder).

Letters from external referees must be provided to the department chairs/director for applications for tenure and promotion. Section 33 of the describes the process to be used for selection of referees and the documentation that is sent to referees. In the Faculty of Human and Social Development, a minimum of three letters from referees is required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor. Four letters from referees are required for promotion to Professor. Unless the Dean otherwise decides, the referees will be external to the University and must not have served in any capacity described in section 33.4. For candidates for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor, the Dean may consider whether factors in the case make it more appropriate to allow one or more referees to be internal to the University.

5. PROCESSES AND DOCUMENTATION TO SUBMIT FOR BIENNIAL SALARY EVALUATION AND MERIT INCREMENTS (CA – Sections 19.25 – 19.41)

A Career Progress Increment (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. Merit Increments (MIs) serve to recognize increasing levels of meritorious performance (section 63.12). The process of awarding CPIs and MIs will be undertaken in accordance with the provisions of Section 19.25 – 19.41 and Sections 63.12 – 63.25 of the CA. General specifications of the process,
including weighting of elements, are provided in Sections 19.25 – 19.29.6. Faculty members should familiarize themselves with all aspects of salary adjustment evaluation as outlined in the CA.

5.1 Documentation and Basis for Biennial Salary Adjustment Evaluation

Documentation submitted for the biennial salary adjustment process should cover the relevant period for the review (as specified in Section 19.29 of the CA). Documents which must be submitted include:

- A two to three page summary highlighting the faculty member’s key accomplishments during the period of review
- HSD short form teaching dossier (see section 1.4)
- An updated CV in University of Victoria format covering the years of review
- Template: www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/resources/templates;
- A signed conflict of interest form (available at http://www.research.uvic.ca/Forms).

If the required documentation is not submitted, no assessment of merit can be made and no MIs will be awarded. If a faculty member wishes to be considered only for a Career Progress Increment she or he must submit, at minimum, a one-page summary of accomplishments in each of the general areas considered for the type of appointment held and an updated CV.

As required by the CA (Section 19.25.1) faculty members other than Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors will be evaluated for Merit Increments on the basis of their teaching, scholarship, and other contributions in the ratio of 40:40:20 respectively. An alternative ratio in which no criterion in the ratio is weighted at less than 20% may be agreed between a faculty member and the Director, and approved by the Dean, in advance, for a fixed period not exceeding five years in situations where the faculty member’s workload does not reflect the usual distribution of responsibilities for the type of appointment that she or he holds (CA 19.26). As per CA 19.26 Directors should make such agreements with the Dean at the time of their appointment as Director, which will be in effect for the term of the appointment. Usually, faculty members will make such agreements in advance with their Director with approval of the Dean before June 1 of the year of evaluation. Faculty members should be aware that the ratio of criterion is used for evaluation for salary adjustment only (see Section II of this document regarding evaluation criteria for reappointment, tenure and promotion).

Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors will be evaluated based on their teaching and other contributions in the ratio of 80:20 respectively. An alternative ratio in which neither criterion in the ratio is weighted at less than 20% may be agreed between an Assistant /Associate/Full Teaching Professor and the Director and approved by the Dean in advance in situations where there has been a change to the usual work distribution of the Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor. Faculty members should be aware that the ratio of criteria is used for evaluation for salary adjustment only (see Section II of this document regarding evaluation criteria for reappointment, tenure and promotion).

5.2 Number and Distribution of Merit Increments

The number of Merit Increments available for distribution to faculty members (including Assistant, Associate and Full Professors/Teaching Professors) within a faculty is provided by the VPAC in two pools:
1. MIs in proportion to twice the number of faculty members; and
2. Supplementary Mls equal to the number of departments in the faculty. (CA 63.19)

Section 63.17 states that “Subject to section 63.19, Mls 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:

63.17.1 0.0, 0.5, or 1.0 Mls;
63.17.2 .5, 2.0, or 2.5 Mls; or
63.17.3 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0 Mls.”

As Section 63.16 of the CA stipulates, "unit" means:
63.16.1 a Faculty;
63.16.2 the Division of Medical Sciences;
63.16.3 the Libraries; and
63.16.4 Academic Administrators.

Within this limit, Mls are awarded for levels of achievement that exceed “satisfactory career progress”; that is, they serve to recognize meritorious performance. An award of four MIs is intended to reflect meritorious performance overall during the period of review while awards of between one and three Mls reflect meritorious performance in one or more areas during the period of review.

The rules governing the distribution of Mls are set out in Section 63 of the CA. As the CA provides in sections 63.16 and 63.17, distributions are to be achieved at the level of the overall Faculty, rather than necessarily being required within each individual School or Program. Each Director will receive an initial allocation of two Merit Increments per faculty member within their School or Program, minus 10% which are held back by the Dean (rounded up to the nearest whole number, if rounding is required) except for Schools or Programs in which there are four or fewer faculty members for which no Mls are held back by the Dean. These withheld Merit Increments are to be used by the Dean to make adjustments to the recommendations for the award of Mls to individual faculty members received from Directors of Schools and Programs in order to ensure equity between units and in the Faculty overall.

5.3 Processes and Deadlines

PLEASE NOTE: The dates cited within 5.3 are approximate and may vary year to year. The exact deadlines will be sent out by the Dean’s Office each year with 4 weeks’ notice.

Section 63.15 of the CA indicates that Mls are only available to faculty members who receive a CPI. Each eligible faculty member who wishes to be considered for the award of a CPI and Mls must submit all documents for review to their Director no later than February 1 of the year in which an evaluation is to be conducted. In the Faculty of Human and Social Development, salary evaluations are conducted biennially in odd numbered years. Earlier deadline dates may be set by the Director as long as these are communicated well in advance to Faculty Members in the unit. Directors will submit documents for their own review to the Dean by February 1 of each evaluation year.

The Director will review the documents and make recommendations to the Dean prior to May 1 of an evaluation year. If agreed to by faculty members in the School or Program prior to May 1 of the year prior to the review, the Director may seek the advice of an advisory
committee on salary review regarding the recommendations to be made. The Director will undertake a qualitative assessment of each faculty member's performance for the relevant period of review specified in the CA 19.29 (usually the preceding four years) for each of the categories of activity for which the faculty member is responsible. In developing their recommendations, Directors must consider the provisions regarding the minimum and maximum numbers of Merit Increments that may be awarded to individual faculty members in accordance with the CA.

In addition to making recommendations regarding distribution of the MIs available to their School or Program, Directors will rank all faculty members who are being recommended for an additional MI(s) above those that have been allocated to their unit. In these cases, the Director will forward the recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by the documentation submitted by the faculty member. The Dean may ask the Director to justify any recommendation both within and above the number of MIs assigned to the School or Program.

The Director will send each faculty member a summary of her/his recommendation to the Dean regarding that faculty member, on or before May 1 of the evaluation year. The Dean will submit her/his recommendation to the Vice-President Academic and Provost on or before June 1. The Dean will communicate his/her recommendation to the faculty member, in the event that it is different from that of the Director. In the case of Directors, or other faculty members occupying administrative positions, the Dean will inform the candidate of her/his recommendation on or before June 1.

Sections 63.31 – 63.32 of the CA specifies that a faculty member may request that the Vice-President Academic and Provost reconsider her or his salary adjustment stating the reasons for the request in writing. This request must be submitted within 30 days of receiving the formal notice of salary adjustment. The Faculty Association may file a grievance under the provisions of section 59 in the case of a faculty member who is not satisfied with the reconsideration.

6. Review of the HSD Faculty Evaluation Policy

Section 19.3 of the CA states: Any departmental policies pertaining to evaluation of Faculty Members must be consistent with the Agreement and the Faculty Evaluation Policy, ratified by a majority of votes cast by those holding regular academic appointments in the unit, and approved by the Dean. Such departmental policies must be available to Members within the Department.

Section 19.4 of the CA states: Every Evaluation Policy must be reviewed by the Faculty, Departments, and the Libraries (as applicable) by December 31 of the year in which a new Agreement comes into effect. Any amendments consequent upon that review must be developed in consultation between the Dean (or the University Librarian) and the unit. Faculty Evaluation Policies must be approved by the members of the Faculty and the Vice-President Academic and Provost; departmental policies must be approved as provided in section 19.3.

Accordingly, this Faculty Evaluation Policy will be reviewed by the Faculty of Human and Social Development by December 31 of the year in which a new CA comes into effect.
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## APPENDIX A: Impact Framework Community University Engagement (March 2016)

### Table. 3 Typology and Measurement tool of Community Engagement at the University of Victoria

*Self-Assessment tool for Research Centers/Faculties (DRAFT)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Types of engagement</th>
<th>Indicators/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Engaged Research</td>
<td>R1 <strong>Co-creation</strong> of research: community is involved in conducting, evaluating community research and service</td>
<td>Community partners are empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2 <strong>Collaborate</strong> with community in each phase of the research including decision-making and analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3 <strong>Involve</strong> community throughout the process to ensure community issues and concerns are understood and considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4 <strong>Consult</strong> community through feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5 <strong>Inform</strong>. Provide objective information to assist in understanding the problems and solutions</td>
<td>Examples: websites, open door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-engaged learning</td>
<td>L1 Guest lectures and public series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2 Coop placements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(student works directly with community/industry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3 Experiential learning – (partnering with community organization for research needs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L4 Integrated teaching approach to learning (community co-teaching models)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Types of engagement</td>
<td>Indicators/Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Neighbor</td>
<td>GN1</td>
<td>Contribute to well-being of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency, On-going communication,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect, Empathy, Equality, Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GN2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GN3</td>
<td>Mutually beneficial partnerships with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbors (government, FN, industry,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSO, HEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>KM1</td>
<td>Sharing knowledge from research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM2</td>
<td>Promoting public understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM3</td>
<td>Direct social, policy impacts</td>
<td>Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Formal guidelines for documenting and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td>rewarding engaged scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/Tenure</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Range of creative activities and products for intended users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Valuing interdisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Valuing knowledge transfer and exchange with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Expanded range of reviewers of quality, significance and impact of faculty work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Recognizing appropriate timelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Self-Assessment Project-based evaluation to be completed by Community Partners*
*Level to be determined (individual or organization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Indicator questions</th>
<th>Quantitative: Provide details where applicable</th>
<th>Qualitative: Provide examples where applicable</th>
<th>Links or Other details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation and Training</td>
<td>Any new jobs created as a result of the project/partnership? <em>(specify position e.g. internship, part time)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was training provided to you or your organization? <em>Please describe the type of training</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any enhancement to the quality of your work? <em>(e.g. livelihood enhancement)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Services and infrastructure</td>
<td>Any new services, products or infrastructure developed as a result of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>In which ways has this project supported an initiative, product, process or program that creates positive social outcomes? In which sector (i.e. health, education, housing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of new ideas to find solutions to social challenges? Describe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains</td>
<td>Indicator questions</td>
<td>Quantitative: Provide details where applicable</td>
<td>Qualitative: Provide examples where applicable</td>
<td>Links or Other details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Programs</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Have there been any new or enhanced processes, programs or policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any new relationships or partnerships with government, industry or civil society organizations as a result of this initiative?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Organizational Development</td>
<td>Has your organization experienced any new capacities, opportunities, and advancements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did the project enhance your organization alignment to its vision?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Any new networks created or strengthened?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any new leadership development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have the initiatives of the project helped to improve conditions in the community? Please describe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td>What approach to the partnership and/or way of being together made the project work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Self Assessment Project-based evaluation to be completed by University Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Indicator questions</th>
<th>Quantitative: Provide details where applicable</th>
<th>Qualitative: Provide examples where applicable</th>
<th>Links or Other details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student training</strong></td>
<td>Student engagement Describe student involvement or engagement in the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were there any research fellowships or awards for students in the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>New skills and/or interpersonal development acquired? New competencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any new employment linkages for student involved in project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Opportunities for further education of students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Theory Development of new and improved theory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advances in research methodology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of new courses or programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains</td>
<td>Indicator questions</td>
<td>Quantitative: Provide details where applicable</td>
<td>Qualitative: Provide examples where applicable</td>
<td>Links or Other details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>Research Alliances</td>
<td>Improved receptivity for research alliances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced interdisciplinary collaboration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-university linkages?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Any new networks created or strengthened?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any new leadership development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative transformation</td>
<td>Any new or enhanced structures or systems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership</strong></td>
<td>What approach to the partnership and/or way of being together made the project work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the challenges?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: Deadlines for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion
University of Victoria and University of Victoria Faculty Association Collective Agreement August 2015

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

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>Deadline for Member to submit the following documentation to the Chair: CV, teaching dossier, copies of citations to scholarly or creative works, summary of candidate’s major achievements and copies of other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit the following documentation to the Chair: CV, teaching dossier, copies of citations to scholarly or creative works, summary of candidate’s major achievements and copies of other documents.</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>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 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 deliver a written response to any additional documents considered by the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) working days prior to the committee’s consideration of the candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to deliver a written response to any additional documents considered by the committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FACULTY OF HUMAN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

Revised and approved by Faculty of Human and Social Development: April 4, 2016; October 13, 2010; November 22, 2006; May 11, 2005; May 16, 2002

### Deadline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after delivery of additional documents</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>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) working 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) working 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) working days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation if file does not go to UAAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s report to President if file does not go to UAAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) working 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>December 15</td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member on files not considered by UAAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FACULTY OF HUMAN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

Revised and approved by Faculty of Human and Social Development: April 4, 2016; October 13, 2010; November 22, 2006; May 11, 2005; May 16, 2002

#### Deadline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member on files considered by UAAC.</td>
<td>Deadline for grievance of President’s decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty (60) working days after receipt of President’s notice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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>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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to submit the following documentation to the Chair: CV, teaching dossier, copies of citations to scholarly or creative works, summary of candidate’s major achievements and copies of other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</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>
</tbody>
</table>
### FACULTY OF HUMAN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

*Revised and approved by Faculty of Human and Social Development: April 4, 2016; October 13, 2010; November 22, 2006; May 11, 2005; May 16, 2002*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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) working 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>Deadline for Member to deliver a written response to any additional documents considered by the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) working days prior to the committee’s consideration of the candidate</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 after delivery of additional documents</td>
<td></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>
### FACULTY OF HUMAN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

Revised and approved by Faculty of Human and Social Development: April 4, 2016; October 13, 2010; November 22, 2006; May 11, 2005; May 16, 2002

**UAAC:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) working 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) working 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></td>
<td>Deadline for UAAC to send report to Member and to the President.</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) calendar days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation if file does not go to UAAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s report to President if file does not go to UAAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) working 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>January 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member on files not considered by UAAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for President to send recommendation to the Member on files considered by UAAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty (60) working days after receipt of President’s notice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for grievance of President’s decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>Deadline</td>
<td>Committee/Administration</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</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>August 31</td>
<td>Deadline for referees to indicate their willingness to serve.</td>
<td></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>Deadline for Member to submit the following documentation to the Chair: CV, teaching dossier, copies of citations to scholarly or creative works, summary of candidate’s major achievements and copies of other documents.</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5) days after receiving the list.</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) working days prior to the committee’s consideration of the candidate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to deliver a written response to any additional documents considered by the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) days after delivery of additional documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to give written notice of intent to make an oral presentation to the committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FACULTY OF HUMAN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

**Revised and approved by Faculty of Human and Social Development: April 4, 2016; October 13, 2010; November 22, 2006; May 11, 2005; May 16, 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dean:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Committee/Administration</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 25</td>
<td></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></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) working 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) working 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>March 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) calendar days after receipt of Dean’s recommendation if file does not go to UAAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Member to send response to Dean’s report to President if file does not go to UAAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) working 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 on files not considered by UAAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 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) working days after receipt of President’s notice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for grievance of President’s decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>