

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS  
STANDARD FOR THE DISTRIBUTION AND EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC  
RESPONSIBILITIES\*

Ratified: June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2020

Approved: July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020

\*This Standard builds on and elaborates on the 2019-2022 Collective Agreement between the University of Victoria Faculty Association and the University of Victoria and the Faculty of Science Evaluation Policy (<https://www.uvic.ca/science/assets/blocks/content/accordions/2019-science-fep-appendices-final.pdf>). Faculty Members of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics are advised to familiarize themselves with both documents. Where there is a conflict between this Standard and the Faculty Evaluation Policy, the FEP shall govern. The Collective Agreement supersedes all documents.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Preamble.....	1
2. Departmental Mandate and Academic Objectives .....	1
3. Assignment of Responsibilities .....	1
3.2. Other considerations in Teaching and course delivery:.....	3
3.3. Assignment of Service Responsibilities .....	3
4. Normal Workload .....	4
4.1. Normal Teaching Workload .....	4
4.2. Course Coordination .....	6
4.3. Normal Research/Scholarly Activity Workload .....	6
4.3.1. Normal Research Workload (Research Stream) .....	7
4.3.2. Normal Scholarly Activity Workload (Teaching Stream) .....	7
4.4. Normal Service Workload .....	7
4.5. Alternative Workload .....	8
5. Performance Expectations for the purposes of Reappointment, Continuing Appointment and Promotion (including Promotion with Tenure) .....	9
5.1. Research Stream Faculty Members .....	9
5.1.1. Reappointment .....	9
5.1.2. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor .....	10
5.1.3. Promotion to Professor.....	10
5.2. Teaching Stream Faculty Members.....	12
5.2.1. Reappointment .....	12
5.2.2. Continuing Appointment .....	12
5.2.3. Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor .....	13
5.2.4. Tenure and Promotion to Teaching Professor.....	13

6.	Performance Expectations for the Purposes of Salary Evaluation.....	15
6.1.	Materials to be used for the purposes of salary evaluation: .....	15
6.2.	Salary Evaluation Process:.....	15
6.3.	Meeting Expectations.....	16
6.3.1.	General Requirements .....	16
6.3.2.	Teaching .....	16
6.3.3.	Research (Research Stream Faculty) .....	17
6.3.4.	Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream Faculty).....	18
6.3.5.	Service .....	18
6.4.	Exceeding Expectations.....	18
6.4.1.	Teaching .....	19
6.4.2.	Research (Research Stream Faculty) .....	19
6.4.3.	Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream Faculty).....	20
6.4.4.	Service .....	21
6.5.	Not meeting expectations.....	21

## **1. Preamble**

The [Collective Agreement](#) (the “CA”) between the University of Victoria Faculty Association and the University of Victoria regulates how Academic Responsibilities are assigned and evaluated. Further elaboration of the process and criteria for evaluation of Academic Responsibilities is made in the Faculty of Science [Faculty Evaluation Policy](#) (“FEP”). Faculty Members also need to comply with the [Graduate Studies Supervision Policy](#).

Article 13 of the CA stipulates that each Unit must create and distribute an approved written Standard by October 19, 2020 unless extensions are granted by waiver. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics Standard (the “Standard”) presents complementary information to that contained in the CA and the FEP. The Standard establishes and defines Normal Workload including expectations for supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, Alternative Workloads that commonly arise through course release or Service expectations, the norms and processes for the allocation of Academic Responsibilities giving consideration to the requirements in CA ss 12.9 and 13.6 d, and the standards for meeting and exceeding performance expectations congruent with appointment type (Teaching and Research Stream) and stage of career for the purposes of salary evaluation. The Standard also defines the criteria for meeting the requirements for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion (including Promotion with Tenure).

This Standard reflects the primacy of collegiality, transparency, equity, and accountability as values that organize the research and teaching work of Mathematics and Statistics faculty. This Standard aspires to embed these values into all practices in the Department, including the evaluation of Research or Scholarly Activity, Teaching, and Service performance across both streams and all ranks.

## **2. Departmental Mandate and Academic Objectives**

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics is a high quality research and teaching department. As such its operational requirements are to make significant contributions to knowledge, and to offer high quality graduate and high quality undergraduate programs in mathematics and statistics, including many joint degrees. In addition, the Department offers high quality service teaching primarily directed at students whose major is in other areas, including Engineering, Computer Science, Science, Economics and Business. These objectives are closely intertwined as service teaching relies crucially on having a strong pool of graduate students who serve as high quality teaching assistants.

## **3. Assignment of Responsibilities**

Faculty Members holding Research Stream appointments have Academic Responsibilities in the areas of Teaching, Research and Service. Faculty Members holding Teaching Stream appointments have Academic Responsibilities in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activity and

Service. These are further described in CA Article 25. Academic Responsibilities are a combination of self-directed and assigned tasks in each of the areas. The balance of commitment between each area of activity is as outlined in CA Article 13.

Assigned Academic Responsibilities are in the areas of Teaching and Service. Assigned Academic Responsibilities shall be distributed in an equitable and transparent manner, giving consideration to all relevant factors as outlined in CA s 12.9. Recognizing that there may be fluctuations in workload in a given year, equitable distribution of Academic Responsibilities should be assessed over a period of no more than five years (CA s 13.13).

Academic Responsibilities are further defined in CA s 12.5.

The Chair shall ensure Teaching is scheduled such that there is a period of one month free of Teaching during which the Faculty Member may take vacation, unless otherwise requested by the Faculty Member (CA s 52.2).

### **3.1. Assignment of Teaching Responsibilities:**

The Department Chair is responsible for the assignment of Teaching responsibilities. Best efforts will be made to align the final assignments of Teaching responsibilities with the requested assignment of the Faculty Member, recognizing that the operational mandate of the Unit and the constraints noted in the CA will take precedence over individual preferences for course assignments. In addition to CA s 12.9, the following factors must be considered in the assignment of Teaching responsibilities:

1. Number of students, considered in the context of whether or not the course has a course coordinator.
2. Level and nature of courses assigned.
3. New course preparations for the instructor, especially for early-career Faculty Members.
4. Presence of tutorials or labs.

In addition to the requirements of balancing workload over a five-year period, the Department Chair will make reasonable effort to ensure that the teaching assignments satisfy the following constraints:

1. *In each year:* Each Faculty Member who so wishes, and is not on study leave, will be assigned at least one course at the 400, 500, or cross-listed 400/500 level.
  - a. Where this requirement cannot be fulfilled, Faculty Members who wish to teach at the 400, 500, or cross-listed 400/500 level will be assigned such a course at least once every two years.
  - b. In order for such a course to run a minimum enrolment may be required.
2. *In each term:* The Chair will avoid asking a Faculty Member to prepare more than two distinct courses.

### **3.2. Other considerations in Teaching and course delivery:**

The primary responsibility for developing and updating course material falls to the Faculty Member assigned to the course. The duties typically associated with teaching a course section are listed below. In a coordinated course the specific duties to be undertaken by each instructor will be determined by the course coordinator, and may include any or all of the duties expected of an instructor in a single-section course.

1. Delivering lectures.
2. Holding office hours. It is expected that each Faculty Member teaching one or more lecture sections in a term will hold at least two hours of office hours per week in that term.
3. Creating assignments, tutorial worksheets, tests, exams, or other assessments.
4. Ensuring that assignments, tutorial worksheets, tests, exams, and other course work are graded in a timely manner. It is expected that the instructor will personally do at least a portion of the grading.
5. Responding to student queries by email, course discussion forums, or other means.

### **3.3. Assignment of Service Responsibilities**

Collegial and shared governance is valued and is only made possible through active involvement of faculty in Department, Faculty, and University committees.

Service to the Department includes regular attendance at Department meetings, serving on elected committees, as well as other Service roles assigned by the Department Chair. Best efforts will be made by the Department Chair to align Service assignments with the preferences and interests of the Faculty Member. Efforts shall be made to allocate Service work equitably across Faculty Members in the Department.

In addition, faculty are encouraged to participate in Service activities outside the Department, including serving the Faculty, the University, the Association and the community. Such self-directed Service activities shall be taken into consideration when making Service assignments.

There is an increasing expectation of Service activity with career stage. Academic leadership is an expectation of Professors and late-stage Associate Professors in both Research and Teaching Streams. Academic leadership includes such activities as chairing Department, Faculty and University committees, or leadership roles in Service activities outside the University.

## 4. Normal Workload

In addition to their specific duties in the categories described below, all Faculty Members in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics are expected to be actively involved in the life of the Department. All Faculty Members in the Department are expected to attend Department meetings and retreats. Other forms of engagement with Departmental life include:

1. Attendance at and participation in research seminars.
2. Attendance at colloquia.

Writing reference letters for students, post docs, and other colleagues as required.

### 4.1. Normal Teaching Workload

Workload associated with teaching in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics is measured in *bits* of teaching activity. The number of *bits* to be performed by each Faculty Member is dependent on their Workload Ratio, with one *bit* being required for each 10% of total Workload Ratio assigned to teaching (based on a 1.0 FTE appointment in the Department, and pro-rated for other appointments). For example, a 1.0 FTE Faculty Member with 40% of their Workload Ratio being teaching is required to undertake 4 *bits* of teaching activity each year, and a 1.0 FTE Faculty Member with 70% of their Workload Ratio being teaching is required to undertake 7 *bits* of teaching activity each year.

The Department recognizes teaching activity in the following ways:

1. 1 *bit* will be credited for each 1.5 unit course section taught. The duties associated with teaching a course, including duties that may be required of an instructor working in a course with a coordinator, are described in Section 3.2 of this Standard. The Department recognizes that not all 1.5 unit courses contribute equally to teaching workload; the manner in which courses are assigned to balance workload is described in Section 3.1 of this Standard.
2. Credit will be given for making a non-classroom contribution to the Department's teaching mission. Such a contribution may include a combination of some of the following activities:
  - a. Supervision of graduate students.
  - b. Supervision of undergraduate research students.
  - c. Light course coordination (the term "light" is defined in Section 4.2 of this Standard).
  - d. Mentorship of new instructors.
  - e. Supervision of courses taught by sessional instructors outside of a coordination arrangement; this may include ensuring that the Department's standards are met

in terms of course delivery, examinations, grading, submission of final grades, academic concessions, and administration related to deferred exams.

f. Creating or grading Ph.D. comprehensive exams.

g. Teaching directed studies courses.

The number of *bits* credited for substantial contributions in this category will be 1 *bit* for Faculty Members with a total teaching workload of at least 3 *bits* and for the Department Chair, and 0.5 *bits* for Faculty Members with a total teaching workload of less than 3 *bits*. A fractional number of *bits* will be granted for lighter contributions in this category. All Faculty Members in the first year of their appointment will be given credit in this category. No more than 1 *bit* will be credited in this category in any one year.

Credit under this category will only be assigned to Faculty Members during periods where they are not on Study Leave (so that for instance a Teaching Stream Faculty Member who has an 8 month study leave within a single academic year will receive no credit in this category during that academic year, and a Research Stream Faculty Member who has a 6 month study leave from July to December will receive at most 0.5 *bits* under this category in the remainder of that academic year).

3. 1 bit will be credited for each heavy course coordination in each term. Fractional bits will be assigned for each moderate course coordination in each term. The terms “heavy” and “moderate” are defined in Section 4.2 of this Standard.
4. In addition to all credits, 1 *bit* will be credited as a teaching reduction for new Faculty Members in their first year of service.
5. Credit will be given to account for additional teaching-related tasks assigned by the Department Chair, when such tasks are unusually large. The number of *bits* credited in this category will depend on the nature of the tasks assigned. Examples of such assignments may include:
  - a. Development of new courses.
  - b. Substantial redesign of existing courses.
6. In cases where a Faculty Member's teaching assignments have been unusually heavy, and cannot be reasonably balanced in the way described in Section 3.1, the Department Chair will credit an appropriate number of *bits* to achieve a balanced workload.

The distribution of teaching workload above is based on the Department's teaching as of January 1, 2020. If rising class sizes or other factors cause the overall workload associated with teaching in the Department to increase beyond these levels, the Department Chair may use 4.1(6) above to ensure that the workload of individual Department Faculty Members does not become unmanageable.



## **4.2. Course Coordination**

Multi-section courses in the Department are normally overseen by a course coordinator. Coordination varies significantly between courses, and also between offerings of the same course. The Department recognizes that the coordination of some courses is “light”, in the sense that it can reasonably be assigned without specific reductions in other areas of teaching, while the coordination of other courses is “heavy”, and requires recognition in the form of relief from other teaching duties. A course coordination is “moderate” if it requires some relief, but not as much as for a “heavy” coordination. The Department Chair will determine, for each coordinated course in each semester, whether the required work to coordinate the course is light, moderate, or heavy. The Department Chair will consider the following factors:

1. Number of students.
2. Number of lecture sections.
3. Number of other instructors assigned to the course.
4. Experience level of other instructors.
5. Whether there are tutorials or labs.
6. Number of teaching assistants assigned to the course.
7. Whether there are online course components.
8. Whether there is support from a Senior Lab Instructor.
9. Whether the coordinator is expected to be primarily responsible for creating course materials.

It is expected that the *bits* assigned for coordination of a given course in a given term will not vary from year to year. In cases where change from past practice is required, it will be made in consultation between the course coordinator and the Department Chair.

## **4.3. Normal Research/Scholarly Activity Workload**

Regular Faculty Members in the Research Stream are expected to maintain an active research program, devoting 40% of their effort to Research Activities (CA s 13.10). Regular Faculty Members in the Teaching Stream are expected to devote 10% of their efforts to Scholarly Activities (CA s 13.11). These are described as activities which enhance teaching ability or effectiveness, including continuing mastery of one’s field of knowledge (FEP s 3.5, and CA s 25.11).

#### ***4.3.1. Normal Research Workload (Research Stream)***

The Research portion of the workload consists of some or all of: reading research articles in the discipline, writing research articles in the discipline, writing computer programs related to the Faculty Member's research program, presenting research at seminars and conferences and collaborating with other researchers in the discipline or in other disciplines. It also includes writing grant proposals. It may also include writing reports or presenting aspects of the Faculty Member's research area to governmental or other decision-making bodies.

Evidence of Research Activity includes but is not limited to obtaining and administering external funding and research dissemination as described in FEP s 3.4, FEP s 3.5, CA s 25.9, and training of HQP. Specifically, being a named principal investigator on an operating grant from NSERC, CIHR, or similar national or international agency will be deemed evidence for an active research program. In the absence of such an operating grant, having at least two publications in reputable, refereed scientific journals over the previous three years' period will also be deemed sufficient evidence for an active research program. Other research contributions which do not fit either of these criteria will be considered on an individual basis.

Research Stream Faculty Members who are not active in research should seek an Alternative Workload or may request to convert to Teaching Stream.

#### ***4.3.2. Normal Scholarly Activity Workload (Teaching Stream)***

Evidence of involvement in Scholarly Activities includes items described in FEP s 3.5 and CA ss 25.11 and 25.12. The Department considers attendance at conferences and workshops related to teaching to be included in FEP s 3.5 g), and also considers taking a scholarly approach to course design and delivery to be included in FEP s 3.5 g).

#### **4.4. Normal Service Workload**

Service includes contributions to the Department, Faculty, University, a profession, or the community as described in FEP s 3.6 and CA s 25.14. Service may also include, but is not limited to, participation in convocation ceremonies, participation in site visits and grant selection committees, journal manuscript refereeing and grant reviews, scientific editorship or membership on editorial boards and conference organization.

It is expected that some portion of each Faculty Member's Service commitment will be devoted to service within the Department. The type of service will be commensurate with the rank of the Faculty Member. In recognition of the time taken to acclimatize to university service, Service responsibilities assigned to newly appointed Faculty Members will be minimal in the first two years of their appointment, and will be in the interests of helping the new Faculty Member to become oriented to the university.

Service duties assigned to Faculty Members within the department are discussed with the Department Chair who will consider the relative workload associated with different committees

and service duties. The Department Chair will strive to achieve a balance in the Service workload of Faculty Members over a 5-year period.

It is recognized that female, indigenous, and racialized Faculty Members often face heavy demand for committee work, and this will be taken into account by the chair when assigning departmental service.

#### **4.5. Alternative Workload**

As per CA ss 13.25 – 13.40, Faculty Members can apply for an Alternative Workload that will alter the balance between the three components of Normal Workload. Applications for an Alternative Workload must be made at least six months in advance of when the proposed arrangement would normally take effect. Alternative Workload arrangements must be approved by the Dean and the Provost, and can be for all or part of an Academic Year, for consecutive Academic Years, or until the end of the Faculty Member's Appointment.

Faculty Members with a Canada Research Chair will normally have an Alternative Workload of 20% Teaching, 60% Research, 20% Service (FEP 2.2).

The Department's Graduate Advisor will normally have an Alternative Workload of 30% Teaching, 40% Research, 30% Service.

The Department Chair and Associate Chair will normally have Alternative Workloads, with the Alternative Workload ratios to be determined at the time of appointment to these positions (FEP s 2.2).

Faculty Members who hold certain external grants or administrative positions may also be eligible for Alternative Workload arrangements, as described in CA s 13.30. Faculty Members seeking such arrangements should consult the Department Chair.

## **5. Performance Expectations for the purposes of Reappointment, Continuing Appointment and Promotion (including Promotion with Tenure)**

**It is emphasized that having met expectations for the purposes of receiving CPI need not imply that the performance expectations for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment or Promotion are met.**

Guidelines and procedures for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion (including Promotion with Tenure) are outlined in CA articles 27, 28, 29, 32 and 33 as well as FEP article 6. Candidates are required to familiarize themselves with the information contained in these articles. They are also urged to consult the checklist in FEP Appendix A, and to discuss any uncertainties they have regarding the process with the Department Chair.

### **5.1. Research Stream Faculty Members**

#### **5.1.1. *Reappointment***

The standard for Reappointment is that the Faculty Member is *making good progress towards Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor* (CA s 27.3).

In addition to the criteria described below, a Research Stream Assistant Professor under consideration for reappointment is expected to be meeting the criteria described in Section 6.3.

In the case where there is any history of significant problems meeting the expectations in Section 6, the Reappointment Committee will evaluate whether the Faculty Member is taking concrete steps that can be expected to lead to satisfying the expectations.

A Research Stream Faculty Member who is being considered for Reappointment is required to provide at least two current Peer Reviews of Teaching. If possible, one of the reviews should be based on teaching at the 100 or 200 level. The two evaluations are to be performed by different peers as described in FEP s 3.3.1.

Since the standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor involve graduate supervision, grant funding and recognition, a candidate for Reappointment should normally demonstrate:

1. Progress towards a training program: The Faculty Member should normally be undertaking supervision or co-supervision of graduate students, or be able to demonstrate active recruitment of graduate students.
2. Progress towards grant funding: The Faculty Member should have an operating grant as a Principal Investigator or co-Principal Investigator from an external granting agency, or should be able to demonstrate activity in grant-writing.
3. Recent peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals.

4. Some involvement in departmental service work.

### ***5.1.2. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor***

The standard for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor is described in CA s 28.16. The Department expects that a Faculty Member applying for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor should demonstrate: satisfactory Teaching, a high quality Research program with a national or international reputation, and a good record of Service to the department, according to the criteria described below. A candidate for Promotion to Associate Professor will normally have at least started supervision as a supervisor (or co-supervisor) of a graduate student at the Masters or Ph.D. level.

In the event that there have been significant problems meeting the expectations set out in Section 6, the Faculty Member is required to demonstrate that the issues have been addressed by the time that he/she is being considered for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

In accordance with FEP s 3.3.1, a Research Stream Faculty Member who is being considered for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor is required to provide at least two current Peer Reviews of Teaching. If possible, one of the reviews should be based on teaching at the 100 or 200 level. The two evaluations are to be performed by different peers as described in FEP s 3.3.1.

A Faculty Member's Teaching will be assessed for the purposes of Promotion based on the factors identified in Section 6.4.1 (including the Peer Reviews mentioned above).

To meet the threshold of a high quality Research program with a national or international reputation, the committee will consider:

1. Quality and quantity of research publications in the discipline.
2. Grant funding: The Faculty Member should normally have an operating grant from an external granting agency as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator.
3. Invitations to speak nationally or internationally at conferences, seminars etc.
4. Other indicators in Section 6.4.2 as appropriate.

For the Service component, the test will be whether the Faculty Member has begun to play a meaningful role in Service. The committee will also take account of the Faculty Member's other Service activities as identified in Section 6.4.4.

### ***5.1.3. Promotion to Professor***

The standard for Promotion to Professor is described in CA s 28.17. The Department expects that a Faculty Member applying for Promotion to Professor should normally

demonstrate: good Teaching, a sustained high quality Research program with an international reputation; and a substantial record of high quality Service, according to the criteria described below. A candidate for Promotion to Professor will normally have completed supervision (normally as the sole supervisor) of graduate students including one at the Ph.D. level.

In accordance with FEP s 3.3.1, a Research Stream Faculty Member who is being considered for Promotion to Professor is required to provide at least two current Peer Reviews of Teaching. If possible, one of the reviews should be based on teaching at the 100 or 200 level. The two evaluations are to be performed by different peers, as described in FEP s 3.3.1.

A Faculty Member's Teaching will be assessed for the purposes of Promotion based on the factors identified in Section 6.4.1 (including the Peer Reviews mentioned above).

To meet the threshold of a high quality Research program with an international reputation, the committee will consider:

1. Quality and quantity of research publications in the discipline. There should be sustained evidence of high quality publications.
2. Grant funding: The Faculty Member should normally have a pattern of operating grants from an external granting agency as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator.
3. Invitations to speak at international conferences, seminars etc.
4. Other indicators in Section 6.4.2 as appropriate.

For the Service component, the test will be whether the Faculty Member has a substantial record of playing a meaningful role in Service. The committee will also take account of the Faculty Member's other Service activities as identified in Section 6.4.4.

## **5.2. Teaching Stream Faculty Members**

### **5.2.1. *Reappointment***

The standard for Reappointment is that the Faculty Member is *making good progress towards obtaining a Continuing Appointment*.

In addition to the criteria below, an Assistant Teaching Professor under consideration for reappointment is expected to be meeting the criteria described in Section 6.3.

In the case where there is any history of significant problems meeting the expectations in Section 6, the Reappointment Committee will evaluate whether the Faculty Member is taking concrete steps that can be expected to lead to satisfying the expectations.

A Teaching Stream Faculty Member who is being considered for Reappointment is required to provide at least two current Peer Reviews of Teaching. At least one of the reviews should be based on teaching at the 100 or 200 level. The two evaluations are to be performed by different peers, who must be mutually acceptable as evaluators by both the Chair and the Faculty Member being evaluated.

### **5.2.2. *Continuing Appointment***

Promotion to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor confers a Continuing Appointment, but promotion is not required for obtaining a Continuing Appointment (CA s 29.4).

In accordance with FEP s 3.3.1, CA s 27.10, and CA s 27.15, a Teaching Stream Faculty Member who is being considered for Continuing Appointment is required to provide two (or three, in the case of an Associate Teaching Professor) current Peer Reviews of Teaching no older than 18 months. At least one of the reviews should be based on teaching at the 100 or 200 level. The evaluations are to be performed by different peers, as described in FEP s 3.3.1.

To obtain a Continuing Appointment a Faculty Member must have a record of good Teaching and good contributions to Service. A Faculty Member's Teaching will be assessed for the purposes of obtaining a Continuing Appointment based on the factors identified in Section 6.4.1 (including the Peer Reviews mentioned above).

In the event that there have been significant problems meeting the expectations set out in Section 6, the Faculty Member is required to demonstrate that the issues have been addressed by the time that he/she is being considered for a Continuing Appointment.

For the Service component, the test will be whether the Faculty Member has begun to play a meaningful role in Service. The committee will also take account of the Faculty Member's other Service activities as identified in Section 6.4.4.

### ***5.2.3. Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor***

The standard for Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor is described in CA s 29.5. The Department expects that the Faculty Member should demonstrate: Excellence in Teaching, initiative in the development or delivery of the Department's academic program, and a good record of Service (CA s 29.5).

In accordance with FEP s 3.3.1, a Teaching Stream Faculty Member who is being considered for Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor is required to provide at least two current Peer Reviews of Teaching. At least one of the reviews should be based on teaching at the 100 or 200 level. The two evaluations are to be performed by different peers, as described in FEP s 3.3.1. In a case where, following CA s 33.7.1, Peer Reviews of Teaching are used as a substitute for an external letter, these must be in addition to the Peer Reviews mentioned above, and carried out by other peer reviewers.

A Faculty Member's Teaching will be assessed for the purposes of Promotion based on the factors identified in Section 6.4.1 (including the Peer Reviews mentioned above).

To meet the threshold of initiative in the development and delivery of courses in the Department's academic program, the committee will consider:

1. Significant development of course materials.
2. Courses delivered in innovative ways.
3. New courses created.
4. Scholarly Activity, particularly as it directly applies to the Faculty Member's teaching.
5. Service activities that impact the department's teaching mission.

For the Service component, the test will be whether the Faculty Member has begun to play a meaningful role in departmental Service. The committee will also take account of the Faculty Member's other Service activities as identified in Section 6.4.4.

### ***5.2.4. Tenure and Promotion to Teaching Professor***

The standard for Promotion to Teaching Professor is described in CA s 29.7. The Department expects that the Faculty Member should demonstrate: A record of outstanding achievement in Teaching; either Scholarship related to Teaching that has attained national or international recognition, or substantial leadership in the improvement of Teaching in the Department or the University; and a substantial record of high quality Service.

In accordance with FEP s 3.3.1, a Teaching Stream Faculty Member who is being considered for Promotion to Teaching Professor is required to provide at least two current Peer Reviews of Teaching. At least one of the reviews should be based on teaching at the



100 or 200 level. The two evaluations are to be performed by different peers, as described in FEP s 3.3.1. In a case where, following CA s 33.7.1, Peer Reviews of Teaching are used as a substitute for an external letter, these must be in addition to the Peer Reviews mentioned above, and carried out by other peer reviewers.

A Faculty Member's Teaching will be assessed for the purposes of Promotion based on the factors identified in Section 6.4.1 (including the Peer Reviews mentioned above). A record of outstanding achievement in Teaching will be demonstrated by documented continued teaching excellence.

In assessing Scholarship related to Teaching, the committee will consider:

1. Quality and quantity of scholarly publications.
2. Grant funding, either internal or external.
3. Invitations to speak nationally or internationally at conferences, seminars etc. related to teaching.
4. Other indicators in Section 6.4.3 as appropriate.

Substantial leadership in the improvement of Teaching in the Department or University may be demonstrated in the following, or other, ways:

1. Significant development of course materials.
2. A record of effective implementation of innovative teaching methods.
3. New courses created.
4. Mentorship of other instructors.
5. Mentorship of graduate students in Teaching.
6. Scholarly activities that impact the Teaching mission of the Department or University.
7. Service activities that impact the Teaching mission of the Department or University.

For the Service component, the test will be whether the Faculty Member has a substantial record of playing a meaningful role in Service. The committee will also take account of the Faculty Member's other Service activities as identified in Section 6.4.4.

## **6. Performance Expectations for the Purposes of Salary Evaluation**

Faculty Members are evaluated for the purposes of salary review on a biennial basis. Faculty Members in the Faculty of Science are evaluated in even-numbered years. As defined in CA s 50.27, the period of review is four years ending the prior December 31.

The Department values community-engaged and Indigenous Research and recognizes that indicators for successful achievement in these areas may be different than those for traditional academic activity. We also recognize that the pace of output may vary. These factors must be taken into account when assessing the Research and Scholarly Activity of Faculty Members.

### **6.1. Materials to be used for the purposes of salary evaluation:**

The materials to be used for the purposes of salary evaluation are described in FEP Chapter 4. The Department Chair may also make reference to established citation indices in the evaluation of research.

### **6.2. Salary Evaluation Process:**

As per CA s 50.28 and FEP Chapter 5, each Faculty Member will submit the above materials by January 15, and meet with the Chair to discuss their accomplishments during the review period. Following that meeting, the Chair will assess Faculty Members as “meets expectations,” “does not meet expectations,” or “exceeds expectations” (CA s 50.30). The standard for “meets” or “exceeds” expectations is defined below within each area of Academic Responsibility and increases with rank.

Subject to the eligibility bands defined in CA s 50.14, all Faculty Members that are assessed as “meets expectations” or “exceeds expectations” will receive a CPI. A rating of “exceeds expectations” means that a Faculty Member is eligible for a Performance Pay Increment (PPI – distributed to approximately 30% of Faculty Members). Within the Faculty of Science, the top 10% of those who are rated as “exceeds expectations” will be recommended by the Dean for an Outstanding Performance Recognition (OPR).

The list of Faculty Members who are rated as “exceeds expectations” will be ranked and forwarded as a ranked list to the Dean, who will follow the procedures described in FEP s 5.6.

Further information on the value of CPIs, PPIs, and OPRs is found in CA Article 50.

It is recognized that the University is required to provide human-rights based accommodations from time to time as circumstances arise that may affect the ability of a Faculty Member to engage in Academic Responsibilities and/or may affect performance in these areas. Approved accommodations must be taken into account when assessing performance for the purposes of biennial salary evaluation.

### **6.3. Meeting Expectations**

#### **6.3.1. *General Requirements***

In cases where the Department Chair identifies a significant problem with the Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activity, or Service effectiveness of a Faculty Member in the Department, the Chair will describe to the Faculty Member the nature of the problem in a timely manner. In such cases the Department Chair may require that, in order to be meeting expectations, the Faculty Member must undertake concrete steps to address the problem. In such cases the specific steps to be undertaken by the Faculty Member will be described by the Chair in writing.

#### **6.3.2. *Teaching***

Meeting expectations in the area of Teaching means fulfilment of assigned Teaching duties to an acceptable standard, as detailed below. In cases where the Chair determines that an acceptable standard of Teaching has not been met, the Chair will follow the procedure outlined in Section 6.3.1.

With respect to the administration of courses, fulfillment of assigned Teaching duties includes:

1. Preparing and submitting course outlines that comply with policy, on schedule.
2. Administering scheduled tests and exams.
3. Ensuring that student work is graded in a timely manner.
4. Submitting final grades in a timely manner.
5. Taking appropriate steps in cases where the above requirements cannot be satisfied.

With respect to the delivery of courses, fulfillment of assigned Teaching duties includes:

1. Preparing and delivering lectures of suitable quality as scheduled.
2. Holding office hours as scheduled.
3. Responding to appropriate student inquiries within a reasonable amount of time.
  - The instructor may specify in the course outline the manner and timelines by which they will respond to student inquiries.
4. Covering material appropriate to the course in pedagogically appropriate ways.
5. Making appropriate arrangements for substitutions or rescheduling when absence from the above points is necessary.

For Faculty Members in the Research Stream contributions to the training of HQP are also expected. It is acknowledged that developing an HQP training program takes time, and so new Faculty Members may meet expectations without directly supervising HQP. However, since training of HQP is part of the requirements for promotion and tenure, early-career Faculty Members are expected to take active steps towards recruitment, possibly including co-supervision of HQP.

### **6.3.3. Research (Research Stream Faculty)**

Meeting expectations in the area of Research is evidenced by activity and engagement in Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity, as defined in CA ss 25.8 and 25.9. However, Research Activities of a Faculty Member with a Research workload of 10% or less will be assessed in the same way as Scholarly Activities in the Teaching Stream, as defined in CA ss 25.11 and 25.12.

In order to *meet expectations* for Research, a Research Stream Faculty Member with an  $n\%$  Research workload, where  $n > 10$ , is expected to:

1. Produce evidence of ongoing research by
  - a. being a named principal investigator on an operating grant from external sources such as NSERC, CIHR or similar agency, or
  - b. having at least  $\lceil 2n/40 \rceil$  publications in reputable, peer-reviewed scientific journals over the previous three year period, or
  - c. making other research contributions (e.g. research papers accepted or submitted to reputable, peer-reviewed scientific journals, conference contributions, books or monographs, patents or technical reports, or work in progress) which the chair will assess on an individual basis.
2. Contribute to the training of HQP, with exceptions for new Faculty Members as noted in the section on meeting expectations in Teaching.
3. Attend research seminars and colloquia on campus.

There is an increasing expectation of Research Activity with career stage.

#### **6.3.4. Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream Faculty)**

Meeting expectations in the area of Scholarly Activity is evidenced by tangible and intangible engagement with the field in ways that will contribute to the Department's teaching program and enhance the Faculty Member's Teaching effectiveness. Indicators of Scholarly Activity are described in CA ss 25.11 and 25.12, as well as FEP s 3.5.

In order to *meet expectations* for Scholarly Activity, a Teaching Stream Faculty Member is expected to demonstrate engagement with at least one of the items listed in FEP s 3.5. The Department recognizes that attendance at workshops or conferences on Teaching is to be included in FEP s 3.5 g). The Department also recognizes the documented use of a scholarly approach to course design and delivery as being included in FEP s 3.5 g).

#### **6.3.5. Service**

Service in all of its manifestations is defined in CA s 25.14.

In order to *meet expectations* for Service, a Faculty Member is expected to:

1. Regularly attend Department meetings.
2. Play an active role on at least one departmental committee or serve the Department in an administrative capacity (e.g. as an Advisor) as assigned by the Chair when the Faculty Member is not on leave. (This expectation does not apply for the Faculty Member's first two years at UVic).
3. Mentor junior colleagues if assigned to do so by the Chair.

There is an increasing expectation of Service activity with career stage, with senior Faculty Members in both the Research and Teaching Streams expected to undertake roles involving leadership (e.g. chairing the Department, chairing Departmental or Faculty committees, serving as Graduate Advisor etc.)

### **6.4. Exceeding Expectations**

Evidence for exceeding expectations in any of the areas of evaluation should be highlighted in the evaluation document submitted by the Faculty Member to the Chair. A Faculty Member may be ranked as exceeding expectations for substantive achievement in one, two, or all three of the areas of Academic Responsibility. Evaluation ratios will be used for the purposes of ranking those Faculty Members who are recommended to receive PPIs and/or OPRs. Evaluation ratios are 40/40/20 for Research Stream Faculty and 70/10/20 for Teaching Stream Faculty unless there has been an approved Alternative Workload in place during the period of review or an alternative evaluation ratio has been approved under CA s 25.27.2.

In determining which Faculty Members exceed expectations in any category, the Chair will assign more weight to the quality than the quantity of the Faculty Member's contributions (FEP ss 3.3, 3.4, 3.5).

#### ***6.4.1. Teaching***

When deciding which Faculty Members exceed expectations in Teaching, and while preparing the ranked list of those Faculty Members exceeding expectations overall the Chair will consider whichever of the following items are included in the Faculty Member's file. The Chair's consideration will take into account the extent to which these factors go beyond the level required to meet expectations for the Faculty Member's rank and stream.

1. Number and variety of courses taught.
2. Numbers of undergraduate students taught.
3. Reading courses offered.
4. Coordination work.
5. Course development work.
6. Engagement with the LTSI Division.
7. Teaching Awards.
8. Course Experience Surveys.
9. Peer observations of teaching.
10. Extent of HQP supervision.

#### ***6.4.2. Research (Research Stream Faculty)***

When deciding which Research Stream Faculty Members exceed expectations in Research, the Chair will consider the items listed in CA s 25.9, FEP s 3.4, and Section 4.3 above. Specific indicators for exceeding expectations in Research may include, but are not limited to, the following items.

1. Publishing frequently (with respect to their sub-discipline) in high quality (e.g. ranked in the first quartile from recognized scientific data bases) or high impact factor journals, or have high impact publications as demonstrated through high citation indices.
2. Publishing monographs, books, invited and contributed book chapters.
3. Demonstrating technology transfer to industry through patents or otherwise.
4. Being an editor of scholarly collections, e.g. conference proceedings, survey collections.
5. Being a principal investigator on one or more operating grants secured from external sources.

6. The value and number of operating grants secured from external sources.
7. Receiving recognition from peers in the form of citations, reviews of work, awards and nominations.
8. Serving on professional and scholarly adjudicatory or review boards or councils.
9. Having their expertise frequently sought in the form of
  - a. invited conference presentations, keynote addresses
  - b. reviews for journals and reviewing databases
  - c. reviews of grant proposals or promotion/tenure applications.
10. Playing a leadership role on a journal editorial board or within a society or professional organization.
11. Having a high impact on graduate student mentoring as demonstrated through record of student progression through program, student awards, student presentations at conferences and/or student career outcomes.
12. Mentoring of other HQP, such as postdoctoral fellows.

#### **6.4.3. *Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream Faculty)***

When deciding which Teaching Stream Faculty Members exceed expectations in Scholarly Activity, the Chair will consider the items listed in CA s 25.12, FEP s 3.5, and Section 4.3 above. Specific indicators for exceeding expectation in Scholarly Activity may include, but are not limited to, the following items.

1. Publications in the scholarship of teaching and learning.
2. Publications of disciplinary research in mathematics or statistics.
3. Substantial other creative or scholarly substantial contributions related to the discipline.
4. Conference presentations.
5. Being a principal investigator on grants, either from internal or external sources.
6. Organization or facilitation of workshops or conferences (including internal events).
7. Contributions to training of HQP.
8. Contributions to curriculum renewal and development in the Department.

#### **6.4.4. Service**

Exceeding expectation in Service is evidenced by a substantive and significant contribution to internal or external Service over the period of review which goes well beyond that expected to meet expectations. The Chair's consideration will take into account the extent to which these factors go beyond the level required to meet expectations for the Faculty Member's rank and stream.

In deciding which Faculty Members *exceed expectations* in service, the Chair will consider the items in CA s 25.14, FEP s 3.6, Section 4.4 above, as well as:

1. Volunteering to undertake Departmental committee work above what is assigned.
2. Engaging in significant outreach activities (including engagement with Indigenous or other designated equity student groups and developing relationships with Indigenous or other designated equity groups outside campus).
3. Serving on Faculty Committees (other than those assigned by the Chair), or Faculty Association or University Committees.
4. Other contributions to the professional development and success of Faculty Members of the Department.
5. Other contributions fostering community and quality of life within the Department, or among students in the Department.

#### **6.5. Not meeting expectations**

Not meeting expectations is defined as a failure to meet the minimum thresholds associated with meeting expectations in any one of the areas of Academic Responsibility. An assessment of not meeting expectations will consider the career stage of the Faculty Member. A Faculty Member who is within the eligibility period for CPI (as defined in CA s 50.14) and who is assessed as not meeting expectations will be recommended by the Chair to receive ½ CPI as per CA s 50.15 and will be re-evaluated in the following year.